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ABSTRACT

COUNTERVISUALITY AS POLICY FEEDBACK:
A CRITICAL POLICY STUDY ON THE SYMBOLIC ROLE OF VISUAL CULTURE
IN CONTEMPORARY ANTIRACIST RESISTANCE

Lindsay N. Plott-Buckner
Old Dominion University, 2018
Director: Dr. Meagan M. Jordan

This critical interpretive study explores the relationship between public policy and visual culture. Drawing from five areas of research literature on (1) policy feedback theory, (2) the spectacle, (3) art and visual culture, (4) Black feminist theory, (5) and critical philosophies of resistance, images of contemporary antiracist activism are conceptualized as a form of policy feedback. Photographs of Ieshia Evans, Bree Newsome, and a self-portrait by Nona Faustine are reverse searched through Google Images. Utilizing constructivist grounded theory, a collection of publicly available news articles, blogs, and social media content are analyzed to better understand how mass publics engage with these images online.

The findings reveal that a unique form of social learning takes place as publics orient themselves to the images in terms of lived experience, current events, and history; as they make sense of images by connecting novel information to previously learned information; and, as they apply the images in a variety of ways in civil society, politics, and market. This form of extra-institutional learning appears to be consistent with current literature on public pedagogy. Implications for the field of public policy are discussed.
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CHAPTER ONE:  
INTRODUCTION  

The imagery that extends from contemporary antiracist social movements constitutes a unique form of policy feedback in response to the punitive turn in public policy in the post-civil rights era. The punitive turn in poverty policy, the War on Drugs, the forms of governance responsible for implementing related policies, and the broader political environment characterized by neoliberal political ideology, have dramatically shaped the current landscape of American racial politics and social control (Lowi, 1998; Soss, Fording, & Schram, 2011a; Taylor, 2016; Wacquant, 2010). Within the academy, the postmodern turn and the emergence of visual culture studies have coincided with these broader societal trends; each arising during the period between the late 1970s and the early to mid-1980s. In many ways postmodernist theory in general, and visual culture studies specifically, has sought to interpret the role of images in maintaining dominant political, economic, and social orders as well as in contesting them (Mirzoeff, 1998, 1999, 2011). Therefore, focusing on visual culture as an underlying source of meaning-making in response to public policy has the potential to yield a powerful analysis of the role of visual images as policy feedback, providing insight into the ways in which images may inform the political beliefs and actions of mass publics. As such, the purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between visual culture and public policy with a specific focus on the images that extend from contemporary antiracist activism. Valuable information about the ways in which past policies shape how citizens\(^1\) produce, create, share, and engage with visual culture online is gained from: (1) connecting images to previous policies and government actions, (2)  

\(^1\) The term *citizens* refers to individuals in “the citizenry of photography” as defined by Azoulay (2008, 2012) and is not dependent on territorial borders of nation-states but rather encompasses all individuals both as potential subjects of the photograph and as potential spectators of the same. This term is inclusive of undocumented residents.
tracing their circulation online, and (3) examining how mass publics engage with the images as they are circulated. Policymakers and scholars could benefit from the insights produced from such research as the knowledge learned may ultimately help them to better understand how visual culture shapes policy preferences. As Castells (2015) argues, institutions cannot long survive on coercion alone, particularly when they run counter to the majority of public opinion. Thus, “the fundamental power struggle is the battle for the construction of meaning in the minds of the people” (Castells, 2015, p. 5). Within this battle, visual culture is paramount.

As Edelman (1971) once argued, images are often an integral part of the way that individuals make sense of an increasingly complex world. To better understand the connections between public policy and the images that arise in the context of antiracist protest, this research project draws on literature in the areas of policy feedback theory (e.g., Pierson, 1993; Mettler & Soss, 2004) and interpretivist approaches to policy studies (e.g., Schneider & Ingram, 1993, 1997) as well as scholarship in visual cultural studies (e.g., Azoulay, 2008, 2012; Mirzoeff, 2011), Black feminist theory (e.g., Collins, 2000; Crenshaw, 1991; Harris-Perry, 2011), and critical philosophies of resistance, (e.g., Adorno, 1973/2007; Davis, 2016; Horkheimer, 2002; Marcuse, 1964), including Afro-pessimism (e.g., Gordon 1995, 1997a, 1997b; More, 2015). Specifically, these theoretical lenses are helpful in contextualizing the three photographs of antiracist resistance upon which this study focuses: widely circulated images of Ieshia Evans, Bree Newsome, and Nona Faustine. These images have been selected for this study due to their depictions of state-citizen interactions involving the contestation of racism in governance and beyond. In these images, Black women, who have undoubtedly taken a prominent role at the forefront of antiracist social movements in recent years, seem to at once implicate and contest the policies of the state, past and present. This is of particular significance due to the ways in which negative stereotypes of Black women have historically informed social policy in the US (Collins,
2000; Crenshaw, 1991, 2012; Davis, 2016; Hancock, 2004; Jordan-Zachery, 2009) as well as the ways in which specific policy areas, namely criminal justice and welfare policy, have been racialized (Alexander, 2011; Heclo, 1994; Lowi, 1998; Soss, Fording, & Schram, 2011a; Taylor, 2016; Waquant, 2010). Additionally, scholars from a variety of disciplines have drawn attention to the ways in which the ideological forces associated with the neoliberal and punitive turns in policymaking have further compounded the long history of structural racism in American political institutions (Davis, 2016; Soss & Schram, 2011a; Taylor, 2016; Waquant, 2010). As such, this study takes a decidedly interdisciplinary approach to contextualizing the images of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine within current scholarship on racial politics while remaining committed to making a contribution to the literature on policy feedback theory (Pierson, 1993; Mettler & Soss, 2004) and shedding light on the nature of the spectacle in the years since Edelman (1971, 1988, 1995) first highlighted the important role of visual culture in American policymaking. Toward this end, the next section introduces some important theoretical considerations guiding this inquiry.

Important Theoretical Considerations

There are several important theoretical considerations that arise from critical scholarship on race and neoliberalism, visual culture, policy feedback theory, critical philosophy, and Afro-pessimism. Collectively, these considerations provide an important point of departure for this research study as they foreground various themes that will be engaged more thoroughly in subsequent chapters. They are highlighted below.

---

2 According to Gooden (2015) the pattern of structural, racial inequities in and across US environmental, health, education, criminal justice, and economic (including welfare) policies are “mutually compounding” and comprise a “conditional structure” that is often tolerated by bureaucratic elites and policymakers because these disparities are “paradoxically viewed as normal” (p. 22).
On Race and Neoliberalism

The focus of recent scholarship on neoliberal ideology is particularly important because, in combination with the tradition of American liberal paternalism, wherein policy benefits are meted out to the citizenry based not on need alone but rather on good behavior coupled with perceived need, neoliberalism exacerbates the kinds of social conditions (characterized by structural racism) that foreground contemporary antiracist activism (Harvey, 2005; Giroux, 2005; Soss, Fording, & Schram, 2011a; Taylor, 2016). Neoliberal ideology, in this context, refers to a widespread belief that “the social good will be maximized by maximizing the reach and frequency of market transactions,” and so “seeks to bring all human action into the domain of the market” (Harvey, 2005, p. 3). Specifically, neoliberalism utilizes a disciplinary regime that monopolizes the coercive power of the state to control both target group behavior and the intra-agency behavior of state administrators through the strategic use of sanctions and rewards (Soss, Fording, & Schram, 2011a, 2011b; Schneider & Ingram, 1993, 1997). Scholars frequently point to the work requirements and stringent sanctions associated with the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) (1996), which overhauled the welfare system, and to mass incarceration and the privatization of the prison industry (Alexander, 2011; Taylor, 2016; Waquant, 2010), as two egregious examples of the ways in which policies informed by neoliberal ideology have appropriated state coercive power in service of the market (Lowi, 1998; Soss, Fording, & Schram, 2011a; Wacquant, 2010). Critics charge that these policies are problematic because neoliberalism conceptualizes the market as a panacea for social problems without regard for the ways in which it is ill-equipped to ameliorate racial and economic inequality (Harvey, 2005; Soss, Fording, & Schram 2011a). Within this context, particularly where state actors seem to ignore the relationship between economic and racial inequality, policy has become more responsive to corporate and moneyed interests than to non-wealthy, individual
This inevitably impacts racial outcomes across multiple policy areas as well as the antiracist activism that arises in the wake of those policies. In this context, visual culture plays a prominent though often overlooked role in the relations between state actors and marginalized publics.

On Visuality and Countervisuality

Visual culture scholars study the ways in which images are culturally and historically produced and shared, as well as the racial, gender, sexual, and power dimensions laden in these practices, and the various modalities and technologies that facilitate image production, creation, audiencing, and circulation (Mirzoeff, 1998, 1999, 2011; Rose, 2016; Sandywell, 2011). Two concepts arise from the literature in visual culture studies that help to situate the role of images in terms of public policy and the coercive power of the state, on the one hand, and mass publics, on the other. These concepts are visuality and countervisuality (Mirzoeff, 2011). Specifically, Mirzoeff (2011) utilizes the term visuality to refer to the practices of picturing, or envisioning phenomena (beyond the capability of the body’s physiological/neurological systems). Visuality so defined has its origins in bureaucratic and military history (as in the need to visualize a battlefield too large for the naked eye to capture in its entirety) and in the scholarship of conservative historian, Thomas Carlyle (Mirzoeff, 2011). According to Mirzoeff, Carlyle linked the practice of visuality with the concept of heroism, which he believed entailed the powerful ability to picturize the ethos of a nation and thereby direct its course. By this, it is meant that a true hero is a visionary in society akin to that of a cinematographer on the set of a movie, one who is responsible for setting the tone of the film in its entirety. Heroes, as such, are responsible for developing a guiding ideological picture that provides both meaning and direction to other societal actors. According to Mirzoeff, Carlyle argued that this means of ideological picturing would also assist government leaders in retaining autocratic power. Conversely, Mirzoeff uses
the term *countervisuality* to refer to practices of contesting dominant ways of seeing. That is, countervisuality is a method of countering the visuality of the state by asserting one’s “right to look” and one’s “political subjectivity” (Mirzoeff, 2011, p.1). In particular, countervisuality involves challenging the ideology underlying the current political order and the powerful societal actors attempting to set the tone for the nation state. As Mirzoeff’s analysis reveals, the types of visuality and countervisuality throughout history have varied across space and time. The present form of visuality, however, is what Mirzoeff finds most problematic.

As Mirzoeff argues, the current state of visuality is the crisis of visuality itself—what he terms *neovisuality*. Neovisuality is a specific type of post-panoptic visual culture, which began to emerge around the end of the Cold War in 1989 and which Mirzoeff associates with the Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA), which was thought by the US government to be a strategically necessary re-visioning of contemporary warfare due primarily to the technological advances of the information age (Mazarr, 1994; Mirzoeff 2011). In the post 9-11 global context, its clearest manifestation in military and civilian life is the global counterinsurgency known as “COIN” (Mirzoeff, 2011; Roper, 2008). What concerns Mirzoeff is that COIN engages a form of visuality that thrives on both ubiquity and invisibility, as exemplified by state surveillance technologies. Indeed, a key thesis of the RMA is that contemporary military strategy must move away from classical forms of warfare involving close combat on the battlefield to more specious forms of warfare such as those advised by Lao Tzu in *The Art of War* (Mazarr, 1994). Thus, “when counterinsurgency deploys itself as a visualized field, it does so by means of representation in which the place of observation is invisible or obscured, for the state of exception is a non-place, like the mystical representation of Carlyle’s Hero” (Mirzoeff, 2011, p. 296). Furthermore, under the RMA the traditional lines between military and civilian life dissipate and the technologies of the private sector converge with those of the state (Mazarr,
1994). Thus, visuality is no longer the domain of the state alone, but rather it is produced through a complex set of state and market relationships or what is often referred to as “neoliberal governance” (Mirzoeff, 2011, p. 278). Moreover, as Mirzoeff argues, COIN relies upon both chaos and countervisuality to justify its means of visuality: that is, the deployment of state surveillance is justified by the very existence of those who might resist it.

The crisis of visuality and the birth of COIN emerge from what Mbembe (2003) terms *necropolitics*, i.e. the sovereign’s “power and the capacity to dictate who may live and who must die” (p. 11). As such, in contemporary warfare, the goal of the sovereign and its post-panoptic visuality becomes the separation of “the ‘host population’ from the ‘insurgent,’ as if quarantining the former from infection by the latter” (Mirzoeff, 2011, p. 279). In so doing, human bodies are marked by the sovereign as either worthy of life or fit for annihilation. Traditional democratic politics as well the closely related normative values of reason, justice, and governance by the people, are usurped as the sovereign declares the state of exception (the necessity of the state to operate extrajudicially to root out insurgents) and the state of emergency (the dire need to act now in the face of chaos). “In such instances, power (and not necessarily state power) continuously refers and appeals to exception, emergency, and a fictionalized notion of the enemy. It also labors to produce that same exception, emergency, and fictionalized enemy” (Mbembe, 2003, p. 16). American domestic life is thus rendered equally as subject to what Mirzoeff terms the “necropolitical regimes of separation” as is the global battlefield upon which insurgency is fought.

On Policy Feedback Theory and Visual Culture

Policy feedback theory, like visual culture, warrants a historical consciousness. Policy feedback theorists posit that past policies shape present politics, expanding the assertion first uttered by Schattschneider (1935) that “new policies create new politics” (p. 288). As policy
feedback scholars argue, new policies shape the political arrangements of government elites, organized interests, and mass publics in material and psychological ways (Mettler & Soss, 2004; Pierson, 1993). *Policy feedback*, therefore, as it relates to mass publics, can be defined following Pierson (1993) and Mettler and Soss (2004), as the form, quality, and extent of citizen participation in political and civic life, which is implicitly impacted by material resources and informed by the subjective interpretations and social meanings imputed to government actors by citizens in the wake of new public policies or changes to existing policies through legislative, executive, or judicial action. Importantly, policy feedback theory and visual culture conjoin at the nexus of what Edelman (1988) refers to as the “political spectacle” (originally theorized as “the society of the spectacle” by Debord, (1983))—a mirage of images constructed by dominant political actors of policy problems (for which ready-made solutions are available), leaders, and enemies (much like the “fictionalized notion of the enemy” to which Mbembe’s (2003) refers). The spectacle, itself a form of visuality, capitalizes upon the reliance of mass publics on imagery and symbols to make sense of a (post)modern world that has become increasingly complex and ambiguous due to the onslaught of data and information directed toward average citizens on a daily basis.

On Critical Philosophy and Afro-Pessimism

As ontology refers to the nature of existence, *political ontology* as articulated here speaks to individual and collective understandings of self and citizenship as one is situated in the world and as communicated both symbolically and materially by and through public policy (Edelman, 1971, 1988, 1995). Specifically, at issue is what it means to live and to survive in an environment antithetical to one’s race (Dumas, 2016), and as Afro-pessimists argue, to live in an environment in which Black lives are often, at least de facto, deemed by the sovereign as unworthy of existence. Scholars of Afro-pessimism frequently cite Patterson’s (1982)
comparative study on the global history of slavery in which he refers to slavery as a kind of “social death,” using the concept of liminality to explicate the ways in which the slave is, on the one hand, socially dead (i.e. marginalized and outside the sphere of social relations within society), and on the other, “essential for [society’s] survival” (p. 46). They conceptualize contemporary Black life as existence “in the wake” of slavery, an ontology that entails being the “afterlife of property” (Sharpe, 2016, p. 15). The existence of the Black diaspora is theorized at once as highly visible, in terms of the spectacular images produced by state and market and embedded in popular culture, and nearly invisible in terms of the extent to which dominant groups understand Black people’s proximal lived experiences with various policies. This is in accordance with Franz Fanon (2008), who insisted that, “the black man is phobogenic,” an object that evokes an irrational fear in the other; and, following Sartre, is overdetermined in his constitution such that where there is one Black, there is already too many. “It is enough that somewhere the object [the Black individual] exists” (Fanon, 2008, p. 133). This often-tacit notion that one visible Black person is already too many is known as the overdetermination thesis. As such, the slave, “the Black,” exists as an object in antagonistic relationship to the subject, “the human,” and as a non-human, “the slave endures in the social imagination and also in the everyday suffering experienced by Black people” (Dumas, 2016, p. 14; Wilderson, 2010).

Between the political ontology of the American citizen, for example, as outlined by the Founding Fathers, and that of “the Black,” lay what Wilderson (2010) terms an ontological aporia.³ This is the place of incompatibility between the nation’s conceptualization of the political subject as rendered by law (“the human”) and the lived experience of Black individuals as the “afterlife of property” (Sharpe, 2016; Gordon 1995, 1997a, 1997b). Whereas discussions of subject and

³ Elsewhere, aporia is defined by Buchanan (2010) as “a point of perplexity, where a combination of axioms and/or propositions (each true in their own right) are found to be incompatible” (p. 24).
object, of political ontology, tend to be abstract, and often excluded in policy debates, they do have practical policy and administrative implications that can spur meaningful dialogue among political actors and administrators. In the context of educational policy, Dumas (2016) writes of Afro-pessimism, as the philosophy of “anti-blackness,” that its practical application provides teachers, administrators, and leadership with the opportunity to reflect on and “explore together what it means to educate a group of people who were never meant to be educated, and in fact, were never meant to be, to exist as humans” (p. 17).

Taken together, theories of Afro-pessimism, of race and neoliberalism, visual culture, policy feedback, and the spectacle, provide an important interdisciplinary framework and a point of departure from which this study proceeds. The next section provides a brief overview of the current landscape of antiracist activism in the US before moving onto the presentation of the images of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine, along with the relevant policies that seem to have shaped the antiracist politics from which these images emerge.

The Current Landscape of Antiracist Activism in the US

Digital culture in this second decade of the new millennium has undoubtedly altered the shape of political protest and activism (Castells, 2015). The Arab Spring, the surge of political activism that spread across the Middle East beginning in 2011 from countries such as Tunisia and Egypt to Lebanon, Jordan, Sudan, Yemen, and other nations in the Arab world, is distinct from previous revolutions in that it was recognized by scholars as “the first set of political upheavals in which all of these things (alienation from the state, consensus among the population in the protest, defence of the movement by the international public opinion) were digitally mediated…” (Hussain & Howard, 2012, as cited by Castells, 2015, p.107). American activists were emboldened as news of the Arab uprisings and the political activism among the Spanish indignados spread across the Internet (Castells, 2015). Just as digital culture preceded and fueled
the political discontent and protest across the Arab world as well as the resistance movement of the indignados, so too did technology play an integral role in the formation of the Occupy movement. Furthermore, the Occupy movement preceded a powerful resurgence of antiracist activism now associated with Black Lives Matter and, more broadly, The Movement for Black Lives. Historian Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor (2016) notes the significance of three formative events preceding this activism: (1) The State of Georgia’s execution of Troy Davis, a Black man thought by family and advocates to be falsely convicted, in September 2011, immediately followed by a “day of outrage” protests when antiracist activists conjoined with activists from the burgeoning Occupy movement on Wall Street, (2) the resistance and organizing of Black Occupy activists, and (3) the murder of Trayvon Martin and the subsequent acquittal of George Zimmerman (p. 144). Together, these events comprise what Taylor refers to as the American Spring, a resurgence of political activism calling for racial and economic equality and advocating direct democracy as a political remedy for the inequalities steepened by the 2008 financial crisis. According to Taylor, this was a critical period in recent American history when Black Americans were forced to reckon with the persistence of racial and economic structural inequalities even under the leadership of the United States’ first Black president, Barack Obama. Out of this discontent emerged the Black Lives Matter movement.

The birth of the Black Lives Matter movement occurred in the hours following the release of the Trayvon Martin verdict when Alicia Garza posted the hashtag #blacklivesmatter on Facebook (Taylor, 2016). Friends and colleagues, Patrisse Khan-Cullors and Opal Tometi, joined Garza in creating and organizing the antiracist social movement, which picked up steam following the death of Mike Brown in Ferguson, Missouri, where activists engaged in prolonged direct-action protest and community organizing to contest police violence against Black communities (Taylor, 2016). The movement has brought issues of gender, race, policy reform,
and structural inequality to the forefront of public discourse. The visual imagery extending from various forms of antiracist activism (even that which is not directly associated with Black Lives Matter) in the years since the American Spring has proliferated online via blogs, social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram as well as more traditional journalism outlets. The countervisuality of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine, introduced in the next section, provides three powerful examples of the ways in which this visual culture functions as a form of policy feedback.

Study Background:

Presentation of the Photographs and Relevant Policies

The photographs utilized in this study along with relevant policies that seem to have shaped the racial politics from which they emerge are presented below to contextualize the images within a policy feedback framework. Whereas a wide array of previous policies has contributed to the current climate of racial politics in the US within which the actions of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine may be understood, this section is intended to provide a snapshot rather than an exhaustive analysis of all the public policies that are implicated. It is also important to note that the assertion that these photographs are forms of policy feedback does not mean that certain policies alone caused the photographs to occur. That argument would foreclose the agency of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine, attributing to the state more coercive power than what seems sensible. Certainly, policy 𝑥, on its own, does not cause photograph 𝑦. Rather, policy 𝑥 may shape the political arrangements and social conditions that give way to contemporary forms of racial politics and antiracist activism out of which photograph 𝑦 emerges. Moreover, “policy feedback” is an academic term, a way of explaining how policies shape and alter political arrangements; in this case, racial politics. Therefore, the act of connecting these images with relevant policies should not be misconstrued as attempting to speak on behalf of the
women in the photographs, i.e. “she did this because of policy x.” Rather, this section is intended to show how policies not only impact and shape political arrangements but also, by extension, the visual culture that emerges from those arrangements. In turn, visual culture has a way of implicating these policies because, as Marcuse (1978) has argued, “art…re-presents reality while accusing it” (p. 8).

General Policies Impacting Study

Following Harvey (2005), Lowi (1998), Soss, Fording, and Schram (2011a, 2011b), and Waquant (2010), three policies are highlighted in accordance with the social control thesis that federal and multilateral neoliberal trade policies often contribute to the kinds of social conditions and insecurity that require increased social control at local and state levels through punitive social policy in the areas of criminal justice and welfare (Table 1). First, this study considers the Uruguay Round Agreements (1994) as a marker of trade liberalism. Indeed, it is one of the most liberal trade bills in recent history, which dissolved the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), and created the World Trade Organization (WTO). Notably, on the same day that Congress passed that bill, it also passed the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act (1994). This policy, among other things, established the “Cops on the Beat” program, providing block grants to states with the goal of increasing citizen-police officer interactions in local communities. Two years later, Congress formally abolished Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) when it passed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (1996), which established a five-year maximum benefit period, tied aid to

---

4 All three women have spoken publicly regarding the reasons for their activism, which are incorporated into the study analysis in Chapter Four and discussed in Chapter Five. Interested readers may also consult BBC (2016), Blay (2016), and Reuters (2016) for more information about Ieshia Evans in her own words. For Bree Newsome, please consult Democracy Now (2015) and Joiner (2017). For Nona Faustine, please consult Mestrich (2014), Smack Mellon (n.d.), and visit her website at http://nonafaustine.virb.com/about.
local job markets, and restricted access to assistance for convicted felons. The policy also encompassed a complex set of reporting requirements for state welfare offices as well as sanctions for administrators and program participants alike (Soss, Fording, & Schram, 2011a, 2011b). Following Harvey (2005), these three policies are representative of the ways in which neoliberalism and neoconservatism have intersected in recent years to set the kinds of conditions and constraints (poverty, over-policing, etc.) that antiracist resistance contests and which have disparately impacted communities of color (Alexander, 2011; Soss, Fording, & Schram, 2011a, 2011b; Taylor, 2016; Waquant, 2010). The images of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine are provided below, accompanied by a brief policy narrative for each photograph and a corresponding table listing the dates of relevant policy decisions and government actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Policy/Government Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>The Uruguay Round Agreements Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ieshia Evans

The policies impacting upon the political conditions leading to the photograph of Ieshia Evans are primarily at the federal level of government. These include the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (1989), which provided $450 million in funding for the Department of Defense’s (DoD’s) drug interdiction and counterdrug activities, including the appropriation of $27 million in C31 (command, control, communications, and intelligence assets) resources to be used for these purposes. By 1996, the House Committee on
National Security recommended that the program continue indefinitely and be expanded to include the provision of resources to local law enforcement agencies, prioritizing but not limiting them to counterdrug activities. The National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 1997 (1996) then replaced the 1201 program with the 1033 program, removing the stipulation that resources were to be used only for counterdrug activities. In 2015, following the unrest in Ferguson, Missouri, after the death of Mike Brown, President Barack Obama signed Executive Order 13688 (2016), which established the Law Enforcement Working Group. The group was charged with reviewing the 1033 program to identify the ways in which the federal government could improve oversight of the program and ensure the proper use and appropriateness of equipment provided to local law enforcement agencies. Later that year, the Law Enforcement Working Group (2015) issued a report making a series of recommendations regarding the military equipment that the committee believed should be prohibited (e.g., tracked armored vehicles, weaponized aircraft, firearms .50 caliber or higher) and controlled (including riot batons, helmets, and shields) by the DoD. The report also made various recommendations for the establishment of more stringent reporting guidelines, oversight, and sanctions for noncompliance.

The photograph of Ms. Evans was taken on July 9, 2016, in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, where she had travelled to participate in protests in the wake of the deaths of Alton Sterling and Philando Castile. The image of Ms. Evans has brought to the fore discussions among publics surrounding the militarization of the police with a focus on the use of riot gear in the context of peaceful protest. In July 2017, in response to a provision outlined in Section 1638 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (2015) that the US Government Accountability Office (GAO) review the 1033 program, the GAO set up a fake law enforcement agency to determine the suitability of the Defense Logistics Agency’s (DLA) internal controls for
implementing the program. The GAO reported that under the guise of this fake government agency it was able to procure one hundred items totaling $1.2 million from the DLA (US Government Accountability Office, 2017). As a result of this investigation, the GAO determined (1) that the DLA needed to improve its existing policies for approving applications for federal agency enrollment into the program, (2) that better controls needed to be in place for verifying the identity of individuals picking up property awarded to individual agencies, (3) that all items transferred should be checked against a list of the type and quantity approved for transfer, and (4) that a strategy for fraud mitigation needed to be in place to reduce fraudulent activity at all stages of the program. The GAO report encompassing these recommendations was sent to the DoD (which agreed with the recommendations and took steps to implement them) as well as relevant Congressional committees. By August 2017, President Trump issued Executive Order 13809 (2018) revoking President Obama’s Executive Order 13688 and directing that all executive agencies cease implementing the recommendations issued by the Law Enforcement Working Group. There have been no additional substantive policy changes requiring additional 1033 oversight, despite the various iterations of the Stop Militarizing Law Enforcement Act (e.g., Senate Bill 1856 sponsored by Senator Paul Rand), which have been presented in Congress over the last few sessions, most prominently during the 2015 Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) Special Session following the protest in Ferguson, Missouri. The photograph of Ms. Evans is featured in Figure 1 below, followed by Table 2, which provides a list of relevant policies relating to the image.
Figure 1. Ieshia Evans – Bachman (2016) “Taking a Stand in Baton Rouge.”

Used with permission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Policy/Government Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 1997 replaces 1201 with the 1033 program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Executive Order 13688 signed by President Obama to curb 1033 program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Committee report issued by the Law Enforcement Equipment Working Group, mandated by EO 13688, makes recommendations to address 1033 program excesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Section 1638 of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 orders review by GAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>GAO-17-532 Report to Congressional Committees: DOD Excess Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Executive Order 13809 signed by President Trump to revoke Executive Order 13688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Senator Paul Rand introduces Senate Bill 1856 – Stop Militarizing Law Enforcement Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bree Newsome

The policies impacting upon the political conditions leading to the photograph of Bree Newsome are primarily at the state level. The Confederate flag began to fly from the top of the dome of the South Carolina Statehouse sometime between 1960 and 1962, although the record is blurred as to the exact date (Chaffin, Cooper, & Knotts, 2017; Webster & Lieb, 2001). Despite many attempts during the late 1990s in the state legislature to have the flag removed, it remained until the turn of the century when South Carolina’s Heritage Act (2000) dictated that only the United States Flag and the South Carolina State flag could be flown from the top of the dome. The Confederate flag would be placed on the Statehouse grounds adjacent to the Confederate soldiers’ monument. This policy further prohibited the removal of the flag or any “monument, marker, memorial, school, or street named in honor of the Confederacy or the civil rights movement located on any municipal, county, or state property” without a joint resolution of the State Assembly approving the measure by a two-thirds vote in each house. Ten days after what became known as the “Charleston massacre” of nine African American members of the Emmanuel AME Church, Bree Newsome alongside ally James Ian Tyson removed the Confederate flag from the Statehouse grounds on June 27, 2015. By July 8, 2015, the image of Ms. Newsome removing the flag appeared on the website of U.S. Representative Hakeem Jeffries regarding his House Amendment 606 (2015) to HR Bill 2822 Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016 (Jeffries, 2015). The amendment, which barred the Confederate flag from appearing within the national park system “and related sites,” passed on the House floor by voice vote but was never codified into law. At the state level, however, on July 9, 2015, after decades of debate, the South Carolina State General Assembly finally passed, and Governor Nicky Haley signed into law, “An Act to Amend Section 1-10-10, Code of Laws of South Carolina, 1976” (2015), formally and indefinitely removing the
Confederate flag from Statehouse grounds. The photograph of Ms. Newsome is featured in Figure 2 below, followed by Table 3, which provides a list of relevant policies relating to the image.

*Figure 2.* Bree Newsome – Anderson (2015). Untitled.

Used with permission.
Table 3
*Policies Impacting the Photographed Event: Bree Newsome*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Policy/Government Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960-2</td>
<td>Confederate Flag begins to fly at Statehouse (Webster &amp; Lieb, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>SC Bill 4895 – Heritage Act of 2000 – Act No. 292, Section 1 allows flag on statehouse. (Chaffin, Cooper, &amp; Knotts, 2017; Webster &amp; Lieb, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>House Amendment 606 to H.R. 2822 passes by floor vote but is not codified into law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>An Act to Amend Section 1-10-10, Code of Laws of South Carolina, 1976, signed into law by Governor Nicky Haley.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nona Faustine

The policies impacting upon the political conditions leading to the photograph of Nona Faustine on Wall Street, a self-portrait from her *White Shoes* series, which she titled “From Her Body Sprang their Greatest Wealth” (Faustine, 2013), extend back several centuries to a 1711 Law Appointing for the More Convenient Hiring of Slaves (New York (N.Y.) Common Council, 1905). Although the slave market was later closed before the turn of the century, the histories of the Atlantic slave trade and of Wall Street as a modern site of global wealth conjoined during this period in the 18th century. Notably, the 1790 Act Making Provision for the Debt of the United States (1845) was influential in stimulating private trade and investment on Wall Street as it issued $80 million in bonds to pay for the Revolutionary War. Nearly two centuries later, during the 1960’s, the US government took action to ensure that various historic locations around the United States would be preserved despite an ever-increasing urbanized American landscape. Both the National Historic Preservation Act (1966) and the National Environmental Policy Act (1969) contained provisions that considered the social and cultural impact of preserving historical landmarks around the nation. In Executive Order 11593 (1971-1975) President Richard Nixon encouraged the federal government to work with local American communities to preserve sites of historical significance even in cases where they were not
already listed on the federal registry. These policies later came into play during the 1990s when the General Services Administration (GSA) began construction on a federal government building to be located in New York City’s Lower Manhattan and soon discovered the presence of an African burial ground. The 1993 Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act (1992) contained within it a provision forcing the GSA to re-intern the bodies it had previously exhumed. In 1996, President Bill Clinton signed Executive Order 13006 (1997), reaffirming the US government’s commitment to locating federal government buildings within the historic districts of cities around the nation, to preserving their history, and to working with local communities to ensure they would be respected throughout the construction process. Ten years later, President George W. Bush signed Presidential Proclamation 7984 (2007), which established the African burial ground as a national monument. Ms. Faustine began working on *White Shoes* in 2012. However, it was not until 2015 as a result of public (i.e. activist) calls for the formal acknowledgement of the slave market, when New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio responded by dedicating a plaque on Wall Street commemorating the historic site (Office of the Mayor, 2015). The photograph of Ms. Faustine is featured in Figure 3 below, followed by Table 4, which provides a list of relevant policies relating to the image.
Figure 3. Nona Faustine – “From Her Body Sprang their Greatest Wealth” (Faustine, 2013)

Used with permission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Policy/Government Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Minutes of The Common Council: A Law Appointing for the More Convenient Hiring of Slaves allowed for the development of the slave market on Wall Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Dedication of Plaque Marking Slave Market by Governor Bill de Blasio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study Relevance and Contribution

This research study takes advantage of Google’s content-based image retrieval (CBIR) technology, reverse searching the images of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine, and employing constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2014) to analyze a sample of news articles, blogs, and social media that have utilized the images in various ways. The specific focus of this study is on the meaning-making processes of mass publics surrounding visual culture, particularly antiracist countervisuality, and the implications of these processes for the field of public policy. This research study is broadly situated within the tradition of critical qualitative inquiry (CQI), which is characterized by an “avowed humanistic and social justice commitment to study the social world from the perspective of the interacting individual” (Denzin, 2010, p. 16), and straddles the boundary between radical humanist and radical structuralist paradigms (Burell & Morgan, 1979). It takes into consideration three forms of policy feedback: (1) contemporary racial politics and antiracist activism, (2) the visual culture associated with this activism, and (3) citizen meaning-making processes that occur as images of antiracist activism are circulated online. As antiracist activists continue to contest government policy in the US, it is important for government actors and policy scholars to understand the dynamic ways in which the visual culture that extends from this activism also serves as a form of policy feedback; informing citizen’s sense of self (i.e. political ontology), their perceptions of government (i.e. perceived legitimacy), and their worldviews. Whereas this study focuses specifically on the relationship between public policy and visual culture regarding the countervisuality of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine, its implications extend to scholars who may have interests in studying the relationship between visual culture and a variety of other policy areas. Moreover, the broader aim of this work is to contribute to existing scholarship on the nature of
the spectacle (Debord, 1983; Edelman, 1988) by focusing on the impact of advances in digital technology (i.e. Web 2.0) on the relationship between public policy and visual culture.

Research Questions Guiding the Study
This study addresses four research questions based on the theoretical concepts introduced in this chapter:

1) How does the visual culture represented by these three photographs impact spectators’ perceptions of self, citizenship, nation, and government?
2) In what ways does countervisuality shape policy preferences?
3) What are the implications of countervisuality for the aporia between Black lived experience and the political ontology set forth by the Founding Fathers?
4) In what ways are citizen perceptions and meaning-making processes shaped by race, class, gender, and sexuality?

Outline of the Study
These research questions are addressed using constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2014) to analyze a sample of news articles, blogs, and social media provided in the search results after the images were reverse searched through Google Images. A thorough review of the literature is provided in Chapter Two, which is divided into five primary sections in the areas of (1) policy feedback theory, (2) the spectacle, (3) visual culture, (4) Black feminist scholarship, and (5) critical philosophies of resistance. Chapter Three outlines the research methodology in detail and addresses the study limitations and delimitations. In Chapter Four, the study findings are reported and the research questions are addressed. The findings are contextualized in Chapter Five in light of the literature reviewed in Chapter Two as well as additional literature, as needed, to illuminate new theoretical concepts brought into the main analysis due to constructivist grounded theory’s reliance on abductive theorizing. Some concluding remarks on the
photographs of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine are also provided in Chapter Five along with a discussion of the implications of the study findings for the field of public policy. The study conclusions are summarized in Chapter Six. A researcher reflexivity statement is provided following that chapter and supplementary material is provided in the appendices, including an alphabetical list of the definitions of key concepts (Appendix I), a list of inductively generated codes from the grounded theory analysis (Appendix II), and details pertaining to the coding and materials reviewed for each image (Appendices III through V).
CHAPTER TWO:
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter engages literature within and across (1) policy feedback theory, (2) the spectacle, (3) visual culture, (4) Black feminist scholarship, and (5) critical philosophies of resistance. The first section focuses on policy feedback theory as well as related interpretivist approaches to policy studies that focus on citizen-state interactions. Importantly, the scholarship in policy feedback theory, as set forth by Pierson (1993), overlaps with the theory of the social construction of target groups and democratic policy design (Schneider & Ingram, 1993, 1997), particularly regarding the effect that policymaking has on civic and political participation. Policy feedback theory acknowledges the ways in which policymakers engage in the social construction of certain groups to justify the use of rewards or sanctions for desired and unwanted behavior, respectively, yet it expands the analysis to larger constituencies of mass publics and examines the impact of racial stereotyping and social control on target groups as well as the broader public.

Section two of this literature review explores Debord’s (1983) and Edelman’s (1988) work on the spectacle, providing an additional theoretical lens through which to interpret the literature on policy feedback theory and related studies of social control in contemporary policymaking. This scholarship on the spectacle is helpful for understanding (1) the ways in which images aid in state coercion and in the formation of public policy, (2) how social constructions and racial stereotyping work so effectively on the public, and (3) the ways in which visual culture can be appropriated by marginalized groups as a counterhegemonic tool of resistance (i.e. countervisuality).

Section three builds on previous work on the spectacle by highlighting literature in visual culture studies, which theorizes citizens as more than just spectators of the spectacle, but actual participants in the making and interpretation countervisual images. Where theories of the
spectacle have the tendency to rob the spectator (i.e. the citizen) of agency, recent visual culture scholarship emphasizes the ways in which individuals and groups can appropriate images and use them to empower, resist, and appeal to more equitable notions of democracy through the production, audiencing, and circulation of images (Mirzoeff, 2011; Rose, 2016). In this third section of the literature review, an important analogous relationship develops, a theme that will extend throughout this study: Policy feedback theory is to group, elitist, and process-oriented theories of politics what visual culture is to art history. In other words, both policy feedback theory and visual culture studies resist established trends in their respective disciplines by focusing attention away from professionals and elites alone and onto average citizens. That is, both public policy and visual culture studies share democratic impulses in their focus not only on the powerful but also on mass publics. The literature in each of these areas, connected in this study by way of Debord and Edelman’s work on the spectacle, along with their democratizing focus on mass publics, will emerge as an important theme in understanding and interpreting the ways in which countervisual images function as a form of policy feedback.

Section four focuses on theories of Black feminist resistance and on the enduring remnants of slavery evident in contemporary visual culture. It examines some of the intellectual work conducted by Black feminist scholars who have traced stereotypes of Black women back through the political spectacle and on to the floors of Congress where they influenced various policy decisions (Crenshaw, 1991, 2012; Hancock, 2004; Jordan-Zachery, 2009). The work of Kimberlé Crenshaw on intersectionality is highlighted as an important theoretical lens through which to view Black women’s resistance and countervisuality in response to these stereotypes.

The final section of this literature review chapter carries over the theme of countervisuality from visual culture studies and focuses more deeply on critical philosophies of resistance; that is, various philosophies that seem to undergird antiracist activism. It highlights
theories of Afro-pessimism in addition to philosophies articulated by members of the Frankfort School, such as Herbert Marcuse and Theodor Adorno, and critical race theorists such as Kimberlé Crenshaw and Gary Peller. It is critically important for understanding and explicating both the unchecked philosophical assumptions of contemporary and historical policymaking as well as some of the philosophical assumptions associated with antiracist resistance and countervisuality. This final section concludes with a theoretical framework based on a synthesis of the literature reviewed in this chapter.

**Policy Feedback Theory**

If countervisuality is, as Mirzoeff (2011) argues, “the assertion of the right to look [and the right to exist], challenging the law that sustains visuality’s authority in order to justify its own sense of right,” (p. 25), then one question that follows from that definition is, by what mechanisms does the law sustain visuality’s authority? How does the state sustain its own authority in ways that publics can see or experience it (i.e. know it exists) and actively contest it through countervisuality? Policy feedback theory is illustrative in this regard as it forms the connective tissue between the authority of the state as exercised through policymaking and the lived experiences of mass publics as they grapple with the effects of those policy decisions in their daily lives. This chapter extends the introductory discussion on policy feedback theory provided in Chapter One beginning with a review of some of the intellectual thought that preceded Pierson’s (1993) influential article, an overview of the theory’s basic premises, and the ways in which policies either sustain or diminish themselves through positive and negative feedback effects. Additionally, because policy feedback theory accepts the premises of the social construction of target groups and democratic policy design (Schneider & Ingram, 1993, 1997), this chapter reviews some of the literature in that area – particularly as it relates to the formation of stereotypes and notions of deservedness embedded into policy designs. Furthermore, one of
the key differences that emerges between policy feedback theory and the social construction of target groups is that the latter focuses primarily on the target groups of policies while the former expands this analytical lens to include the impacts of policies on mass publics more broadly. As such, this chapter includes literature at the intersections of policy feedback theory and public opinion research, introducing the two concepts of proximity and visibility as they relate to the publics’ familiarity and experience (of lack thereof) with specific policies (Soss & Schram, 2007).

Finally, this section reviews the racial classification model (RCM) introduced by Soss, Fording, and Schram (2011a), which illustrates the impacts of stereotypes in policymaking on the use of sanctions within welfare policy and which brings to the fore theories of social control and political and economic ideologies as they impact upon publics, creating what Lowi (1998) termed an “internal Cold War.” Where policy feedback theory argues that previous policies shape present politics, social control theories are a natural extension of that work with their focus on the dire effects of those policies on mass publics. Within this scholarship, previous policies are also tied to the ideological commitments of political elites. Illustrative of this, Lowi’s pointed analysis focused on the (neo)liberal and (neo)conservative dimensions of public policy, particularly those associated with the War on Drugs and the reformulation of welfare policy. In his view, these policies resulted in the excessive focus of state and local governments on matters of social control, owing primarily to the social insecurity stemming from the liberal shift in US trade policy during the 1990s.5 (In Lowi’s view, it was the liberalization of trade policy that created the very social insecurities that punitive policies were enacted to ameliorate.) Together,

5 *Neo* is placed in parentheses here because although Lowi (1998) did not use this prefix, his writing on the issue is consistent with contemporary definitions and critiques of neoliberalism and neoconservatism as articulated by Harvey (2005), Soss, Fording, & Schram (2011), and others.
the body of literature reviewed in this section on policy feedback theory seems naturally to address the specific mechanisms by which the state, via public policy, sustains, in Mirzoeff’s words, its own authority through visuality and the ways in which mass publics are impacted by those mechanisms. The next section begins by introducing some of the intellectual thought that preceded policy feedback theory with a specific focus on Lowi’s regime theory (1964, 1972, 1985) and Skocpol’s (1992) structured polity approach.

Intellectual Precursors: Lowi’s Regime Theory and Skocpol’s Structured Polity Approach

The idea that political arrangements are the output of public policy, in contrast to the long-held premise that policy is solely the output of the political process (e.g., Easton, 1957), makes policy feedback theory a novel approach to the study of public policy and its impacts on political elites, interest groups, and mass publics in general. The scholarship of political scientists E.E. Schattschneider and Theodore J. Lowi is central to the intellectual thought that supports policy feedback theory’s emphasis on public policy as the focal point of political analyses (Mettler & Soss, 2004). Schattschneider (1935) was first to articulate the counterintuitive notion that “new policies create new politics” (p. 288) during a period in which many scholars believed that policy was merely an output of complex governmental processes. Lowi (1964, 1972, 1985) later reprised Schattschneider’s sentiment, introducing a policy typology consisting of distributive, regulatory, redistributive, and constituent policy regimes, which he argued, shaped the political arrangements that flowed from new policies (see Table 5). These regimes, according to Lowi, could be distinguished from one another based on two dimensions. The first dimension is the type of conduct the law is established to sanction or reward: individual conduct or the environment of conduct. Individual conduct and the environment of conduct can be distinguished from one another according to the extent that the policy attempts to impact an individual’s
behavior either directly or indirectly through his or her environment. The second dimension is the *positive or negative intent of the law*: The Primary Rule (the use of sanctions) or the Secondary Rule (the conference of rewards or benefits) (Lowi, 1985). Each applies directly or indirectly to the target group of a policy.

According to Lowi, *regulatory policies* were a combination of the intent of the law to influence individual conduct and behavior directly through Primary Rules (sanctions) such as in the case of public health law and industrial safety; *distributive policies* were also considered an example of the intent to influence individual conduct but through the Secondary Rule, i.e. the use of benefits and rewards (as in the case of pork barrel politics); *redistributive policies* were examples of the intent to govern via the environment of conduct through the Primary Rule such as in the case of government policies toward the income tax; and, finally, *constituent policies* were an example of the intent to govern the environment of conduct using the Primary Rule and consisted of policies that were essentially “rules about rules and about authority” for public agencies and other government actors (p. 74).
Table 5
Lowi’s (1985) Typology of Public Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule Type</th>
<th>Individual Conduct</th>
<th>Environmental Conduct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary (Punishment)</td>
<td>Regulatory Policy</td>
<td>Redistributive Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (Reward)</td>
<td>Distributive Policy</td>
<td>Constituent Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lowi was particularly critical of the use of distributive policy regimes due to their tendency to elicit patronage politics, i.e. the “pay to play” mentality surrounding politics and public service, as he believed them to be a threat to American democracy. Consequently, he believed that laws served the public best when they were (1) consistently applied to a wide scope of the population, or at minimum (2) when they “express[ed] a clear rule of law” (Lowi, 1972, p. 308). “A rule of law,” Lowi (1972) wrote, “identifies the citizen in each person, the public part of us. The making of a real law…is an act of setting a public morality upon some action or status hitherto considered private” (p. 288). Lowi’s scholarship thus had its own ontological implications as it highlighted the intimate nature of law and public policy and its concomitant ability to shape the political subject. Although Lowi considered the idea of the state to be an abstract concept, the action of policymaking, in his view, is what made the state tangible. The kinds of politics that followed from policy could be better understood and perhaps even predicted by attending to a policy’s rule type and the conduct it intended to influence (Lowi, 1985). Remaining quite critical of 20th century pluralist and elitist theories of American politics, particularly because he felt that they were tautological in that the premises of these theories (regarding group participation in the political process and the concentration of political power among elites, respectively) caused scholars to see in their empirical findings exactly what they
predicted (group power or elite power, respectively), Lowi’s enduring legacy was the centrality he afforded public policy in his analyses of American politics.

In *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy*, Theda Skocpol (1992) introduced her structured polity approach, which afforded public policy a central role in her analysis of early US social policy. Most troubling to Skocpol were the various theoretical approaches previous scholars had utilized in trying to explain the unique course of social policy in the United States between the 1870s and the 1920s, which differed significantly from the course of other modern welfare states. As she notes:

> The United States thus did not follow other Western nations on the road toward a paternalist welfare state, in which male bureaucrats would administer regulations and social insurance ‘for the good’ of breadwinning industrial workers. Instead, America came close to forging a maternalist welfare state, with female-dominated public agencies implementing regulations and benefits for the good of women and children.

Much as Lowi took issue with the tautology of pluralist and elitist approaches to the study of politics and public policy, Skocpol, too, found that the theoretical approaches to studying this unique form of early social policy in the US lacked explanatory power. Previous approaches, she argued, were much too socially deterministic, that is, placing too much emphasis on socioeconomic changes in American society as the leading cause of the types of policy outputs characteristic of the US political system during late 19th and early 20th centuries. Careful to avoid swinging to the polar opposite, a politically determinist approach to the study of early American social policy, Skocpol introduced her structured polity approach with a focus on four main processes:

(1) The establishment and transformation of state and party organizations through which politicians pursue policy initiatives; (2) the effects of political institutions and procedures on the identities, goals, and capacities of social groups that become involved in the politics of social policymaking; (3) the ‘fit’—or lack thereof—between the goals and capacities of various politically active groups, and the historically changing points of access and leverage allowed by a nation’s
This approach, she argued, would allow scholars to give more primacy to the role of state formation (as in the building of political institutions and the ways in which those institutions shape and constrain political arrangements) and the agency of political actors (who may at times act in ways that run counter to the demands of their constituents) in shaping policy outcomes. Importantly, where scholars had previously been reluctant to fully engage the concept of the “state” in American political studies, especially as an autonomous agent independent of the polity, Skocpol defined the term more clearly as “any set of relatively differentiated organizations that claims sovereignty and coercive control over a territory and its population, defending and perhaps extending that claim in competition with other states,” and advocated affording the state a more prominent role in studies on the determinants of US social policy (Skocpol, 1992, p. 43). In so doing, she centered her structured polity approach within a theoretical orientation that lends equal credence both to socioeconomic and cultural factors, on the one hand, and state and political party factors, on the other, as determinants of group political consciousness. In this way, Skocpol argued that policies at time 1 both alter state capacities and initiate changes in the politics and capabilities of social groups, which in turn, impact the types of policies enacted or not, at time 2. These theoretical contributions to policy feedback theory played a central role in Pierson’s (1993) formal articulation of its main premises.

Basic Premises of Policy Feedback Theory

Policy feedback theory accepts the general premises that (1) previous policies shape current politics and therefore new policies create new political arrangements (Lowi, 1964, 1972, 1985; Mettler & Soss, 2004; Pierson, 1993; Schattschneider, 1935; Skocpol, 1992); (2) the feedback effects of public policy include both material and interpretive impacts on government elites, interest groups, and mass publics (Mettler & Soss, 2004; Pierson, 1993; Skocpol, 1992);
(3) Policymakers and other government actors often engage in the social construction of certain racial and other demographic groups (Pierce et al., 2014; Pierson, 2007; Schneider & Ingram, 1993, 1997); and, (4) social constructions of groups influence public perceptions about the extent to which a group is believed to be deserving of either benefits or punishments allocated to them through policy decisions (Ingram, Schneider, & deLeon, 2007; Mettler & Soss, 2004; Pierce et al., 2014; Pierson, 1993, 2007; Schneider & Ingram, 1993, 1997; Soss & Schram, 2007; Soss, Fording, & Schram, 2011a).

As previously stated, policy feedback theory turns traditional theorizing about public policy (as the output of the political process) on its head, affording it a central role in determining political arrangements among government elites, organized interests, and mass publics (Pierson, 1993, 2007). Thus, public policy is conceptualized within policy feedback theory as the input, or the impetus, to the political process, which in turn impacts these groups in varied ways (Pierson, 1993). These three overlapping and intersecting groups of actors (government elites, interest groups, and mass publics) are significantly altered by the enactment of new policies and programs as well as changes to existing ones.

As Pierson (1993) highlights, policy feedback consists of two mechanisms: (1) the resources and incentives mechanism and (2) the interpretive mechanism (see Table 6). Accordingly, the resources and incentives mechanism includes material benefits to government actors within public agencies, to interest groups, and to mass publics, which in turn impact the relative power a group has as well as the level of access, ability to organize, and other benefits that impact participation in policymaking and political bargaining (Pierson, 1993). The interpretive mechanism includes policy learning (for government elites and interest groups) and, following Arnold (1990), a policy’s visibility and traceability (for interest groups and mass publics) (Pierson, 1993). Visibility in this context refers to the extent to which a policy is
identifiable and knowable to publics. Such policies are often underscored by focusing events. A focusing event, may entail a “push” in the form of “a crisis or disaster that comes along to call attention to the [policy] problem, a powerful symbol that catches on, or the personal experience of a policy maker” (Kingdon, 2011, pp. 94-95). It is these events that tend to have the most symbolic power for both organized interests and mass publics. Moreover, in addition to being visible to publics, a policy should also be traceable to specific policy actors who can be held accountable for related policy outcomes (Pierson, 1993).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>Pierson’s (1993) Dimensions of Policy Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanisms</strong></td>
<td><strong>Government Elites</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources/Incentives</td>
<td>administrative capacities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
<td>policy learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the context of government elites, public policy can relinquish resources and incentives upon bureaucrats and other government actors as well as stimulate learning processes whereby government actors learn new processes and modes of administering novel programs through implementation and evaluation (cf. Pressman & Widalvsky, 1973). Similarly, for interest groups, policies can provide material rewards in the form of spoils (as was the case at the turn of the 20th century with patronage politics overtaking many local governments), by shaping those the
resources of persons likely to share membership interests through financing and by increasing access to government officials (Pierson, 1993). Additionally, the interpretive impacts of policies for interest groups, according to Pierson, include both policy learning (as interest groups may help facilitate either directly or indirectly the implementation of new policies alongside or in partnership with government actors) and the visibility and traceability of policies.

The interpretive and resource effects on mass publics, according to Pierson’s (1993) analysis, differ from those on government elites and interest groups primarily in that there is not stipulated learning effect provided via the interpretive mechanism nor are there spoils or administrative and organizational effects in the form of a resource mechanism. Mass publics can be defined largely as unorganized groups of individuals that may share social and cultural norms but have not formally coordinated themselves to issue demands upon any other social or interest group, whether such demands would be mediated by government institutions or wholly separate from them (Truman, 1962). Therefore, certain effects, such as those stipulated for government elites and interest groups, can be much more difficult to gauge for mass publics, if they exist at all. For these citizens, Pierson argues that the resources and incentives that flow from policy decisions are largely the result of lock-in effects, i.e. the extent to which the adoption of alternatives to a policy declines over time as the policy becomes routinized in and through the institutions of government and society. As policies become locked-in, target groups face less and less opportunities to demand policy changes and alternatives as time goes on. The interpretive effects for mass publics, as with interest groups, consist of the concepts of visibility and traceability, which direct the public’s attention toward perceived government responsiveness, hold elected officials accountable for policy outcomes, and which might inspire certain individuals to formally organize (Pierson, 1993; Truman, 1962).
Much of the empirical research on the interpretive and material feedback effects on mass publics in policy feedback research focuses on social policy areas such as welfare and criminal justice—the two arms of social control as theorized by Lowi (1998), Wacquant (2010) and Soss & Schram (2007), among other scholars. With the effects of policies highlighted by Pierson (1993), subsequent policy feedback research has turned to the specific ways in which certain policies and their interpretive and material mechanisms may produce positive or negative feedback effects that either sustain or diminish, respectively, the very programs initiated through social policy as well as the political arrangements that develop around those programs.

Positive and Negative Policy Feedback Effects

In setting an agenda for policy feedback research, Pierson (1993) highlighted the importance of attending to “individual actors outside the circuit of bureaucrats, politicians, and interest groups” to better understand the ways in which policies frame citizens’ cognitive and interpretive understandings of their social world (Pierson, 1993, p. 625). As such, research within policy feedback theory often attends to citizen-bureaucrat interactions at the point of service delivery and the ways in which those interactions may shape citizens’ sense of self, their perceived value in the eyes of the state, and their willingness to engage in political activity (Moynihan & Herd, 2010). Various elements of public policies shape the kinds of feedback, positive or negative, that are likely to ensue (Jordan & Matt, 2014). As Pierson argued, multiple factors can influence the tractability of a policy so that alternatives become less feasible over time as the policy is routinized in political and civil institutions (a positive effect) or, in turn, factors may cause a decrease in the number of program participants as well as negatively impact the capabilities of participants to exercise their political voice (a negative effect) (Jordan & Matt, 2014). As such, feedback effects refer to the specific ways in which the authoritative decisions of government actors are sustained (or not) over time.
Positive feedback effects

Mettler’s (2002) study on the impact of the G.I. bill following World War II on program recipients is exemplary of the positive feedback effects social policy may create. Mettler found in her study that the bill increased participation in civic and political activity among its White male recipients, and that the bill’s resource and interpretive effects both enhanced feelings of reciprocity (the desire to give back to society in exchange for the material benefit of the bill) and critically impacted the civic and political participation of the men who received assistance. These were men who reported coming from modest lower-middle class backgrounds, who may not have otherwise participated in civic and political society at such rates. Importantly, Mettler (2002) concluded that the resource and interpretive effects of the bill “enhanced beneficiaries’ socioeconomic circumstances and skills in ways that heightened their capacity and predisposition for civic involvement” (p. 362). Her study delineated the ways in which public policies, through their resource and interpretive effects, enhanced citizens’ engagement in civic society. Moreover, Mettler’s work adapted the civic voluntary model proposed by Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995), bringing it under the umbrella of policy feedback theory. Where Verba and colleagues proposed that people do not participate in civic and political society due to a lack of (1) resources, (2) psychological desire, or (3) access to “recruitment networks” (Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995, p. 269), Mettler noted the ways in which such factors as civic capacity and civic predisposition fall within the rubric of policy feedback theory’s interpretive and resource mechanisms. Civic capacity, as such, refers to one’s ability to participate based on the level or resources (i.e. time, skills, and money) upon which one can draw (resource effects), whereas civic predisposition refers to one’s psychological inclinations to participate (interpretive effects) (Mettler, 2002). In Mettler’s model, the resource effects of public policies impact citizens’ material status in society but also have a symbolic impact that in turn affects citizens
psychologically regarding their subjective beliefs about government as well as their concomitant ability to affect political change. Such positive effects as those Mettler found in her study in turn impact the likelihood that a policy will become routinized and thus less subject to change over time. Material resources provide program participants with the capabilities to organize politically, to participate in the political realm, and to advocate for the continuance of the program while psychological resources operate simultaneously, positively impacting participant beliefs about how the government views them as a constituency as well as beliefs about their abilities to create change and whether or not the government will be responsive to their demands (i.e. political efficacy). These impacts differ markedly from more negative feedback effects that affect publics’ access to material resources and beliefs about their political efficacy.

Negative feedback effects

Negative feedback effects are often built in, or endogenous, to certain policies and tend to encompass restrictions on program usage, often at the point of service, that have the counterintuitive effect of decreasing both the number of program participants as well as the extent of material and psychological resources and capabilities upon which existing participants may draw. For example, bureaucratic red tape, such as voter identification laws and stringent documentation requirements for social security benefits, tend to preclude already disadvantaged populations from certain benefits to which they are legally entitled, thus contributing to a decrease in program usage and negatively impacting their sense of political efficacy (Moynihan & Herd, 2010). For this reason, Moynihan and Herd (2010) call for a “theory of administrative inclusion” focusing on both normative and practical aspects of the problems that red tape presents to both public administrators (in terms of administrating the program) and to citizens eligible for government benefits (in terms of participating in the program) (p. 665). Specifically, Moynihan and Herd recommend scholars pay attention to the ways in which rules are written
(i.e. policy design) to ensure that the cost of compliance with policy rules does not exceed the actual benefits to which a citizen may be legally entitled. As a result, administrative inclusion would limit the extent to which program compliance deters program usage among publics.

As with bureaucratic red tape, policy feedback research has also highlighted the ways in which criminal justice policy tends to impact individuals’ notions of citizenship, sense of political efficacy, and inclination to participate in civic and political activity. In other words, the punitive nature of a policy may negatively impact program participants’ future faith in government and the likelihood that they will exercise their right to vote. For example, Weaver and Lerman (2010) find that contact with the criminal justice system, even just being stopped by the police (much less convicted and incarcerated), negatively impacts citizens’ trust in government, voting turnout, and civic participation; this effect extends beyond those who are legally disenfranchised for felony convictions and includes those who are not otherwise barred from engagement in political activity. They conclude that “[c]arceral contact is not randomly distributed, but is both spatially and racially concentrated” and thus has important and long-lasting ramifications for communities of color (Weaver & Lerman, 2010, p. 817). Moreover, during incarceration, racial biases in the use of solitary confinement to punish prisoners results in larger proportions of African American prisoners placed in confinement as compared to their White counterparts—a punishment that, in the long term, can negatively impact both recidivism and inmates’ mental well-being (Olson, 2016). Thus, racial bias in policing, carceral contact, and in the allocation of prison punishments negatively impact Black individuals’ subsequent rates of political participation, recidivism, and general well-being (Olson, 2016; Weaver & Lerman, 2010).

Similarly, research on welfare program usage reveals various negative impacts of welfare policy on program participants’ sense of political efficacy. Sarat (1990) and Soss (1999), for
example, conducted ethnographic research consisting of fieldwork and intensive interviewing with welfare program participants during the 1990s. Acknowledging the diversity and polyvocality among welfare recipients, Sarat (1990) found key differences between welfare recipients and non-recipients: “Differences arise because the identity of the welfare poor is, in substantial part, legally constructed and that because the legal constitution of their subjectivity is visible in a way the legal constitution of the subjectivity of others is not” (378-379). Thus, the interpretive effect, i.e. “the legal constitution,” amounts to what Sarat terms a legal consciousness—a consciousness in which participants are continuously aware of and resistant to the ways in which their behavior and the life options available to them are constrained by the state on a daily basis.

Furthermore, Soss (1999), concerned with the finding of Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995) that (1) recipients of means-tested programs tend to be the least active in politics despite regular church attendance (which often fosters civics skills) and that (2) there existed no significant differences in education or financial status between themselves and the general public, engaged in ethnographic methods to better understand the interpretive factors that lead to such political inactivity. Soss conducted over fifty in-depth interviews with welfare recipients in the State of Florida, and supplemented his findings with statistical analyses from the National Election Series (NES) data. He found that participation in a means-tested program, such as AFDC (now TANF) negatively impacted participant’s sense of external political efficacy—the extent to which they view government as responsive to their needs—but tended to boost internal

---

6 Notably, Verba and colleagues also found that welfare recipients participated in politics to a much lesser extent than recipients of universally administered programs such as social security. This is consistent with research in policy feedback theory where scholars generally observe a positive effect of universal social welfare programs on participant political and civic participation but a negative one on participants of means-tested programs (See Mettler, 2002; Mettler & Stonecash, 2008; Skocpol, 1992).
political efficacy—the belief that they are capable of managing their interactions with government actors. The result is that the decrease in external political efficacy contributes to a lack of political involvement among welfare recipients, as was the case of with an AFDC program participant named Vanessa whom Soss cited:

> When they start talking about voting, I turn the TV [off]. I do. It’s no guarantee. This person can make all these promises, but that don’t mean they’re going to do it. The rest of government mostly works like the AFDC office. I mean, I don’t deal with the government when I can. (Soss, 1999, p. 360)

In fact, Soss found that AFDC recipients in his study were more likely than SSDI recipients to view government as undemocratic and operating autonomously from public opinion. Parents of small children who participated in the Head Start program were the exception to his findings with regards to the political participation deficit amongst means-tested program recipients. Furthermore, Soss observed that parents benefited from Head Start’s utilization of maximum feasible participation and that the opportunity to participate in program decision-making boosted recipients’ feelings of government responsiveness in contrast to those who only participated in AFDC. Subsequent policy feedback research has revealed similar political participation deficits amongst recipients of means-tested government benefits, particularly for TANF participants. Conversely, and in line with the findings of Soss and Verba and colleagues, subsequent research has also revealed that universally administered social welfare programs may foster participation in American political and civic society more so than other social programs.

**The Stigma of Means-Tested Programs and The Mediating Role of Public Policy**

As revealed in the last two sections, the resource and interpretive mechanisms of public policy, through endogenous mechanisms built into a policy’s design, can impact program participants’ political participation in a multiplicity of ways that differ according to whether a program is targeted universally to all citizens or means-tested and thus available only to low-income individuals who qualify. For example, Mettler and Stonecash (2008), after reviewing the
2005 Maxwell Poll results, discovered that, controlling for factors such as income, age, and education,

the greater the number of programs that individuals have benefited from over time that are designed according to universal principals (meaning that they are not subject to income limits), the more likely they are to vote. Conversely, the greater the number of income-limited or means-tested programs that individuals have benefited from, the less likely they are to vote. (p. 274)

Although Mettler and Stonecash were unable to clearly identify a causal mechanism for this finding, they speculated that the stigma of means-tested programs led to participant experiences (like Vanessa’s in Soss’ (1999) study) that ultimately decrease feelings of political efficacy. In universal programs, which do not tend to carry the same level of stigma as means-tested programs, however, Mettler and Stonecash speculated that, overall, participant experiences are far more positive and, as such, the implicit messages participants receive reinforce the value of each participant’s citizenship and political participation as well as their perceptions of government responsiveness.

For these reasons, advocates of the “targeting within universalism” (Skocpol, 1991) approach to social policy argue that public support for universal programs is easier to garner than for means-tested programs and that antipoverty programs for the poor are often subject to racial and other biases when it comes to public opinion. Within this context, negative stereotypes are exacerbated by the individualist mentality among Americans that stresses self-reliance and individualism as well as the ability to pick oneself up by one’s bootstraps when times are difficult (Skocpol, 1991). However, as Skocpol (1991) explains, critics of the universalism approach to social policy counter that those most in need are not always well-served by universal programs, as often such programs better cater to middle class recipients. One example of this is when bureaucrats engage in creaming, i.e. selecting clientele for program participation who are already predisposed to act in ways consistent with desired program outcomes, or when
stereotypes negatively impact sanctions as Soss, Fording, and Schram (2011a) have found with the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. What remains clear, and is consistent with both Lowi’s and Schattschneider’s theorizing, as well as the contemporary work of policy feedback and democratic design scholars, is that certain groups are likely to benefit from certain policies while others experience sanctions and stigma, both socially and politically, which then negatively impact participants’ political participation.

This is particularly important because, as Schattschneider (1935) noted in his tariff study, not only do “new policies create new politics” but also such policies have the additional effect of creating losers and winners (p. 288). In the context of the findings of Mettler and Stonecash (2008), this means that the stakes are high, not just in terms of winning and losing, but the extent to which winning and losing bear upon the “socializing effects that in turn influence the extent to which they exercise their political voice” (p. 274). Thus, as policies circumscribe membership in the political community through interpretive and resource mechanisms, initiating the formation of groups in society, encouraging or discouraging civic behavior and political participation on the part of certain target groups, they also shape the political voices used to contest existing policies and make demands on government for more just policy decisions (Mettler & Soss, 2004). This reiterates the need for scholars to “pay closer attention to the processes that mediate policy-feedback effects,” in particular by engaging in “more citizen-centered” research (Mettler & Soss, 2004, p. 64).

Such an approach, as Hacker, Mettler, and Soss (2007) advocate, must also entail a policy-centered perspective in which researchers “[treat] public policy as an analytic fulcrum” and attend to “the dynamic constellation of social, economic, and political forces that surround specific domains of political action” (p. 14). Figure 4 illustrates the mediating role of public
By placing public policy at the center of research inquiry and focusing on the causal and mediating impacts of policy with regards to democratic citizenship and material (as well as psychic) inequality, scholars have devised a way of tracking how “recent policy changes are transforming the meaning of American citizenship” (Hacker, Mettler, & Soss, 2007, p. 18). It is within these types of scholarly inquiries where the premises of policy feedback theory and those associated with the social construction of target populations and democratic design theory intersect and operate in tandem, each taking similar approaches with regards to the centrality of
public policy in maintaining democracy and economic equality via their impact on publics. As such, some of the founding scholars of both theoretical traditions are committed to working together to address these issues (Pierson, 2007; Ingram, 2007). The next section highlights the main tenets of the social construction of target groups as they are generally accepted by scholars working in the policy feedback tradition.

Social Construction of Target Groups and Democratic Policy Design

The social construction of target groups and democratic policy design theory (Schneider & Ingram, 1993, 1997) emerged during the 1990s around the same time as Pierson (1993) articulated policy feedback theory. Due to the normative aspect of Schneider and Ingram’s work and the centrality of the social construction thesis, however, the theory was slow to gain acceptance into mainstream policy theory. For instance, Sabatier (1999) omitted the framework from his influential edited series, *Theories of the Policy Process*, due to concerns that the theory would not be falsifiable; however, he later recanted and included it in his second edition (Sabatier, 2007). In the years since, the framework has been applied to many quantitative and qualitative research studies, most frequently in social welfare policy (Pierce et al., 2014).

The work of Schneider and Ingram (1993) is based on the premise that “[s]ocial constructions become embedded in policy as messages that are absorbed by citizens and affect their orientation and participation patterns,” and this “helps explain why some groups are advantaged more than others independently of traditional notions of political power and how policy designs can reinforce or alter such experiences” (p. 334). The advantages and disadvantages typology is created by the intersection of two axes—power and social construction (see Table 7).

---

7 However, Sabatier did not include policy feedback theory until the third edition of the handbook edited by Sabatier and Weible (2014).
Table 7  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Positive Social Construction</th>
<th>Negative Social Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Advantaged (deserving)</td>
<td>Contenders (undeserving)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Dependents (deserving)</td>
<td>Deviants (undeserving)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Power* refers to the relative degree of power a group has in society and whether it is strong or weak in terms of its ability to influence others; it is “conceptualized mainly in terms of the first face of power” (Schneider & Ingram, 1997, p. 108; Bachrach & Baratz, 1970). *Construction* refers to the ways in which a group is framed through policymaking (positively or negatively) and is considered by policy design scholars to be malleable over time. *Advantaged* groups are relatively strong, possessing a high degree of power and are largely (socially) constructed in positive ways. *Contenders* also possess a high degree of power but tend to be constructed in relatively negative ways. *Dependents* are relatively weak groups in society but tend to be positively constructed. *Deviants* are both weak in power and constructed negatively. Both contenders and deviants are considered *undeserving* whereas advantaged and dependents groups are considered *deserving* of benefits that might be allocated through public policy. As such, the two main premises of social construction and democratic policy design are (1) *the target group premise* that policy is a tool for administering rewards and burdens to target groups depending on the extent of power the group possesses and the ways in which the group is socially constructed as positive (deserving) or negative (undeserving); and (2) *the feedforward premise* that the ways in which groups are valued or devalued through public policy ultimately shapes their political participation and disposition toward the state (Pierce et al, 2014). As mentioned previously,
policy feedback theory is in accordance with the social construction of target groups and
democratic policy design theory on these two arguments as both premises bring to the fore the
ways in which public policies can, at least implicitly, racialize, gender, and class target groups in
ways that impact their faith in government and proclivity to participate in politics.

Research studies engaging either or both premises often focus on a variety of social
policy issues with a significant level of attention directed toward welfare policy (Pierce et al.,
2014). Research focusing specifically on the social constructions of target groups within welfare
policy encompasses scholarship on the ways in which stereotypes of Black women informed the
major welfare revision that resulted in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity
Reconciliation (PRWOR) (1996). For example, both Hancock (2004) and Jordan-Zachery (2009)
provide detailed analyses of the Congressional debates, discourse, and media coverage relative to
social constructions of Black women, tracing stereotypes back to Patrick Moynihan’s influential
report on the topic during the 1960s and moving forward to welfare reform efforts that coincided
with the Reagan administration’s “welfare queen” rhetoric, which set the stage for the total
eradication of AFDC. In concert with the social construction thesis, both scholars concluded that
discursive images of Black women, the “symbols, stereotypes, and myths” used by
policymakers, “constructed African American women as pathological and dysfunctional because
of their perceived variation from the expected norm either in terms of family formation, work
patterns, poverty rates or criminal activity” (Jordan-Zachery, 2009, p. 166). Hancock’s analysis
likewise underscores the salience of those public opinions, and the coinciding “public disgust,”
regarding Black women as underserving of public aid, concluding that:

[P]ublic identity and the politics of disgust condition the process of public
judgment through its impact on choice of common conduct, evaluations of the
legitimacy of those making claims, and citizen’s subsequent listening power.
These artifacts of inequality curtail the democratic potential of legislative policy
making by infusing the process with misperceptions, misrepresentations, and
emotional miscues that reinforce the marginalization of welfare recipients. The
need for expanded participation alone cannot address the intransigence of public identity because the politics of disgust keeps the identity in place. (Hancock, 2004, p. 147)

Importantly, both Hancock’s and Jordan-Zachery’s analyses draw attention to the centrality of public opinion beyond that of target groups in shaping the social constructions that inform policymaking. Soss and Schram (2007) assert that scholars, in addition to acknowledging the ways in which target groups are socially constructed through the policy process, should also attend to “the use of policy design as a conscious political strategy that is used to alter the preferences, beliefs, and behaviors of broad mass publics, not simply organized elites or program beneficiaries” (p. 99). In so doing, the focus of policy feedback theory research extends from target groups alone to large swaths of publics, rendering public opinion research a critical avenue of inquiry for policy feedback scholars.

From Target Groups to Mass Publics: This Issue of Public Opinion

As the social construction of target groups’ main premises would suggest, public opinion influences government actors’ beliefs about the deservedness of certain target groups, and thus directly or indirectly shapes the ways in which policies impact mass publics via the interpretive and resource mechanisms highlighted by Pierson (1993), Mettler and Soss (2004), and others. In particular, social welfare policies, according to Soss and Schram (2007), tend to garner support because of what they symbolize (i.e. core societal beliefs) rather than for their material program components (i.e. providing supplemental poverty assistance) to those in need. After all, many Americans never experience them directly. The relative distance of most Americans to the direct effects of welfare policy’s material program benefits (as well as related program sanctions) reflects the ways in which both elites and average citizens must rely on the social constructions of program participants as a mental heuristic of target group deservedness. Likewise, it also
reflects the extent to which such social constructions shape support for, or condemnation of, policies.

Soss and Schram (2007), for example, investigated the relationship between welfare reform and public support for the Democratic party during the 1990s. They argued that conservative backlash against the progressive policy changes of the 1960s had, by the 1980s, placed the Democratic party in a conundrum: The Democrats attempted welfare reform largely because they believed that they could garner favor among the public for their handling of an issue (aid for the poor) that had come to be viewed as unfavorable due, in part, to the association of Black recipients as deviant and underserving (Soss & Schram, 2007). Thus, scholars and political operatives, according to Soss and Schram, devised two progressive revisionist theses that through welfare reform: (1) the party could transform the debate on welfare into a less contentious discussion based on personal responsibility, or (2) it could negate the discussion of deservedness entirely by disassociating welfare reform from racial cues. As Soss and Schram argue, attempts to deracialize welfare politics constituted an indirect benefit of welfare revision, i.e. the political economy of welfare reform, as the recasting (or complete eradication) of the discourse around the issue “would then redound to the advantage of both the poor and the Democratic party” (Soss & Schram, 2007, p. 104). After reviewing panels of General Social Survey and National Election Series data, however, Soss and Schram concluded that reform resulted neither in increased support for the Democratic party nor in supplanting the growing association between race and welfare, particularly as Democrats did not attend to the intersecting dimensions of visibility and proximity relative to welfare policy (Soss & Schram, 2007) (see Figure 5 below). Citing the scholarship of Murray Edelman, they adduced:

Public policies vary not only in their visibility, but also their proximity. Regardless of their visibility in public discourse, policies may be distant from citizens’ everyday lives as a result of geography (as with some foreign policies), the patterning of social relations (as with income-targeted policy in a class-
segregated city), or time (as with policy effects that will be felt personally but only at some remote date). When highly visible policies have proximate, tangible effects on people’s lives, mass publics will experience them more directly and, hence will gain greater ability to evaluate them through ‘individual observation rather than mass response to others’ cues (Edelman, 1971). (Soss & Schram, 2007, p. 113)

In Soss and Schram’s analysis, visibility refers to an issue’s salience in public discourse whereas proximity refers to the extent to which that issue is encountered in the daily lives of the general public. A “distant-visible” issue, such as AFDC or TANF, is one that is salient in public discourse but the details of which are far removed from the daily, lived experiences of most Americans. Thus, because Democrats did not account for the ways in which mass publics rely on visible social constructions of welfare recipients (e.g., the Welfare Queen) due to a lack of personal experience with welfare policy itself, they were unable to separate discussions of race and deservedness with welfare reform. Soss and Schram’s (2007) concepts of visibility and proximity naturally create something akin to Wilderson’s (2010) idea of the ontological aporia, which emerges in policy scholarship between the lived experience of program participants as they are proximal to welfare policy and the distant yet visible and highly salient stereotypes of welfare recipients in the public imagination.
Figure 5. The visibility-proximity axis based on Soss & Schram (2007).

The issue of visibility therefore is central to social constructions of target groups and, when proximity is low, the distance between mass publics and policies tends to afford stereotypes a more prominent place in public opinion and policy discourse than might otherwise be the case if the majority of mass publics possessed direct experience with them. The impact of such stereotypes as they make up the distance between the public’s direct experience and the policy itself can, as Soss, Fording, and Schram’s (2011a) racial classification model (RCM) reveals, negatively impact the administration of programs (i.e. via negative feedback effects), particularly with regards to the use of punitive mechanisms intended to ensure both administrator and participant program compliance.
The Racial Classification Model (RCM)

After reviewing and analyzing data over multiple decades from public opinion surveys, administrative program datasets, and in-depth interviews with welfare recipients, case managers and other public employees, Soss, Fording, and Schram (2011a), explicated the ways in which welfare and criminal justice policies produced by the American federalist system enabled the discriminatory application of sanctions to Black and Latino citizens at local and state levels. According to Soss and colleagues, beginning in the 1970s, as labor markets in urban ghettos collapsed and local cities experienced unprecedented levels of civil unrest, carceral and welfare policies (welfare policies being much more effective in this regard after the mid to late 1990s) aided in controlling public insurrection and became de facto mechanisms for inscribing social constructions of deservedness and citizenship onto Black and Latina recipients of welfare aid.

The results of their analyses provided support for their Racial Classification Model (RCM), which seems to extend naturally from the social construction of target populations theory of Schneider and Ingram (1997). The RCM contains three propositions: (1) that policy actors rely on social classifications in their attempts to bring order to the social world, (2) that policy actors are more likely to consider these classifications (especially those pertaining to racial differences) as relevant to policymaking when the salience of racial minorities is high in a given context, and (3) that the higher the magnitude of difference perceived between racial groups the more likely there are to be “racially patterned outcomes” from particular programs (Soss, Fording, & Schram, 2011a, p. 79). The magnitude of this difference is produced by dominant social and racial stereotypes, whether or not policy actors explicitly buy in to those stereotypes, and whether or not cues that might lead actors to adopt stereotypes as heuristics are present during the policymaking process. As such, Soss and colleagues concluded that:

The state’s carceral ‘right hand’ has risen in importance; welfare discourses and procedures are increasingly criminalized; and welfare and criminal justice
operations now function as integrated elements of a single system for managing marginal populations. (Soss, Fording, & Schram 2011a, p. 295)

Furthermore, they argued that the criminalization of the welfare system and racial disparities in the application of its related sanctions are enabled by policy tools such as devolution and second-order devolution, especially when the salience of racial minorities is high and concentrated locally in juxtaposition to majority-White jurisdictions (Soss, Fording, & Schram, 2011a). Thus, the allocation of sanctions according to stereotypes and social constructions, as Hancock (2004) and Jordan-Zachery (2009) argued, becomes a central mechanism of social control for policy makers even within institutions that *prima fascia* are not intended to mete out punishments to the citizenry.

Punitive Policy and Theories of Social Control

Policy feedback scholars such as Joe Soss have focused on issues of social control most likely due to the extent of negative feedback effects of such mechanisms on both target groups and mass publics. Lowi’s (1998) analysis stemming from his declaration of an internal Cold War on local American communities, for example, came as a result of the impact of neoliberal policy on average citizens and the resulting role of federal, state, and local governments in attempting to govern individual conduct (i.e. morality) through mechanisms of social control. Lowi (1998) and others (e.g., Soss, Fording, & Schram, 2011a; Wacquant, 2010) identify both welfare policy and criminal justice policy as the two “arms” of social control. As a result of neoliberal policy, which combines state and market mechanisms into policy solutions for social problems, and administrative reforms during the 1970s and 1980s up to the present, Lowi (1998) argued that there exists within the US a system of governance that is liberal at the top (federal and multilateral) and conservative at the bottom where policy implementation is devolved to states and local governments. The resulting punitive policies, Lowi argued, amount to this internal Cold War in which individuals who have no real stake in the “social contract” (i.e., derive no
benefit from the system) are more vulnerable to the actions of the state as well as to the social insecurity brought on by liberal trade reforms. In other words, to Lowi, liberal trade and social control do not operate independently of one another. The punitive turn, characterized by stringent welfare reform, the War on Drugs, and “tough on crime policy,” thus become necessary as a result of the inequality produced by globalization and market deregulation (see Figure 6).

The focus on privatization, administrative decentralization, policy devolution, and “reinventing government,” that characterizes new governance and new public administration under neoliberalism, thus, is thought to have aided conservative efforts to roll back the welfare state, increase the power of state and local government, and initiate the War on Drugs and related “tough on crime” policies that likewise impact policing practices (Alexander, 2011; Soss & Schram, 2007; Taylor, 2016; Wacquant, 2010). Wacquant (2010), in this regard, refers specifically to resulting changes in poverty and criminal justice policy as the transition from welfare to workfare and from policing and corrections to prisonfare. In his view, unprecedented numbers of American citizens, disproportionately made up of people of color, have been incarcerated while the overhauled welfare system became far more punitive in nature (Alexander, 2011; Lowi, 1998; Pierson, 2007; Soss & Schram, 2007; Soss, Fording, & Schram, 2011a; Taylor, 2016; Wacquant, 2010), thereby instituting a number of negative feedback effects whereby program participants, either de facto or de jure, lack the political voice to contest the punitive measures of the neoliberal state.
Figure 6. Lowi’s (1998) theorizing on social control under neoliberalism.

It is here where Harvey’s (2005) analysis of these mechanisms is instructive as it provides a plausible explanation as to how this blending of neoliberal and neoconservative policy was possible in the first place. According to Harvey’s analysis, there are five primary contradictions between neoliberalism in theory (i.e. appearance) and neoliberalism in practice (i.e. reality), which neoconservatism attempts to solve: (1) the theory of the non-interventionist state runs counter to elite expectations that the state should intervene through public policy on behalf of the market, (2) this interventionist approach in reality translates into authoritarianism and often occurs at the expense of the very individual freedoms that neoliberalism, in theory, is supposed
to champion, (3) the interventionist stance in support of financial markets incites rather than discourage “speculative volatility, financial scandals, and chronic instability,” lending credence to Lowi’s theory that trade liberalization creates the social insecurities that welfare policies in particular are meant to ameliorate, (4) the ideal of market competition often manifests in reality as a monopoly of multinational conglomerates rather than a multiplicity of distinct private entities engaged in market competition, and (5) the free market bolstered by the state often results, via the aforementioned social instability, in “social incoherence,” anti-social behavior, and increased criminal activity (Harvey, 2005, pp. 79-81). Thus, in accordance with social control theorists, Harvey argues that neoliberalism incites social insecurity and that, when blended with neoconservative doctrine, punitive policy emerges as an autocratic modality of state social control (Harvey, 2005; Lowi, 1998; Soss, Fording, & Schram, 2011a; Wacquant, 2010).

Neoconservatism, argues Harvey, in addition to its support of class hierarchy, capitalizes on neoliberalism’s contradictions by offering punitive solutions for these predicaments in the form of an ideological emphasis on law and order and “its concern for an overweening morality as the social glue to keep the body politic secure in the face of external and internal dangers” (Harvey, 2005, p. 82). Thus, neoliberalism and neoconservatism operate in tandem and fluctuate over time as neoconservatism focuses specifically on the application of punitive social control to sustain a certain “morality” that remains always already threatened by factors associated with neoliberal stances on market deregulation and globalization. The consideration of such a blending of ideologies is integral to theories of policy feedback and democratic policy design as well as theories of social control primarily because of the impact such ideology may have on policy actors’ core beliefs, on the social constructions and stereotypes of target groups that inform public policy, and on the instruments and designs endogenous to those policies. These
built in endogenous effects, of course, following Jordan and Matt (2014), then constrain the political activities as well as the political efficacy of citizens who come into contact with (i.e. those who are proximal to) the welfare and criminal justice systems.

Policy Summary

The first section of this literature review began by posing the question of how and by what mechanisms the state may retain, in Mirzoeff’s words, “visuality’s authority” in such ways that mass publics can readily identify and offer in turn a countervisual to underlying dominant ideologies. The literature on policy feedback theory, the social construction of target groups, the RCM, and social control theory highlights such mechanisms with their focus on the strategic and often implicit relationship between citizens and the state—as public policy allocates benefits and sanctions that in turn impact the formation, or not, of new political arrangements. Furthermore, these factors also impact citizens’ self-conceptualizations and perceptions of government responsiveness. Importantly, as the RCM revealed, stereotypes function much as visual images do; that is, as mental heuristics influencing policy decisions. Moreover, as Lowi (1971) asserted, public policy, as “the allocation of values” (Bachrach & Baratz, 1970), is in many ways far more intimate than is often acknowledged by scholars in the field, which makes the interpretive effects of policy on average citizens, particularly recipients of social welfare policy, an important area of scholarly inquiry. The intimate, value-laden nature of public policy, its ability to function as social control, and its ability to determine perceptions of individuals’ deservedness for government benefits, or conversely, for punitive action, makes critical theories of society and human behavior integral to the study of American politics and policymaking. As the next section will show, literature on the spectacle is instructive in this regard because it highlights the visuality of the state as well as visuality’s impacts on policymaking and public opinion.
The Spectacle

This relatively brief section forms the conceptual glue needed to link policy feedback theory, democratic policy design, the RCM, and theories of social control (section one) with visual culture studies (section three). As the previous section revealed, public policies are often enacted and amended based on perceived stereotypes—images—of target populations (Schneider & Ingram, 1993, 1997). As these images inform policy, policy impacts mass publics primarily through interpretive and resource mechanisms, which, again, impact the ways in which citizens see themselves through the eyes of the state and the existing capabilities they might draw upon to affect political change (Pierson, 1993; Mettler & Soss, 2004). This section, engaging the literature on the spectacle, focuses on why exactly images hold so much sway with regards to public opinion as well as the ways in which they function as a kind of ideology in and of themselves, packaging ready-made solutions to political and economic problems and thereby exerting visuality’s authority. In what follows, two primary critiques are highlighted, one on the appropriation of images by the market (Debord, 1983) and one by the state (Edelman, 1988). Importantly, in terms of the capitalist appropriation of visual technology, Mirzoeff (2011) views Debord’s theorizing as “the logical endpoint” of such machinations (p. 23). Although Debord and Edelman differ from one another in terms of the academic disciplines in which they wrote (Murray Edelman was a political scientist and Guy Debord a French cultural theorist) and the particular causes each attributed to the degradation of society; their work, taken together, highlights the impacts of both the business and political elite on average citizens and the ways in which, in the period in which they wrote (the late 20th Century), individuals struggled to make meaning from their daily experiences under the sheer weight of the spectacular images produced by postmodern society.
This section begins with a review of Debord’s (1983) scholarship on the spectacle, and then moves on to a more in-depth treatment of Edelman’s (1988). Importantly, this review encompasses Edelman’s (1971, 1995) additional theoretical work, which bookended his theory of the spectacle. Across all three works, Edelman sought to make clear the relationship between public policy and visual culture via the spectacle. Furthermore, the works of both Edelman and Debord provide a foundational understanding of the role of images in postmodern culture that is built upon in subsequent sections. As such, this section also reviews several critiques of the ways in which the spectacle is theorized, particularly by DeBord, as theories of the spectacle tend to verge on political and economic determinism with little accounting for the agency of the spectators themselves. These critiques aid in pivoting from the literature on the spectacle to that of visual culture proper. This next section begins by highlighting DeBord’s critique of the spectacular images promulgated by the market.

On the Market and the Society of the Spectacle

Guy Debord first published his work on the spectacle in Paris in 1967 as *La société du spectacle*. By 1970 his work had been translated into English, and though it has been through subsequent revisions, Debord’s text stands as an enduring critique of the role of consumerism in perpetuating, and perhaps debilitating, visual culture. According to Debord (1983), the historical transition into “the society of the spectacle” occurred as social life gradually transformed from a focus on “being” to one on “having” and finally to one on “appearing.” Therefore, the spectacle represented, in Debord’s view, a state of social, political, and economic life that gives dominance to the image, to the appearance of things, over authentic lived experience: it is a state of life in which human subjects are rendered subordinate to the economy. The dominance of appearance over reality, according to Debord (1983), emerged as a result of a capitalist society so heavily focused on production, consumption, and accumulation, as to render reality itself “the visible
negation of life” (para 10). The spectacle thus is a state in which human relations are mediated by images that support the dominant ideology of market rationality.

Debord’s analysis of the spectacle focused on the salient themes of time, space, and culture. In Debord’s view, the economy had supplanted the notion of cyclical time as it was conceived under agrarian forms of production (when time was based on the seasons) with irreversible time, that is, a universalized kind of time that is made to seem “given” when in fact it is socially constructed in the particular interests of the market: “The time of production is first of all the measure of commodities. Therefore, the time officially affirmed over the entire expanse of the globe as the general time of society refers only to the specialized interests which constitute it and is no more than a particular time” (para 146). Through this appropriation of time, the spectacle occludes history and makes “what is” seem given and natural; although, “what is” is actually the spectacle, an appropriation of “the real” by the appearances of image-objects. Like the capitalist appropriation of time, urbanism, for Debord, represented the capitalist appropriation of space in service of the means of production. Across time and space, therefore, culture, along with history, is commodified and forgotten; art is annihilated, and its critical function is buried under a mass of spectacular images (Debord, 1983). Importantly, in Debord’s analysis, the spectacle is not just ideological in nature, but rather: “The spectacle is ideology par excellence, because it exposes and manifests in its fullness the essence of all ideological systems: the impoverishment, servitude and negation of real life” (para 215) (emphasis added). Debord’s argument here is that spectacle is not just supported by ideology but rather the images that constitute the spectacle are an ideology in and of themselves, which then helps to rationalize the appropriation of culture by consumerism. As such, Debord contended that the spectacle can only

---

8 It is important to recognize here that these are similar dimensions to those cited by Soss and Schram (2007) with regards to the ways in which publics may differ in terms of proximity (i.e. direct experience) to various policies.
be destroyed by means of practical action, humans working in concert with one another, informed by a critical (i.e. dialectical) theory of society: “[T]he obscure and difficult path of critical theory must also be the lot of the practical movement acting on the scale of society” (para 203). Although Debord’s theory of the spectacle does not appear in Edelman’s work, the theme of a totalitarian conglomerate of images deceiving the public with its conflation of appearance and reality re-emerged in Edelman’s state-centric theorizing on the political spectacle.

On the State and The Political Spectacle

Whereas Debord’s work on the spectacle centered on the market, Edelman’s (1971, 1988, 1995) scholarship introduced the idea of the political spectacle into the disciplines of public policy and political science. In so doing he highlighted the connections between public policy, politics, and the role of myth, symbols, and images in postmodern society. In *Politics as Symbolic Action*, Edelman (1971) contended that symbols are potent ways for individuals to make meaning from events in the social world, including those precipitated by government actors and, as such, are often more effective in reinforcing individuals’ existing beliefs or establishing new ones than information with substantive empirical content (i.e. data): “Meaning is basically different from information and incompatible with it. Meaning is associated with order—with a patterned cognitive structure that permits anticipation of future developments so that perceptions are expected and not surprising” (p. 31). Conversely, “[i]nformation involves complexity or lack of order: inability to foresee. Unlike meaning, it is transmitted; and what is transmitted is complicating premises” (p. 31). Thus, in Edelman’s view, the meaning attributed to images by the public reduces ambiguity by allowing individuals to focus on a symbolic representation of reality to make sense of the present world and to anticipate potential futures. In contrast, when individuals experience an onslaught of information revealing the complexity of the social world in all its ambiguity, that information increases rather than decreases anxiety
about present and future worlds. Images, therefore, allow spectators to circumvent the overwhelming information and data produced by postmodern society by offering a more simplistic, even if patently false, ordering of the world.

To better understand these meaning-making processes that so inform the beliefs of mass publics, particularly about government action and policy, Edelman (1971) argued that policymakers and political scientists would benefit from engaging in phenomenological inquiry. Such inquiries, Edelman warned, must also resist the temptation of assuming that meanings in each instance correspond to textbook definitions of concepts or that they are in any sense objective and universal to every individual’s lived experience:

…we have to learn from examination of the phenomenological responses of people to political events and language which signals reinforce meanings already held (and so are redundant), which change or destroy existing meanings (and so are informative), and which are ignored or not perceived (and so are cognitively subordinate to accepted perceptions). (p. 32) (emphasis added)

Thus, Edelman (1971) believed that the role of government in shaping the beliefs among mass publics is especially powerful and occurs most frequently when individuals are subject to the following three conditions:

…[1] difficulty or inability to examine a source of anxiety empirically, often because it involves a situation expected to occur in the future (the expectation itself often cued by governmental action or rhetoric); [2] avid search for information to resolve the uncertainty and anxiety, which is intensified by rumor and other forms of communication; [3] conspicuous publicized governmental action which either explicitly asserts or clearly implies a factual state of affairs that does resolve the uncertainty. (p. 174)

The impact of government action on the beliefs and meaning-making processes among mass publics, therefore, rests on the ability of government actors to reduce uncertainty and ambiguity by asserting “a factual state of affairs.” This, according to Edelman, is accomplished through tactics of escalation that are used to widen political support, often among publics for whom the policy preferences among political actors are neither salient nor directly relevant (the “distant-
visible” to which Soss and Schram (2007) referred) and ritualization, “a tacit agreement regarding the terms of value allocations, rationalized in terms of the public interest through formal, and essentially banal procedures and routines” (pp. 176-177). It is this thinking that set the foundation for Edelman’s subsequent theorizing on the nature of the political spectacle.

In *Constructing the Political Spectacle*, Edelman (1988) theorized that the spectacle comprises political actor’s constructions of (1) social problems, (2) political leaders, and (3) political enemies. To Edelman, the spectacle was promulgated by an ambivalent and acquiescent news media and witnessed by spectators (i.e. publics) who remain reliant on images to provide meaning and a simplified rendering of reality. Like Debord’s argument, Edelman believed that the political spectacle occluded history to such an extent that the current political order, with its attendant policy prescriptions, problems, and solutions, might be seen as factually given rather than as an historically situated and socially constructed reality. Although both Debord’s and Edelman’s accounts of the spectacle focus on the proliferation of images—i.e. dominant ideology in action—Edelman’s concept of the political spectacle highlights the ability of the state to manufacture and impose meaning on the public to garner support for the actions of political elites through the creation of images that mass publics may interpret as meaningful explanations for their lived experiences. Although Edelman did not go so far as Debord in arguing that the spectacle is itself an ideology, he did argue that the meanings provided to the public by the political spectacle were based less on fact than on political ideology:

> Accounts of political issues, problems, crises, threats, and leaders now become devices for creating disparate assumptions and beliefs about the social and political world rather than factual statements. The very concept of ‘fact’ becomes irrelevant because every meaningful political object and person is an interpretation that reflects and perpetuates an ideology. Taken together, they comprise a spectacle which varies with the social situation of the spectator and serves as a meaning machine: a generator of points of view and therefore perceptions, anxieties, aspirations, and strategies. (Edelman, 1988, p. 10)
In both accounts of the spectacle, mass publics as spectators are rendered relatively passive and offer little in the way of resistance to the machinations of political and economic elites. Furthermore, the spectacle as a meaning-making-machine performs the dual jobs of escalation and routinization (Edelman, 1971), which are necessary to garner support for and maintain the existing political and economic order. In so doing, the language and practice of policymaking renders the concept of public policy remote and outside of the confinements of daily life such that policy becomes a mythical artifact:

… the political spectacle evokes something like the awe and sense of personal powerlessness characteristic of a religious posture; an implicit association with the religious attitudes doubtless underlies this kind of political language. Like religious myths about great events in a time and place outside everyday experience, these political accounts build an intensified appeal and an acquiescent response upon their remoteness. (pp. 97-98)

The inherent power of the spectacle, then, as Edelman believed, rationalizes the actions of political actors and constrains the analytical lens (i.e. the interpretive policy feedback mechanism) through which disadvantaged populations might view their own circumstances: “Metaphors, other tropes, and ambiguity encourage people in disparate social situations to define themselves, others, and the conditions of their lives through a spectacle that normally rationalizes those conditions” (Edelman, 1988, p. 103). That is, the a-historical and “given” nature of the spectacle precludes an understanding of the ways in which the state (in the case of Edelman) and the market (in the case of Debord) have shaped the structural, political, and economic circumstances of those who are marginalized and oppressed under the current political and economic order. Rather, such populations are left to interpret that suffering through the rationality of the spectacle, which itself conflates appearance with reality and in so doing justifies its own existence.
As previously discussed, Debord believed the best way to destroy the spectacle would be through the deployment of critical theory and the use of dialectical analysis coupled with practical action. Edelman, in addition to highlighting the importance of a critical theoretical perspective like Debord, believed that the demystifying potential of art, at least certain types of art, might help to stimulate the public imagination for new possibilities—alternatives to life as constrained by the political spectacle:

Though it is not often successful for many or for extended time periods, art is worth attention as an antidote to political mystification because works of art depend for their power upon properties that contrast revealingly with the characteristics of political language. Art helps counter banal political forms and so can be a liberating form of political expression. It becomes that when it estranges people from bemusement with facts, conventional assumptions, and conventional language so that they see their inherent contradictions and recognize alternative potentialities. (Edelman, 1988, p. 127)

In a passage citing Marcuse’s (1964) concept of the one dimensional society—wherein the combination of an overly bureaucratic (and totalitarian) administrative society and the commodification of culture essentially fold into itself everything that opposes it, Edelman (1988) articulated a vision of art’s potential to counter the faux optimism and the lull fashioned by the political spectacle: “Pessimism in art is a component of its humanizing power; it offers a liberating contrast to the rosy promises with which political and commercial pitchmen assault the public” (p. 127). In this way, Edelman believed, art is able to rail against what Marcuse (1964) referred to as the happy consciousness—a mass produced happiness premised on the fulfillment of fictional needs that are themselves manufactured by the market.

Importantly, Edelman issued several warnings and caveats to analyzing the spectacle that are of interest here. First, scholars should remain skeptical of the use of rational choice theory as an analytic lens to understand the spectacle, particularly, as he argued, because the theory itself can be appropriated to rationalize the very myths the spectacle promotes. Second, scholars must be willing to embrace a degree of moral relativism while understanding that such a position “in
no way denies the need for a clear moral code; it recognizes, rather, that interpretations of actions do vary with social situations” (Edelman, 1988, p. 5). Moral relativism, as Edelman explained, requires scholars to take on a degree of humility in the analysis of various cultures and human conditions:

It is moral certainty, not tentativeness, that historically has encouraged people to harm or kill others. Genocide, racial and religious persecution, and the rest of the long catalogue of political acts that have stained human history can only come from people who are sure they are right. (p. 5)

Third, a critical, interpretive theoretical lens becomes necessary to attend to the socially constructed and symbolic nature of the spectacle as well as the power dimensions laden in the various interpretations of the socio-political world it produces:

Some like-minded groups control the resources to allocate valued benefits while others interact with one another socially and symbolically to insure docile acceptance of their deprivations. The powerful and the powerless cooperate in this way to solidify each other’s positions; symbolic interactions complement economic and social disparities. (p. 97)

In From Art to Politics, Edelman fleshed out his theory of art as the social and cultural foundation upon which politics are both understood and contested (by mass publics) as well as fashioned and rationalized (by political actors). Although Edelman conceded that not everyone has access to an art education, he believed that the ideas and symbolic interpretations of the life world that are embedded in art are frequently transferred into public discourse, thus becoming highly salient, visible constructions, whether or not this transference is explicitly acknowledged and even in lieu of a public not formally educated in the arts:

Victory or defeat in battle, heroic or tyrannical leadership, hostile or friendly relations with foreign nations, the suffering or the laziness of the poor, help or frustration from bureaucracies, conspiracy, altruism—all find their models in well-known works of art. These shape perception and public reactions, and advocates for particular courses of action tap the beliefs and emotions they evoke, whether or not are explicitly cited or recalled. (Edelman, 1995, pp. 39-40)
Auguring later scholarship in policy feedback theory (Pierson, 1993) as well as the theory of the social construction of target populations and democratic policy design (Schneider & Ingram, 1993, 1997), Edelman pointed to the ways in which art informs how women, in particular, are portrayed in politics, and specifically in male discourse: as “an ideal,” “as property,” “an outlet for aggression,” and as “a threatening and potentially powerful competitor” (p. 45). These symbolic meanings then play a role in the way women in society, and particularly in politics, are viewed. Additionally, Edelman contended that art is not only the basis for shaping roles in society, for public policy formulation, and for political action, but it is also a means of deflecting the spectacle and allowing the public to think and act in ways that refuse the “passive acceptance of conventional ideas and banal responses to political clichés” and, as such, “help[s] foster a reflective public that is less inclined to think and act in a herd spirit or according to the cues and dictates provided by a privileged oligarchy” (p. 143). Thus, although Edelman was well aware of the ways in which art can reinforce elitism, he believed that art also had the potential to improve democracy and to promote creativity and imagination. Despite this belief, both Edelman and Debord accorded a minimal degree of agency to spectators in their analyses. As such, there are have been various critiques leveled at the concept of the spectacle, particularly due to inherent nihilist perspective on societal relations in Debord and Edelman’s accounts.

Critiques of the Spectacle

Before moving on to the next section on art and visual culture, it is important to highlight a few critiques of the concept of the spectacle because they lead nicely into more recent theories of the photograph in contemporary visual culture. Sontag (1973), for example, made reference to the notion of the spectacle in a collection of her earlier essays on photography, noting that “Cameras [can] define reality in the two ways essential to the workings of an advanced industrial society: as a spectacle (for the masses) and as an object of surveillance (for rulers)” (p. 178).
However, in her later work, Sontag (2003) articulated a self-defined conservative position on the spectacle, seeming to reject the nihilism inherent in the thesis that, in (post)modern society, reality has dissipated, and appearances have prevailed. The implication of this radical standpoint, she argued, is that it minimizes (or fully occludes) the reality of suffering for so many in the world—that is, it fails to account for an external world that exists in concrete form rather than in the ephemeral sense of a collapsed world dissipating into appearances (Sontag, 2003).

Similarly, Jones (2013), following Manovich (2001), critiqued the postmodernism of theorists like Debord and Baudrillard, arguing that the notion of the spectacle and its dissolution at the hands of digital technology (as Baudrillard argued would occur) reiterates the idea of a passive and helpless human subject that must appeal to the transcendentalism (i.e. that which is not grounded in lived experience) implicit in Kantian aesthetics, where Kant posited that aesthetic judgment bridges the divide between subject(ive) and object(ive) life. The aesthetic judgment, Jones argues, renders a disembodied subject. This notion of the spectator, therefore, contradicts any sense of an embodied, lived experience. Likewise, the spectacle as the appropriation of images by capitalism or by political elites does not quite represent the totality of visuality’s authority as Mirzoeff (2011) conceptualizes it. His concept of visuality as “the domain of authority” remains broader, though still encompasses the elite classes of business and political actors that take over the visual ordering of society for their own gain. This notion of the domain of authority, rather, is something that extends beyond the scope of these actors and encompasses this idea of the necropolitical – the sovereign power to decide who lives and who dies such that countervisuality functions as what Mirzoeff refers to as “Visuality 2,” that is, a “picturing of the self or collective that exceeds or proceeds that subjugation to centralized authority” and which “attempt[s] to reconfigure visuality as a whole” (pp. 23-24). In this light, the spectacle as rendered by Debord and Edelman becomes a means to an end, serving the
ultimate purpose of reinforcing visuality’s authority. Furthermore, the spectator, as Jones’
argues, must be conscious of that authority, of the ultimate purpose of visuality, and, as such,
must be able to present a version of the real that extends beyond and surpasses the visuality of
the state. Unlike the passive, acquiescent spectator, then, the countervisual necessitates a fully
embodied, conscious political subject capable of picturing life outside of and at the margins of
visuality’s reach across both time and space.

Such critiques of the spectacle in light of this idea of an active, embodied spectator are
central to comprehending one of the primary differences between art history and critique, on the
one hand, and visual culture, on the other. Much like policy feedback theory and the social
construction of target populations have begun to focus on average citizens in addition to political
elites (as compared to group- and elite-based theories of public policy), visual culture studies
focus on the interpretive and embodied experiences of average spectators and the cultural
meanings attributed to images as they are viewed and shared within a collective of spectators. In
so doing, they give recognition both to a fully embodied spectator and to an objective structural
world in which the current political and economic order present real challenges for marginalized
populations.

Spectacle Summary

The scholarship of Debord (1983) and Edelman (1971, 1988, 1995) highlights the role of
images in aiding the hegemonic impulses of both state and market in a consumerist and complex
postmodern culture. In important ways, their scholarship on the spectacle set the stage for the
transdisciplinary endeavor of visual culture studies. Although, as noted previously, visual
cultural theorists have contested some of Debord’s theses on the spectacle, his work has been
influential in conceptualizing the proliferation of images in the late 20th century. Where both
Debord’s and Edelman’s theorizing on the nature of the spectacle encompass a rather passive
human subject susceptible to dominant ideologies of the market and the state, the critical interpretivist analyses they advocated have allowed subsequent visual culture theorists to engage alternative theoretical lenses from which a more democratic ethos arises, thus affording a more active and embodied role for the human subject as spectator. Indeed, visual culture studies, which began to flourish in the academy during the 1980s as a discipline in its own right, has much to say about the possibilities of art, and photography in particular, as a counterhegemonic resource allowing mass publics to provide a countervisual response to the spectacular images generated by the market and the state. The next section highlights this body of scholarship that developed in the years following theories of the spectacle, outlining some of the parallels between the democratic nature of visual culture studies, with their focus on the meaning-making processes of average spectators, and policy feedback theory’s focus on mass publics.

**Art and Visual Culture: Democratizing Images**

Whereas the previous section addressed literature on the spectacle by Debord (1983) and Edelman (1988), this section focuses on the literature in visual culture studies, which differs from that of the spectacle in three primary ways: (1) with regards to a broader and more hierarchal conceptualization of state authority that extends above and beyond the machinations of political and business elites (e.g., the notion of sovereignty and the state of exception), (2) the acknowledgement of structural impediments to social and political equity among the marginalized, and (3) the ways in which real, embodied subjects become conscious of how their lived experiences are constrained by state authority and thus begin to contest those constraints, asserting the right to look and, most importantly, the right to exist (Mirzoeff, 2011). This section focuses primarily on this third difference in light of the technological developments associated with the digital age.
Importantly, visual culture in relation to art history and art criticism is, in many ways, analogous to the relationship between policy feedback theory and many of the theoretical frameworks in public policy and political science that preceded it, which follow from and exist in relation to the pluralist, elitist, and systems theories of politics during the 20th century. Pierson’s (1993) call for scholars to attend to the impact of policies on mass publics parallels the call in visual culture studies to attend to the ways in which average citizens engage with, interpret, and make meaning from images. In this way, Debord’s and Edelman’s theorizing on the spectacle, and specifically Edelman’s contention that art has the capacity to reinforce, rather than negate, democratic impulses, has augured the dialogue surrounding ideas of countervisuality and resistance in visual culture studies. Within this dialogue, visual culture theorists attempt to wrestle judgments of aesthetics away from the “professional gaze,” a way of looking that has its roots in elitism (Azoulay, 2012). Visual culture studies give primacy to spectators, regardless of their professional qualifications, placing them on an equal playing field with the artists and the subjects of the artwork themselves. This runs counter to the traditional focus of professionalism, for example, in art history where the position of judgment is primarily given only to one with the proper qualifications to render judgment — i.e. to one with a “good eye.” (Azoulay, 2012, p. 46; Rose, 2016, p. 57). Thus, the emergence of visual culture as an academic discipline, much like policy feedback theory, has had a democratizing effect on research practices in refocusing scholars’ attention onto average citizens rather than elites and professionals alone. As such, this section focuses on theories that elucidate the ways in which publics interpret and contest visuality’s authority as knowledgeable agents in their own right.

The literature review on visual culture begins with a more in-depth treatment of Mirzoeff’s (2011) concepts of visuality and countervisuality and then moves on to a history of visual culture as a formal discipline of study within the academy. This is followed by Azoulay’s
(2008) concept of the citizenry of photography, which, just as the idea of state authority is expanded in other visual culture studies, particularly in the context of notions of state sovereignty, also expands the concept of citizenship beyond its traditional renderings as related to the territory of nation states. Also engaged is Azoulay’s (2012) notion of the open-endedness of the photograph; that is, that images remain continually open to reinterpretation within the citizenry of photography without allowing the professional gaze to prematurely foreclose the meanings publics attribute to them. Additionally, comparisons are drawn between Soss and Schram’s (2007) focus on visibility and proximity in relation to public policy, on the one hand, and visual culture’s focus on the concepts of sublime and aura, on the other hand. Civil rights photography and Black radical resistance are thus conceptualized as a means of countervisuality and an effort to make the proximal, lived experiences of minorities more visible to mass publics through the engagement of both aura and sublime. Finally, a summary is provided before moving onto Black feminist scholarship, which situates countervisuality (as discussed in the introductory chapter and in this section) within a Black feminist framework of resistance to visuality’s authority.

Visuality and Countervisuality

As discussed in the introductory chapter, visuality has implications for not just the ways in which society visualizes itself and the way forward as a nation state, but also for the visualization of history itself. According to Mirzoeff (2011), visuality was responsible for the surveillance of slaves on plantations, formed the basis for modern warfare, and has its intellectual roots in the work of historian Thomas Carlyle, who believed that the power to visualize history was essential to “heroic leadership” and the maintenance of “autocratic authority” (p. 3). Thus, visuality has three main effects: (1) to name, categorize, and define; (2) to separate; and, (3) to normalize and make things seem “given” (rather than socially
constructed) (Mirzoeff, 2011). These practices, as such, are central both to war and to politics. Indeed, one of the main promises of visuality for modern warfare was the ability to see what the naked eye could not: the battlefield in its entirety. As Mirzoeff (2011) notes:

The sense of visuality as war was concrete, not abstract. It referred both to the necessity for modern generals to visualize a battlefield that could not be seen from a single viewpoint, as theorized by the theorist of modern war Karl von Clausewitz (1780-1831), and to the revival of military painting that constructed battle scenes from the perspective of the general. (p. 124).

This idea of visuality was exemplified by Napoleon’s resurrection of geographic engineers following the revolution and what Mirzoeff references as “artist engineers,” who were charged with painting images of battle scenes from the perspective of the commanding generals. The value of these paintings was not merely aesthetic but also strategic in their utility for the military. It was Carlyle who took Clausewitz’s emphasis on the necessity for generals to hold mental pictures of the battlefield in its entirety and began developing his concept of visuality, which necessitated not just mental pictures but actual material renderings of these images:

Whereas Clausewitz had defined a military strategy of rendering the battlefield as a mental picture, Carlyle generalized the visualizing of history itself as being the means to order and control it. In so doing, he epitomized Michel Foucault’s reversal of Clausewitz’s well-known aphorism that ‘war is merely the continuation of politics by other means’ to read, ‘Politics is the continuation of war by other means.’ If the exceptional capacity for vision and imagination was first formulated as a tactic for war, it was then reverse-engineered by Carlyle as a mode of governance. (Mirzoeff, 2011, p. 125)

As a mode of governance, of implementing and executing visuality’s authority, then, modern history in the West can be segmented into various periods marked by regimes of visuality. For example, Mirzoeff identifies the following three critical periods: the plantation complex (1660-1860), the imperial complex (1860-1945), and the military-industrial complex (1945 to present). In each case, visuality was dominated by what Mirzoeff (2011) refers to as the metonymic figure; the overseer on the plantation, the missionary of the West’s imperialism, and the counterinsurgent as regards the military-industrial complex, respectively (p. 35). These figures,
in the context of Mbembe’s (2003) necropolitics, have historically (and presently) asserted the authority to decide who lives and who dies. Importantly, these complexes as theorized by Mirzoeff are not temporally discrete but rather ongoing methods of visualizing and universalizing the world—the effects of which linger on in contemporary society. Specifically, as Mirzoeff (2011) notes, the plantation complex continues today in American culture as “its seemingly permanent state of racialized controversy, from Rodney King to Barack Obama” (p. 155). To Mirzoeff, these periods of visuality (which he breaks down further into smaller temporal ranges) are countered along the way by various forms of realist art, which, in his view, act as a countervisual to these dominant complexes, emanating notions of both particularity and potentiality and making them visible to the masses. By particularity is meant the contextual and historical reality of disadvantaged populations across space and time. By potentiality is meant the ability to, for example, make the countervisual “legible as ‘real’ to others, as well as to those involved in making it” (Mirzoeff, 2011, p. 153).

With regards to the plantation complex, Mirzoeff references a famous photograph by photographer Timothy O’Sullivan, who captured an image of around one hundred formerly enslaved African Americans after Union soldiers attacked the South Carolina Sea Islands during the Civil War. Noting that the date of the photograph, 1862, was well before the Emancipation Proclamation, Mirzoeff (2011) contextualized the photograph in terms of his notion of countervisuality and the right to look, drawing attention to the fact that the individuals in the photograph appear to be looking directly toward the camera in a way that asserted their political subjectivity and violated the de facto plantation rule against the enslaved looking directly at a White person:

The photograph can therefore be seen as depicting democracy, the democracy so feared by Plato and Carlyle, the absence of mastery. Under Roman law, an interregnum was a state of exception that called for the appointment of an interrex, the king of the in-between. In O’Sullivan’s photograph we can see the
interplebs, the in-between people. On the Sea Islands, the space between regimes became a space without regime, democracy. (Mirzoeff, 2011, p. 162)

The photograph, as such, made visible the situation of freed men and women prior to formal emancipation and conveyed the potentiality of a democracy that would encompass the political subjectivity of the formerly enslaved. The “interstitial space” they occupied in the photograph is, in fact, quite similar to Wilderson’s (2010) notion of the ontological aporia between the ontology of the citizen, on one hand, and the ontology of “the Black,” on the other. Within this complex, the liminality of the slave, of “the Black,” is the continued articulation of political subjectivity from this interstitial place. Though the strategy of war has shifted away from Clausewitz’s theories, and, according to Mirzoeff, this contemporary period represents the crisis of visuality itself; the liminality of the slave, the plantation complex of visuality, lingers on with visuality asserting itself from the “nonplace” of the state of exception, and, according to Lowi (1998), the site of the local where the internal Cold War is waged. Visual culture studies, in this way, focus on the democratizing effects of both images themselves as well as spectators’ interpretations of them. They make images accessible and in their analyses they reveal the multiplicity of ways in which images may serve the dominant hegemony of state and market or, conversely, reveal the particularities and context of the lived experiences of the marginalized.

The History of Visual Culture Studies

The formation of visual culture as a transdisciplinary topic of inquiry emerged during the 1980s out of the disciplines of art history and cultural studies. It coincides with much of the formative writing and theorizing on postmodernity by scholars such as Jean-Francois Lyotard, Fredrick Jameson, Jean Baudrillard, and many others (Dikovitskaya, 2011; Mirzoeff, 1998; Sandywell & Heywood, 2011). Notably, visual culture theorists focus on images, rather than text, as one of the central characteristics of postmodernity. As Mirzoeff (1998) argues, “the postmodern is the crisis caused by modernism and modern culture confronting the failure of its
own strategy of visualizing” and, furthermore, “it is the visual crisis of culture that creates postmodernity, not textuality” (p. 4). Importantly, in referencing the “visual,” Mirzoeff is not speaking of the physiological and neurological process of seeing. Rather, as he contends:

The right to look is not about seeing. It begins at a personal level with the look into someone else’s eyes to express friendship, solidarity or love. That look must be mutual, each person inventing the other, or it fails. As such, it is unrepresentable. The right to look claims autonomy, not individualism or voyeurism, but the claim to political subjectivity and collectivity…(Mirzoeff, 2011, p. 1)

Thus, visual culture is about the interaction of spectators, artists, and subjects who claim a certain subjectivity—a “right to look,” to love, to challenge, to contest, and to interpret visual phenomena unmediated by the professional gaze, as well as the claim to authority that that right entails. Power is implicated in the process as are other dynamics of sensual and embodied experience that often accompany the visual:

At one level we certainly focus on the centrality of vision and the visual world in producing meanings, establishing and maintaining aesthetic values, gender stereotypes and power relations within culture. At another level we recognize that opening up the field of vision as an arena in which cultural meanings get constituted, also simultaneously anchors to it an entire range of analyses and interpretations of the audio, the spatial, and of the psychic dynamics of spectatorship. (Rogoff, 1998, p. 14)

Furthermore, visual culture in postmodernity is a challenge to the autocratic system of perspectivism that dominated modernity. Perspectivism as a visual system was based on the idea that there was only one way of seeing (as in the perspective of the general) and, thus, paintings were created utilizing a conic system, a device based on the “idea of symmetrical visual pyramids or cones with one of their apexes the receding vanishing or centric point in the painting, the other the eye of the painter or the beholder” (Jay, 1998, p. 68). This approach of one way of looking was also accompanied by a formalist approach to art in which a work’s form and content became more important than the meaning average spectators attributed to it. It paralleled the dominant paradigm of Cartesianism in the sciences but was by no means uncontested (Jay,
1998; Mirzoeff, 1998, 1999). This Cartesian way of looking is one example of what Jay (1998) refers to as a “scopic regime.” Yet, as Mirzoeff (2011) notes “[j]ust as power always creates resistance, so did the Cartesian way of seeing generate alternatives” (p. 44). Thus, where Mirzoeff defines postmodernity as the crisis of “modern culture confronting the failure of its own strategy of visualizing,” it seems he is also referring to the failure of autocratic ways of looking to retain their dominance over society. As such, the meanings engendered from images are theorized as open-ended, subject to debate and continual reinterpretation: “Visual culture is new precisely because of its focus on the visual as a place where meanings are contested” (Mirzoeff, 1998, p. 6). Photography, within visual culture, is considered a democratic medium that has proliferated within, if not been made more complex by, a digital culture in which images can be edited and manipulated (Mirzoeff, 1998). In this way, Edelman’s (1988) contention that images and symbols were far easier for spectators to digest than empirical data seems to have been prescient, particularly in light of the ways in which digital culture inundates the public with masses of information on a daily basis in ways that further complicate how individuals make sense of their social worlds:

Digital culture, is defined, at least in part by information flows of a level of infinite complexity that is beyond the capacity of human comprehension, and so it is that photography—fully imbued with the consequences of this culture—has come to form a prime means for making sense in ways that we can experience as something which feels very much like familiar and direct human perception. Photography is an intricate yet shifting assemblage of technologies, bodies, politics and aesthetics; tangible and ephemeral… (Summers, 2011, p. 459)

Like Mirzoeff, Azoulay (2012) traces the emergence of visual culture as an institutionalized academic field of study to the 1980s, coinciding with the origins of both postmodern theory and neoliberalism (Harvey, 1990, 2005). Importantly, however, with regards to visual culture as a historical phenomenon, Azoulay (2012) locates its origins “150 years previously at a period when it became possible to isolate the referent of the gaze from three additional sets of factors:”
1. From the concrete place where the referent (object or image) was located, from the event of its creation, and more generally from the determinant context—historical, cultural, practical or institutional—within which it was created.
2. From the cultural context within which the referent was transmitted for use or for viewing (or for viewing while being used).
3. From the value invested in it in this context. (p. 63)

Although the technology associated with the camera ultimately allowed for the removal of the above cited factors from the image itself, historically the camera has aided various progressive movements in engaging the countervisual—from the abolitionists to contemporary social movements. The *daguerreotype*, an early predecessor of the modern camera, which was created in the 1830s simultaneously by Hippolyte Bayard in France and Fox Talbot in Britain (Mirzoeff, 1999), emerged during a time of progressive abolitionist and radical antislavery resistance. As Davis (1998) notes, the newly developed camera was used to capture images during Nat Turner’s slave rebellion in 1831, the case surrounding the murder of Elijah P. Lovejoy (a White owner of an abolitionist newspaper in Illinois), Frederick Douglass’ escape from slavery, and Robert Purvis’ organization of the Underground Railroad (p. 267). The camera quickly became accessible to both Blacks and Whites and readily available across class lines. Despite these initial democratic impulses associated with the technology, the accessibility of the camera also allowed for the appropriation of images toward a variety of unpredictable ends. The ability to remove an image from its context, for example, impacted upon the ways in which art historians and critics judged and received works of art, which, as Azoulay (2012) argues, were not always democratic.

From the Judgment of Taste to the Citizenry of Photography

In order to distinguish between the domain of art history and art criticism and that of visual culture studies, Azoulay (2012) provides a brief genealogy of the “judgement of taste,” a form of judging she associates with the professional gaze—what she refers to as the “paradigm
of art.” That is, her idea of a paradigm of art⁹ is associated with professionalized ways of judging the aesthetic and political dimensions of an image in art history. Accordingly, she articulates three iterations of the judgment of taste throughout history. The first begins with Kantian aesthetics—a “reflexive” judgment that ascertains the quality of a work of art based on a pronouncement that “This is beautiful” (Azoulay, 2012, p. 35). The second judgment of taste, Azoulay asserts, emerged in the 20th century in the wake of Marcel Duchamp’s *In the Name of Art*. In this work, Duchamp was concerned with not just what allows one to proclaim, “This is beautiful” in the Kantian sense, but also that which determines the degree to which objects may be considered art at all, rendering the judgment, “This is art” or “This is not art.” Azoulay argues that the third judgment, which was developed during the post-war period, is similar to what Walter Benjamin called the “aestheticizing of politics.” As Azoulay notes, Benjamin’s complex historical analysis of the relationship between aesthetics and politics was subsequently reified by art critics who transformed the professional gaze into a method of rendering dichotomized judgments of “This is aesthetic” or “This is political,” where the aesthetic and political become two opposite poles: The aesthetic as intrinsic to the work of art and the political as extrinsic (p. 41). Azoulay (2012) contrasts the professional gaze of the “paradigm of art” with what she refers to as the “paradigm of visual culture” (p. 55). She argues that visual culture contrasts with the judgment of taste in three important ways: regarding the roles of (1) the artist, (2) the referent, and (3) the spectator.

The paradigm of art, as Azoulay (2012) argues, places the onus for the quality of the work on the artist, “someone who has succeeded in, or failed to, make her work become this or that,” whereas her idea of the paradigm of visual culture is interested in the ways in which all

---

⁹ Although there are many paradigms in art, Azoulay uses this phrase to refer to the discipline’s reliance on trained expertise and professionalized ways of creating and interpreting visual images.
participants contribute to the image (i.e. the subjects photographed, the photographer, and the spectators) (p. 57). The paradigm of visual culture, in contrast to the paradigm of art, renders judgment based in part on the notion of “This is like…” that is, the classification or qualities of a work of art are often associated with precedent—i.e. a particular object or image can be understood as a work of art, or as a piece of high quality, because it is similar to another form or modality encountered in previous work of art (Azoulay, 2012). Thus, where the paradigm of art mostly focuses on what is inherent in the work itself and not on the cultural and social factors that may have brought it into being (p. 59), visual culture studies, in contrast, is interested in the photograph in situ, i.e. in the context of the various social actors who brought the image into existence, the factors surrounding the photographed event, and the relations between those actors and the subjects who appear in the image. Finally, with regards to the role of the spectator, in the paradigm of art, the quality of the work, as a judgment rendered by a rather disembodied spectator, is dependent on the work itself and not on the agency of citizens who choose to interact with and draw meaning from the image. In visual culture, however, the spectator assumes a position of agency in taking responsibility for her judgment—the image is only the starting point, “one utterance in a chain of utterances…,” which are inherently political, contextual, and connected to multiple spectators in a much more democratic way (Azoulay, 2012, p. 61). This is in keeping with Mirzoeff’s (2011) claim that countervisuality asserts and makes visible a certain political subjectivity, which in Azoulay’s (2012) paradigm of visual culture, extends to both the subjects in the images as well as the spectators through their various interpretations of the image. In many ways Azoulay’s conceptualization of the paradigm of art also parallels Edelman’s (1988) contention that the ideology represented by the spectacle, through the production of images, constrains the analytic lens through which the disaffected may understand their circumstances. In turn, the democratic impulses of visual culture, to which
Azoulay refers, parallels Edelman’s (1995) later work in which he theorizes art as a potential means of contesting that ideology.

The paradigm of art, to Azoulay (2012), constrained the interpretation of images to a professional class of elites, whereas the paradigm of visual culture broadened the plane upon which average citizens (artists, subjects, and spectators) could make meaning of the world around them. In contrasting the elitist undertones of the judgment of taste with the democratic and participatory undertones of visual culture, Azoulay (2008, 2012) theorizes the existence of a “citizenry of photography.” Her concept of a citizenry of photography is based on the civil contract as articulated in the 1798 Declaration of the Rights of Man and the 1791 Declaration of the Rights of Woman by Olympe de Gouge. To Azoulay (2008), it “affords enough distance to view a different type of relation between human beings, between the governed, in the framework of which the citizen aims to break away from his or her status as a citizen and exercise citizenship—that is, to turn citizenship into the arena of constant becoming, together with other (non)citizens” (p. 118) (emphasis in original). This is remnant in some ways of Lowi’s (1985) suggestion that one way to understand the ubiquitous but difficult to define entity knows as “the state” is to operationalize it in terms of what it does, that is, the state in action, i.e. policymaking. The state in action, then, parallels the citizenry of photography where photography provides a modality within which individuals perform their citizenship—citizenship in action. However, in Azoulay’s (2008, 2012) analysis, the citizenship of photography is wholly separate from the contradictions in natural and political rights that extend from the “sovereign,” the nation state. The citizenry of photography includes individuals with official political rights in the nation state in which they reside as well as those whose “citizen status is flawed, or even nonexistent (as in the case of refugees, the poor, migrant workers, etc.), or temporarily suspended (citizens struck by disaster, exposed for a limited period of time)…” (Azoulay, 2008, p. 118). While rejecting the
classical liberal rationality associated with the social contract between citizen and sovereign, and recognizing that in the past as well as in the present, minorities and non-citizens are made vulnerable to the (mis)representation and decontextualization made possible by the camera, Azoulay (2008) argues that, in visual culture, “the civil contract of photography…is based on an ethical duty, and on patterns of deterritorialization” (p. 128). As such:

Citizenship in the citizenry of photography asks not to be stopped at borders and plays a vital political role in making sure other cultures are accessible, in all of their prestige or misery, deeming local cultures to be worthy of documentation and public display. Photography, being in principle accessible to all, bestows universal citizenship on a new citizenry whose citizens produce, distribute, and look at images. (Azoulay, 2008, p. 134)

This universal citizenship transcends physical borders and has implications for both spectators and the subjects of photographs: “Every citizen in the citizenry of photography has equal rights, but photography continues to testify to the enormous inequality that reigns outside. This inequality among equals imposes a common, though not equal, burden of responsibility on the shoulders of all citizens of photography” (Azoulay, 2008, p. 144). Within the citizenry of photography, the photographed subject has the right to make her grievances known through what Azoulay (2008) refers to as the photographic énoncé, and the spectator is called to act—to transform the énoncé “into an emergency claim” (p. 145). The énoncé, in poststructuralist terms, and in the context of the photograph, is the representation of the “I” (the subject) in the photograph as compared to the flesh and blood “I” (the actual person) on the scene of the photographed event who consents (theoretically, at least), in the context of the citizenry of photography, to being photographed. In cases where the photograph bears witness to power disparities, oppression, or state violence—images that, for example, contest political (not photographic) citizenship—the spectator is called not just to gaze upon the image but to respond to the claim rendered by the énoncé. In the context of necropolitics, this means that the énoncé may very well be the assertion of the right to exist, which, according to Azoulay’s ethics of the
citizenry of photography, demands from the spectator a response on behalf of the subject of the photograph. Thus, the emergency claim of the énoncé counters the emergency claim of the state. As Azoulay argues, these images are continually open to reinterpretation and thus the call to action, the demand for response may be transformed over time into one claim or another but it is always and ever present in the photograph itself.

The Open-Endedness of the Photograph

To make sense of this ever-present-ness of the photographic énoncé, Azoulay (2008) distinguishes between what she calls “the event of photography” and “the photographed event.” The event of photography, Azoulay argues, is often overlooked as it represents the interaction between the photographer, the photographed, and the spectators at the site of photography and it is always and everywhere a possibility even when cameras are not apparent to the participants (pp. 21-22). In contrast, the photographed event is the event captured by the camera lens. Azoulay emphasizes that the photograph itself is “an additional factor in the unfolding of the event of photography,” which is also, when it is reproduced and shared in a different context, “[t]he encounter with the photograph [that] continues the event of photography that happened elsewhere” (Azoulay, 2008, p. 23). Put simply, the event of photography is lived experience, it is contextual, it is the ongoing and ever-present interaction between artist, subject, and spectator; the photographed event is that which is directly captured through the lens of the camera and which remains ongoing through its open-endedness in subsequent interactions with spectators. In this way, Azoulay (2008) likens the relationship between the event surrounding the camera (in which the photograph in question is taken) and the event surrounding the photograph (the encounter of the spectator with the photograph) to a mathematical equation in that “the moment we attempt to unravel the connection between them, we immediately become aware of the hidden variables in the equation” (p. 26). That is, by connecting the context with the content,
variables emerge that have until that time remained hidden to the naked eye. There can be multiple reasons for hidden variable ranging from incidental to nefarious, from an unintentional “seeping away of information” to an intentional abuse of power that seeks to overtake the photographed event (Azoulay, 2008, pp. 26-27). Regardless, the spectator becomes an active participant placed on equal level with the artist, the photographed subject, and other spectators engaging in processes of interpretation, meaning-making, and concomitant attempts to “solve” the photographic equation.

This open-endedness of the photograph is a salient theme in the literature on photography and visual culture. For example, J. Berger (1980) articulates the open-ended and non-linear qualities of the photograph by creatively reworking one of Brecht’s poems about the role of an actor in communing with the audience. In the text, Berger asks the reader to replace the word “instant” with “photography” and the word “acting” with the “re-creation of context” (that is, the quality of the image that makes it continually open for re-interpretation):

So you should simply make the instant photography
Stand out, without in the process hiding
What you are making it stand out from.
Give your acting re-creation of context
That progression of one-thing-after-another,
that attitude of
Working up what you have taken on. In this way
You will show the flow of events and also the course
Of your work, permitting the spectator
To experience this Now on many levels, coming from
Previously and
Merging into Afterwards, also having much else Now
Alongside it. He is sitting not only
In your theatre but also
In the world. (as cited in J. Berger, 1980, p. 65)

Thus, the spectator in relation to image, to the subject of the photograph, and to the photographer is tied through the visual image into the past and the future as well as to all that emerges alongside it (i.e. contextual factors): “The ideal of photography, aesthetics apart, is there to seize
an ‘historic’ moment” (J. Berger, 1980, p. 51). Thus, the system of spectatorship and interpretation with regards to photographic images is not linear but radial:10 “A radial system has to be constructed around the photograph so that it may be seen in terms which are simultaneously personal, political, economic, dramatic, every day and historic” (Berger, J., 1980, p. 67). Hidden variables, then, are a salient theme in the analysis of visual culture and it is up to the citizens of photography to reveal them through closer analysis. As much as the camera may reveal context and history and thus function as a tool of remembrance, as noted by theorists such as Sontag (1973), J. Berger (1980), and Barthes (2012), it is also capable of inducing forgetfulness, such as in Debord’s (1983) and Edelman’s (1988) analyses of the of the spectacle and Mirzoeff’s (2011) concept of visuality.

This is essentially what Barthes’ (2012) argues in his famous collection, *Mythologies*, a series of analyses of various types of French media between 1954 and 1956. From this collection, he articulated a theory of semiotics as applied to the concept of “myths,” which he defined in the context of his work as “depoliticized speech” (Barthes, 2012, p. 254). In referencing the political, Barthes meant not the traditional definition of politics (in terms of interaction with the business of state governance) but that which refers to “the whole of human relations in their real, social structure, in their power of making the world…” (p. 255). Myth, in Barthes’ view, had the tendency to distort human relations and to present political concepts simply as a “given” with no other justification for their existence. As such, in the transmission of myths, “history evaporates” (Barthes, 2012, p. 264). The implications of Barthes’ concept of history evaporating are twofold: (1) that those with power, particularly political and business elites, may use images to control the historical narrative and (2) those without power, the

---

10 Spectatorship does not always coincide with interpretation. In many ways, particularly as theorized within the spectacle, spectators may take an image as a given rather than question its veracity or attempt to attribute meaning to it beyond its form.
marginalized, become misrepresented; their stories and histories untold (i.e. the missing variable). This makes Mirzoeff’s (2012) concept of the countervisual as a modality intended to convey a realism that depicts both potentiality and particularity all the more necessary as it rages against what Angela Davis (2016) has recently referred to as “the tyranny of the universal” (p. 87). Whereas history and context may remain outside of the photograph and thus just out of reach for the spectator, the role of countervisuality in light of Mirzoeff (2011), Azoulay (2008, 2012), J. Berger (1980), and others, is to bring them back into the frame.

On the Aura, the Sublime, and the Aesthetics of the Photograph

   Just as the concepts of visibility and proximity are central to policy feedback theory, so too are the concepts of aura and sublime to visual culture studies. The sublime “is the pleasurable experience in representation of that which would be painful or terrifying in reality, leading to a realization of the limits of the human and the power of nature” (Mirzoeff, 1998). And, what Benjamin (1968) referred to as aura is the authentic and sensual quality of a work of art, “its presence in time and space, its unique existence at the place where it happens to be” (p. 220). Much like Barthes’ (2012) belief that history evaporated in the presence of myth, Benjamin believed that the aura had disappeared in both photography and cinematography, owing to their reproducibility. “To pry an object from its shell, to destroy its aura, is the mark of a perception whose ‘sense of the universal equality of things’ has increased to such a degree that it extracts it even from a unique object by means of its reproduction” (Benjamin, 1968, p. 223). Therefore, in Benjamin’s view, the diminishing aura of photography and cinema through their reproducibility led to an image devoid of context, similar in some ways to Azoulay’s (2008) concept of the hidden variable. This reproduction of images, in Benjamin’s (1968) view, stemmed from two desires of the spectator: (1) to bring objects closer, and (2) “to [overcome] the uniqueness of every reality by accepting its reproduction” (p. 223). As Benjamin (1968) argued, this
reproduction not only changed the modality of presentation (for example, from an image displayed in a museum to one displayed in a book in one’s private library or on a wall in one’s home), but it also altered the functional qualities of the image (p. 225).

Sublime and aura, then, are ways of discussing and conceptualizing the ideal distance between the spectator and the image (proximity) as well as the impact on society of an image’s reproduction (visibility). The two concepts parallel those of visibility and proximity presented in the policy feedback section of this chapter. In Soss and Schram’s (2007) analysis, a policy’s visibility means, quite literally, that it is seen and known by mass publics, but not necessarily that individuals have direct experience with it. Thus, it is possible to say that visibility is to the sublime what proximity is to aura. To this extent, aura translates to proximity whereas sublime provides the distance necessary so that the spectator is not overcome with terror such that an image produced in consideration of the sublime is made visible but not necessarily proximal. To Boyne (2011), the sublime “demands surrender to what is newly arrived or has been an overwhelming presence for as long as any can remember” (p. 300). In the sense of Mirzoeff’s (1998) definition, it also requires that which is represented in the photograph to be far enough away so that the terror of “the real” does not overcome the joy one might find in perceiving it. Therefore, to engage sublime, the spectator must be distant enough so as not to be overtaken by it; whereas, to engage aura one must be present with the image-in-context. For Boyne, the concept of “technological sublime” (a term made popular by David Nye), is evidenced in architecture and other technological developments of modernity as well as in public art. Just as there is no one way of looking, one “good eye,” there is also no one way of engaging the sublime, nor the aura of an image. However, as countervisuality entails the conveyance of

---

11 However, the technological sublime as Boyne uses it differs from more traditional definitions of the sublime in that it denotes a spectator’s experience with phenomena (e.g. a massive bridge) in proximity.
particularity (i.e. proximity) there are certain ramifications for marginalized groups as to the ways in which their political subjectivity and lived experiences are conveyed through the image.

Race and the Missing Variable

The notion that photography may occlude history and thus make *what is* seem as though it is naturally given is problematic when both history and context, i.e. particularity, can make the difference between a just and unjust rendering of society. The production and reproduction of civil rights photography is illustrative of this phenomenon. M.A. Berger (2011), for example, identifies the ways in which the imagery presented to the public in the name of social progressiveness during that time frame was deceptive in its representation of the role of Black individuals in the movement and throughout history:

> At issue is the price that the photographs extracted for their promotion of reform. In order to safely move whites to either tolerate or embrace social and legislative change, the photographs occluded various racial facts, including the agency of blacks in shaping American history and the shared beliefs of reactionary and progressive whites.

In keeping with Azoulay (2008) and J. Berger’s (1980) contention that the photographed event, the continual interpretation of both the relationship between photographer and subject(s) as well as the relationship between the spectator and the subject(s) as represented in the image, is open-ended and non-linear, M.A. Berger (2011) also notes that the reproduction of civil rights imagery in contemporary times can either reinforce the status quo (the spectacle) or begin to reveal what was occluded:

> When we reproduce civil rights photography today with the same framing that dominated media accounts during the 1960s, we inadvertently enforce the racial status quo. Before we can ‘write the final page’ of the civil rights era, we must reframe the iconic photographs and develop a more progressive cannon of images. Until we do so, the most significant social work of civil rights photographs will continue to be the limits they place on the exercise of black power. (M.A. Berger, 2011, p. 160)
Indeed, Black power and Black agency have often functioned as the missing variable in civil rights photography. hooks (1995), reflecting on that era, writes that the lack of accurate representation of Black resistance and radical politics led to a situation in which “[e]veryday black folks began to see themselves as not having a major role to play in the production of images” (p. 59). Prior to desegregation, hooks (1995) notes that the walls of Black homes were “sites of resistance,” places “where images could be displayed, shown to friends and strangers” (p. 59). As such, the power of the camera to reproduce images meant that:

The sites of contestation were not out there [visible], in the world of white power, they were within segregated black life. Since no ‘white’ galleries displayed images of black people created by black folks, spaces had to be made within diverse black communities [proximal]…. The camera was the central instrument by which blacks could disprove representations of us created by white folks. (hooks, 1995, p. 59) (emphasis added)

hooks' reflection on the importance of Black photography in Black homes (in part, due to its exclusion from public spaces) indicates that certain experiences that were proximal for Black families were, conversely, distant for other racial groups. Instead, images of Black people during the civil rights era were largely controlled by Whites and made visible by them, but this form of representation lacked proximity to authentic Black lived experience. That the walls of Black homes became “sites of contestation,” and that media images were controlled by Whites during this era, signals again not just the existence of Wilderson’s (2010) ontological aporia between the races, but also the ways in which this aporia plays out in the context of the visual culture of that era. Figure 4 below provides a visual of these relationships, overlaying the concepts of sublime and aura onto Soss and Schram’s (2007) visibility-proximity axis.
Figure 7. The aura and sublime overlaid on the visibility-proximity axis.

It is important to note that proximity does not necessarily negate visibility, nor does aura necessarily negate the sublime, but rather the relations between them (proximity/aura and visibility/sublime) must be continually negotiated by spectators, artists, and subjects, in the production and circulation of countervisual images. As Azoulay’s (2008) concept of the photographic énoncé makes apparent, aura is transformed but not necessarily diminished through the reproduction of images. Likewise, visibility, as it relates to making countervisuality visible, may entail translating to others the particularity and proximity of individuals’ lived experience as well as the potentiality that comes from acknowledging their right to exist as political subjects in their own right. Therefore, these concepts can be thought to form a nexus, a meeting place, between the lived experience of the marginalized and the line of sight of the masses.
Visual Culture Summary

As this section highlighted, visual culture theorists focus on the “visual crisis of culture” that postmodernity entails (Mirzoeff, 1998). The role of professionalism, of “the good eye,” and the notion of one way of seeing, are contested through and by the citizenry of photography, wherein spectators, artists, and subjects continue to interpret and contextualize the images proliferated by digital culture. The spectacle, the aggregation of images, becomes open-ended and dynamic and hidden variables cannot long remain unseen so long as marginalized constituencies assert “the right to look” and the right to exist. Where Edelman (1971, 1988) asserted that the work of political actors in constructing the spectacle consisted of defining problems, establishing leaders, and identifying enemies, countervisuality contests the grounds of authority such elites use to justify their particular problem definitions, the casting of “heroes” who possess ready-made policy solutions for those problems, and the power of elites to name and classify political enemies. Following Edelman’s (1988) and Debord’s (1983) theorizing on the spectacle, and Mirzoeff’s (2011) work on visuality and countervisuality, critical theories of resistance are integral to countering dominant hegemonies and engaging visual culture in the contestation of the political status quo, particularly by engaging the concepts of visibility/sublime and aura/proximity. Whereas this section addressed the ways in which visual culture has democratized art, the next section engages some of the various ways in which Black feminists engage the concepts closely associated with both visual culture and public policy (visibility/sublime and proximity/aura) through feminist, antiracist activism.

Black Feminist Scholarship

This section focuses specifically on the intellectual work of Black feminist scholars in contesting structural injustices and in highlighting the spectacular images and stereotypes of Black women that perpetuate them. Through various means, these scholars highlight the ways in
which visual culture is appropriated by the state for political ends. As scholars trace the use of images to policy actors and decision-making points, they work to differentiate between appearance (i.e. what appears and arises from the spectacle) and reality. By contesting the state, these policy studies become modalities of resistance and forms of countervisuality in their own right (e.g., Browne, 2015; Crenshaw, 1991, 2012; Hancock, 2004; Jordan-Zachery, 2009; Sharpe, 2016). In this context, it is important to recall that the images produced through policymaking need not be actual photographs or works of art (although they can be), but rather, at minimum, they consist of salient, visible social constructions embedded in the public imagination, which are then utilized by policymakers as a measure of target group deservedness (Schneider & Ingram, 1993, 1997). Not altogether different from Carlyle’s appropriation of Clausewitz’s theorizing on military strategy in order to make mental images of the battlefield come to life on the canvas, contemporary images of Black women matter whether they remain psychological constructs (as stereotypes) or whether those constructs are given form and materiality through artistic means. However, the invisible nature of stereotypes as mental schema renders the processes of tracing their policy impacts even more difficult. Indeed, images as stereotypes work much the same as a group’s core beliefs in the context of public policy, although the impact they have on politics and on the minds of policymakers can be much more difficult to trace. As Fricker (2007) argues, “images are capable of a visceral impact on judgement, which allows them to condition our judgements without our awareness, whereas it would take an unconscious belief to do so with comparable stealth” (p. 37). The idea that the impact of images on one’s judgment may occur outside of a decision-maker’s awareness complicates the already difficult process that publics encounter in tracing policy outcomes back to specific policy actors—a key component of the democratic loop that allows constituents to hold politicians accountable for their actions (Arnold, 1990; Pierson, 1993). As such, this section
examines some of the complex work involved in tracing social constructions back to the policymaking process, forward to policy outcomes, and in providing a countervisual to the spectacular images that reinforce the structural barriers to Black women’s social, economic, and political equity.

The following subsections review the work of several Black feminist scholars who have taken on this endeavor, engaging various academic lenses (e.g., legal, historic, literary, philosophical), to pinpoint the role of social constructions of Black women vis-à-vis the policy process. First, the problems of these constructions are addressed on an ontological level with particular attention to Hortense Spillers’ (2003) analysis of the enduring legacy in contemporary society of Black women as slaves. The following subsection addresses various metaphors and analytical lenses engaged by Black feminist scholars as they highlight the images and stereotypes of Black women in the public imagination. This includes some of the unjust sociopolitical outcomes as a result of political elites’ reliance on those images. Additionally, Kimberlé Crenshaw’s influential theorizing on intersectionality as well as the policy studies of Julia Jordan-Zachery (2009) and Ange-Marie Hancock (2004) are highlighted to reveal the ways in which deviant stereotypes of Black women and other women of color have negatively impacted both welfare reform and policing practices. Finally, literature on the Black Lives Matter movement is reviewed, focusing on the ways in which the movement provides a countervisual to the state by foregrounding the lived experiences of Black women in direct contradiction to the prevalent stereotypes that permeate the public imagination. A summary is provided prior to moving on to the last section, which more fully engages some of the philosophical implications of the literature reviewed thus far as it relates to public policy and visual culture.
The Black Woman as Slave

The ontological aporia theorized by Wilderson (2010) that separates the slave (object) and the human (subject) is further complicated by the ways in which Black women have been socially constructed in and through public policy and the ways in which current antiracist activism speaks to the power of activists to appropriate the camera in the contestation of those images. The Moynihan Report on the “negro family” during the 1960s stands as an enduring example of the power of discursive imagery in the pathologization Black and non-White families. Hortense Spillers (2003), in her often-cited essay on the topic, “Mama’s Baby, Papa’s Maybe,” describes the ways in which this report positioned “the ‘white’ family, by implication, and the ‘Negro family,’ by outright assertion, in a constant opposition of binary meanings” (p. 205). The Moynihan report, in its characterization of Black women as deviant and incapable of adhering to traditional gender norms, as matriarchs in Black homes, and as mammies or caretakers in White homes, was widely criticized among Black feminist intellectuals for placing the blame of structural inequalities in policy outcomes squarely on the personal deficiencies of Black women (Collins, 2000). Many of these stereotypes emerged from chattel slavery and are thought to linger on in contemporary policy discourse (Jordan-Zachery, 2009; Marie-Hancock, 2004). As Spillers (2003) argues in her essay, “Interstices: A Small Drama of Words,” Black women since the time of slavery have functioned in society, reproductively speaking, as the ontological marker of the non-human:

She became…the principal point of passage between the human and the non-human world. Her issue became the focus of a cunning difference—visually, psychologically, ontologically—as the route by which the dominant modes decided the distinction between humanity and ‘other.’ At this level of radical discontinuity in the ‘great chain of being,’ black is vestibular to culture. In other words, the black person mirrored for the society around her what a human being was not. (p. 155)
The argument of many scholars, including Spillers herself, is that this act of mirroring continues in contemporary society. In this way, Black women’s intellectual work becomes not only an assertion of the right to exist, but the right to exist as a fully human political subject—acknowledged as a gendered and racialized body with a particular lived experience and a history of social, economic, and political marginalization. In contesting the state and asserting the right to exist as a human subject, Black feminist studies engage a certain imagery in their own right: that of the metaphor. In the context of Black feminist intellectual work, the metaphor serves as a guide, a heuristic, for various forms of antiracist and feminist resistance deemed necessary in the pursuit of a more just and equitable society.

The Crooked Room, Wake Work, and Dark Sousveillance

Just as social constructions are frequently utilized in the formulation and implementation of public policy, so, too, are metaphors invoked in scholarship on the deleterious effects of those policies on communities of color. In this way, metaphors function as descriptive heuristics for the ways in which policy impacts peoples’ lived experience. Harris-Perry (2011), for example, argues that the social constructions of Black women deployed in policymaking operate as a kind of collective public shaming, a form of reprobation, not just of specific target groups, but of all Black women. As such, she argues that fighting back against these stereotypes (whether in policymaking or in activist circles or simply by using one’s life choices to defy them or prove them wrong), for Black women, is the equivalent of trying to stand upright in a crooked room: No matter the strength and good posture of one’s body, no matter the individual or collective effort invoked in the name of standing erect; the room, after all, remains at an angle antithetical to uprightness. To Harris-Perry (2011), one of the worst consequences of the crooked room is that of “continual misrecognition,” that is, Black women are not recognized in the context of public policy as authentic and unique beings but rather as familiar archetypes in the public
imagination (p. 133). Therefore, the primary focus of much Black feminist literature on public policy involves exposing these salient stereotypes of Black women as tropes and juxtaposing them against Black women’s authentic lived experiences.

Furthermore, these acts of exposing and resisting the dominant visuality of the state are akin to what Sharpe (2016) refers to as *wake work*, which she defines “as a theory and praxis of the wake: a theory and praxis of Black being in the diaspora” (p. 19). Like Harris-Perry and the crooked room, Sharpe uses the wake as her own metaphor for Black lived experience in the afterlife of slavery. Her use of the word signals the meaning of the word *wake* as in (1) the ritual that takes place after a death, (2) the form that water takes as it trails behind a ship (as in a slave ship), and (3) the critical philosophical levels of consciousness evoked in and from life in the aftermath of slavery (Sharpe, 2016, p. 21). Invoking a powerful visual image—the hold of a slave ship—Sharpe writes that through wake work

> [w]e must think about Black flesh, Black optics, and ways of producing enfleshed work; think the ways the hold cannot and does not hold even as the hold remains in the form of the semiotics of the slave ship hold, the prison, the womb, and elsewhere in and as the tension between being and instrumentality that is Black being in the wake. At stake is not recognizing antiblackness as total climate. At stake, too, is not recognizing an insistent Black visual/sonic resistance to that imposition of non / being. How might we stay in the wake with and as those whom the state positions to die ungrievable deaths and live lives meant to be unlivable? These are questions of temporality, the *longue durée*, the residence and hold time of the wake. (Sharpe, 2016, pp. 21-22)

Wake work, then, involves acknowledging the ubiquity of antiblackness in contemporary culture, the ways in which the hold of the slave ship still manifests and resonates in the afterlife of slavery, and a willingness to theorize from that place—from the hold—about what it means to exist when one’s existence is always already threatened by the state itself.

In the context of this theorizing, contestations of state policy (past and present) and the various modalities of social control are brought to the fore. Browne’s (2015) scholarship, for example, outlines the impacts of various forms of state surveillance (visuality), including in her
analysis technologies that may not on their face seem visual, such as the architectural design of
slave ships, the monitoring of plantations and slave movement across them, and the modern
passport as a government issued document tracing the movement of bodies across the borders of
nation states. Importantly, Browne (2015) invokes her own neologism for these processes of
contesting this surveillance, referring to her scholarship as “dark sousveillance.” Dark
sousveillance, to Browne, entails “chart[ing] possibilities and coordinat[ing] modes of
responding to, challenging, and confronting [the] surveillance that was [is] almost all-
encompassing” (p. 21). Thus, it is not just “observing those in authority (the slave patroller or the
plantation overseer, for instance) …but also… the use of a keen and experiential insight of
plantation surveillance in order to resist it” (Browne, 2015, p. 22). It is through this insight that
both past and present technologies of the state, i.e. modes of visuality, and the lingering remnants
of slavery that comprise life in the wake are contested and resisted. In this way, dark
sousveillance engages time, space, and historicity, in tracing deleterious policy outcomes (i.e. the
“unlivable” lives and “ungrievable deaths”) to specific policies and practices of the state.

It is through the conceptual lenses of the crooked room, wake work, and dark
sousveillance, that the scholarship highlighted next, that of Kimberlé Crenshaw (1991, 2012),
Ange-Marie Hancock (2004), Julia Jordan-Zachery (2009), and Patricia Hill Collins (2000), are
situated. Theirs’ are methods of addressing the theorized antagonisms between Black lived
experience, on the one hand, and (White) humanity, on the other. Through the praxis of “looking
back” at the state, Black feminist scholars overcome what James (1997) refers to as a type of
“amnesia,” a theoretical gray space enveloping both the academy and, more broadly, the
historical record; a space that often occludes the historical arc of Black women’s intellectual
involvement in policy contestation and in circles of feminist and antiracist activism. Perhaps one
of the most important conceptual anecdotes to that amnesia in recent decades is Crenshaw’s
During the late 1980s and throughout the 1990s, a decade of substantive social policy change, intersectionality functioned as an explanatory framework for Black women’s predicament in the contexts of policymaking, antiracist social movements, and feminist activism, and it became a powerful tool for revealing the hidden variable within these circles: Black women.

Intersectionality, Black Feminism, and Public Policy

In “Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color,” Crenshaw (1991) articulated intersectionality as a framework for explaining the ways in which Black women are often marginalized both in policymaking and within feminist and antiracist circles. This marginalization, according to Crenshaw, is structural, political, and representational—it views categories such as gender and race as mutually exclusive, and in so doing, it negates the unique experiences of women of color and relegates them to the sidelines of policymaking and activist circles. Thus, intersectionality brings to the fore (1) the ways in which marginalized women of color, like all people, possess overlapping identities with regard to race, gender, class, sexuality, and citizenship status (among other demographics), and (2) how these identities shape differential policy outcomes, accordingly. Moreover, Crenshaw’s notion of intersectionality highlights the hierarchal ways in which Black men have historically predominated discussions of race as well as the ways in which White women have historically predominated feminist activism. In both cases, the intellectual thought as well as the lived experiences of Black women have been occluded as primacy is often given to the needs and intellectual thought of others. It is in this context that Crenshaw’s (1991) work on intersectionality stands as a critique of “either/or identity politics.”

As many have used the framework to articulate, it is only when feminists become antiracists, and antiracists become feminists, that either group succeeds in dismantling racist,
sexist, and classist forms of oppression because they are inextricably linked (hooks, 2000). In other words, the intersectional framework views the acknowledgement of race, gender, and other demographics in and outside of the context of policymaking and activist circles as a fruitful lens through which to explain how intersecting demographics differentially impact people’s lived experiences. Identity politics, then, in the context of intersectionality, shift away from a one-dimensional either/or conceptualization of identity to a multidimensional both/and way of explaining life at the interstices of various demographics. Hence, Crenshaw’s work focuses on the ways in which the needs of Black women and other women of color, as “the intersectional subject,” are marginalized in and through policymaking and broader society (Crenshaw, 2012).

The marginalization of Black women in public policy is often tacit and therefore the impacts of their exclusion in terms of policy outcomes are felt proximally through direct experience. For example, in her analysis, Crenshaw (1991) highlights the ways in which specific policies and programs meant to help victims of domestic abuse worsen conditions for and further endanger women of color. Focusing on the Immigration and Nationality Act, which was amended in 1990, “to protect immigrant women who were battered or exposed by the United States citizens or permanent residents these women immigrated to the United States to marry,” Crenshaw discussed the negative feedback effects among non-English speaking, women of color immigrants (p. 1247). The amendment provided a waiver to immigrant women for the original policy provision that required women to remain married for two years before applying for permanent resident status. The waiver would be granted so long as they could provide appropriate documentation proving their status as victims of domestic abuse. However, policymakers failed to acknowledge the ways in which these women’s lives might be endangered should they report their abuse to the authorities. In amending the legislation to benefit abused immigrant women but failing to account for the structural barriers precluding them from meeting
the requirements to obtain those benefits, legislators kept them trapped in their abusive circumstances. That is, “Congress positioned these women to absorb the simultaneous impact of its anti-immigration policy and their spouse’s abuse” (Crenshaw, 1991, p. 1250). For women at these intersections, in the aporia that exists between the lived experiences of dominant groups and the those of the marginalized, their marginalization was exacerbated both by policymakers and through the politics of feminist and antiracist grassroots organizations, which, according to Crenshaw, failed to see the ways in which this intersectionality disparately impacted the lives of the immigrant women they were supposed to protect. That Black women and other women of color may be conceived at once as both the missing variable from policy considerations and as a symbol of deviance in the public imagination augurs not only the liminality of Black (feminist) being “in the wake,” but also the sheer salience of their deviant representations both in the halls of Congress and in the media.

Representations of Black Women in the Media and in Public Policy

There has been considerable Black feminist scholarship spanning multiple disciplines, from English literature, to visual studies, to public policy, on the ways in which images of women of color in the public imagination have shaped, and been shaped by, both news media and the policymaking process. This scholarship is important as it foregrounds the ways in which certain policy areas such as those highlighted by social control theorists—social welfare and criminal justice policy—have been conflated with deviant notions of Blackness. Indeed, with regards to social welfare, Hugh Heclo (1994) noted that the debates surrounding poverty policy in the 1990s had become “inseparable from [America’s] racial debate” and that, historically speaking, “[i]mplicitly…race has always played a powerful role in poverty policy. It has done so by shaping divisions among the disadvantaged and the politics for exploiting those divisions” (p. 297). Likewise, Taylor (2016), in her historical analysis of race, social policy, and Black
liberation, argues that the Black Codes that emerged across the South during Reconstruction “conflated Blackness with criminality,” and, in combination with the convict leasing system, had the effect of racializing policing policy as well as the criminal justice system that would emerge in the 20th Century (p. 109). The conflation of racial stereotypes with these two policy areas—the two arms of social control—reveals the ways in which Black communities are disparately impacted by the internal Cold War to which Lowi (1998) referred, rendering policy studies on racial stereotypes one of the most important means of countering the state’s visuality. As such, the scholarship of Collins (2000), Hancock (2004), and Jordan-Zachery (2009) exemplifies the important and necessary work of tracing the material and interpretive policy impacts of policies that rely on racial stereotypes, particularly those of Black women, back to specific policy discourses as revealed in Congressional documents.

Collins (2000), for example, draws on the work of literary scholar Trudy Harris in From Mammies to Militants: Domestics in Black American Literature, to identify the various ways in which images of Black women become salient in popular culture and in politics. Multiple stereotypes emerge that impact the ways in which policymakers (and the general public) view Black women as social constructions. Specifically, Collins points to the powerful image of the Black woman as *mammy*, as the “faithful, obedient domestic servant,” who “represents the normative yardstick used to evaluate all Black women’s behavior” (p. 80). According to Collins, the image of the mammy has been manipulated by policymakers over time (for reasons of political expediency) into such images as the “matriarch,” “the black lady,” and the “jezebel.” The *matriarch*, for example, sits at the center of the thesis of the controversial Moynihan report—namely, that the poor conditions in which Black families found themselves was largely due to the absence of Black fathers in the homes of their children and the overly dominant role of Black mothers in their children’s development (Collins, 2000). Although the report
acknowledged the deleterious effects of slavery on Black families, according to Collins and other scholars, it failed to account for the many structural barriers to employment, education, and housing encountered by most Black families during the 1960s. Instead, the analysis merely focused on “Black women’s individual social behavior” and “justified moderate White working-class Democrats’ emotional reactions of anger and resentment toward government demands that they finance (through taxes) the redistribution of resources to Blacks and minorities whom those Democrats deemed underserving” (Hancock, 2004, p. 51). The matriarch, within this context, embodies the social deviance of Black families in the form an “overly aggressive, unfeminine woman,” and whereas “the mammy typif[ie]d] the Black mother figure in White homes, the matriarch symboliz[ie]d the mother figure in Black homes” (Collins, 2000, p. 83). Such images, then, reveal the malleability and liminality of Black women as social constructs within different spheres; in welfare policy, as deviant matriarchs in their own homes, and in White homes, as mammy caretakers.

The mammy and the matriarch subsequently gave rise to even more stereotypes of Black women, which became sources of political bargaining during the 1990s welfare reform debates. One example of this is the discursive image of the Black lady, which, according to Collins, represents yet another powerful image in the public imagination, paralleling that of the matriarch. However, rather than living in poverty, the Black lady has lifted herself up into the middle class: She is “the hard working Black woman professional who works twice as hard as everyone else” (Collins, 2000, p. 89). Pointing to Wahneema Lubiano’s analysis, which noted the political economy of the Black lady image when viewed in contrast to the matriarch, Collins argues that “images of the welfare queen and the Black lady evolved in tandem with persistent efforts to cut social welfare spending for working-class Blacks and limit affirmative action opportunities for middle-class Blacks” (p. 89). The modest successes of the Black lady
reinforced the notion of the protestant work ethic as the key to resolving poverty—particularly Black poverty—rendering substantive forms of government aid as a remedy for structural barriers to socioeconomic equality unnecessary.

In addition to the mammy, the matriarch, and the Black lady, Collins writes, there arose far more deviant iterations of Black female stereotypes. During the Reagan administration, and thereafter, many of these images came to the forefront of the political spectacle, providing political elites with the rationale to stem the so-called excesses of the modern welfare state. As feminist scholars note, the image of the welfare queen encompassed both the qualities of the matriarch as well as the sexual aggressiveness of “the jezebel” and “the hoochie” (Collins, 2000; Hancock, 2004; Jordan-Zachery, 2009). The term jezebel derives from myths about Black female slaves’ hyper sexuality and fertility, whereas the hoochie stems from more contemporary social constructions of Black women’s sexual appetite, which render her unable to control her passions as well as the number of children she births, most especially while she is on welfare (Collins, 2000; Hancock, 2004; Jordan-Zachery, 2009). These stereotypes became a powerful means of objectifying Black women both in the formulation of welfare policy and in the administration of criminal justice.

Social Constructions and Welfare Reform

Both Hancock (2004) and Jordan-Zachery (2009) have traced the role these images have played in the minds of both policymakers and mass publics with regards to the contentious topic of welfare reform. As these scholars argue, during the 104th Congress, the images of the Welfare Queen and the matriarch coalesced with those of the jezebel to form the impression of the lazy Black woman who refuses to work, is unfeminine, emasculating, hyper-sexual, and has babies just to increase the size of her welfare check (Hancock, 2004; Jordan-Zachery, 2009). As such, she became an undeserving beneficiary of the welfare benefits provided under Aid to Families
with Dependent Children (AFDC). As Hancock (2004) notes, this image carried with it the greatest of consequences in the policy realm:

The impact of the ‘welfare queen’ public identity on the political culture is undeniable. What theorists call a narrative or controlling image of the ‘welfare queen’ has distinct political and policy ramifications. She is judged at all levels to be shirking her duty to carry her part of the load as a citizen. She usurps taxpayers’ money, produces children who will do the same, and emasculates the titular head of her household, the Black male… she avoids contributing her fair share to the national well-being, either as ‘a bearer of American values’ or as a contributor to the U.S. political economy. (p. 60)

In this way, the passage of Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) (1996) came, in part, as a response to this highly salient, and thus visible, public identity. Rather than placing the public identity of the Black woman in context and considering the structural and systemic factors impacting upon her condition and need, she became the antagonist of the modern welfare state. As Jordan-Zachery (2009) observes, initially President Clinton acknowledged the “lack of jobs and a livable wage” as the primary reason for Black women’s welfare use; however, Republicans in Congress “[thwarted] Clinton’s policy goals of providing assistance in return for personal responsibility; instead, they promoted the end of assistance to force responsibility, thereby eliminating the culture of poverty” (p. 95). In this way, the salient themes of the decades-old Moynihan report continued to haunt welfare reform under the Clinton administration and beyond.

Centering the problems of Black families on the absence of fathers and the dominance of Black women in the home (as matriarchs) rather than on the structural problems of the day helped fuel the ire of legislators who resented any notion of redistributive policy to such undeserving constituents: These socially constructed public identities thus provided policymakers with evidence of Black female deviance, and, as such, what initially was an inquiry into the causes and problems of poverty in the Black community, was ultimately used to dismantle the very public assistance—AFDC—in place to remedy their situation. According to
Jordan-Zachery (2009), the cultural image of the Black woman, whose promiscuity and propensity for child bearing was out of control, allowed for the political rhetoric and “morality frames” consisting of the need to reduce the size of families on welfare, despite statistical data revealing that the size of families receiving AFDC had decreased between 1969 and 2000.

As Jordan-Zachery (2009) writes, “in giving welfare a black face—it becomes possible to suggest that recipients are deviant—the creation of the ‘other’” (p. 88). Out of this deviance, the matriarch, the welfare queen, and the jezebel, comes the urban teen mother—the ultimate representation of “intergenerational welfare use…and the culture of poverty,” who “contributes to the breakdown of society” (Jordan-Zachery, 2009, p. 92). Rendering her even more problematic than her predecessors, she is a second-generation recipient of government services. Thus, from matriarch to teen mother, the socially constructed imagery of Black women is contoured by, fluctuates alongside, and informs the formulation and amendment of public law.

As Soss and Schram (2007) noted, these laws and their corresponding social constructions become highly visible to the masses but low in proximity as relatively few Americans possess direct experience with them. In turn, this impacts the ways in which Black women are covered (or not) by the media as well as the extent to which representatives of the state are responsive to their needs. Accordingly, these representations impact not just policymaking but also the believability of Black women as victims within the criminal justice system.

The Case of the Central Park Jogger

Crenshaw’s (1991) analysis of the Central Park rape case is instructive in highlighting the covert ways in which Black women’s stereotypes impact their status as victims of sexual violence. Whereas much of the work on stereotypes and public policy focuses on the role of these images in policy formulation and design (Schneider & Ingram, 1993, 1997) (such as with PRWORA) and on their impact on the implementation of welfare policy (Soss, Fording, &
Schram, 2011a), another area of concern is the extent to which these images impact upon the perceived believability of the voices of victims and witnesses of color within the criminal justice system. Often criminal justice institutions are heavily impacted, though in tacit ways, by what Fricker (2007) terms testimonial injustice, a phenomenon influenced by negative stereotypes that...[demotes] the speaker from informant to source of information, from subject to object. This reveals the intrinsic harm of testimonial injustice as epistemic objectification: when a hearer undermines a speaker in her capacity as a giver of knowledge, the speaker is epistemically objectified. (p. 133) (emphasis in original)

These themes of testimonial injustice and epistemic objectification are evident in Crenshaw’s analysis where she draws on the sexualized images of Black women to highlight the nuanced ways in which the spectacle surrounding the Central Park rape case occluded other cases occurring around the same time in which women of color were the victims, and how in some instances, the crimes were far more gruesome. As Crenshaw argues, the media coverage following the high-profile rape of the Central Park jogger in the 1990s failed to account for the 28 rape-related cases in which Black or Hispanic women were the victims. In one case, Crenshaw (1991) argues, “a woman was raped, sodomized, and thrown off the top of a four-story building in Brooklyn,” yet the media continued to focus on the plight of the Central Park jogger (p. 1268).

Drawing from her research on this particular case, Crenshaw (1991) notes that the social constructions of Black woman’s sexuality, the imagery of Black women as hyper-sexed and unable to control themselves, often unfairly calls into question their believability when they report incidents of rape: “If these sexual images form even part of the cultural imagery of Black women, then the very representation of a Black female body at least suggests certain narratives that may make Black women’s rape either less believable or less important” (p. 1271). Specifically, it is the imagery of the Black woman as sexually deviant and bad, which justifies
her undermining and epistemic objectification, whether she is a victim of a crime seeking redress through the criminal justice system or whether she is simply the recipient of public aid. In each case she becomes both the cause and the effect—the aggressor and the victim—of her own unfortunate circumstances. That these disparate circumstances—the particular lived experiences of Black women and other women of color—occur not only temporally as their bodies have been historically racialized and gendered, but also spatially as urban spaces have been both heavily segregated (due to structural racism in the housing markets) and highly policed, gives way to another body of literature addressing the impact of racialized policies on the social construction of urban spaces and the administration of criminal justice.

The Social Construction of Urban Spaces

The ways in which urban spaces have been historically and socially constructed through discrimination in private housing markets as well as through local government efforts to maintain racially segregated spaces combines with these representations in ways that further marginalize women of color (Bass, 2001; Crenshaw, 2012). As Bass (2001) argues, the objectification of Blacks via methods of social control—from slave patrols, to Jim Crow, to the War on Drugs—coupled with racial and, most essential, spatial segregation has allowed for “police policies and practices” that “perpetuate a relationship between the police and racial minorities that is substantially authoritarian and regulatory in nature” (p. 164). This regulatory relationship, scholars argue, has been the primary cause leading to the state’s mass-incarceration of Black men and women (as well as Latino/a men and women) (Alexander, 2011; Soss, Fording, & Schram, 2011a; Taylor 2016; Waquant, 2010).

Importantly, Crenshaw’s (2012) analysis underscores the ways in which private housing markets intersect with government practices of placing communities of color under heavy surveillance and together limit both the economic and social mobility of Black women as well as
their bodily movements across time and space. Those who reside in urban communities of color, Crenshaw argues, are subject to increased interaction with the criminal justice system and placed at the discretion of police officers who are likewise impacted by negative social imagery and stereotypes of Black women’s deviance. As such, interactions between law enforcement and women of color are likely to be characterized by epistemic objectification (Fricker, 2007), which occurs as Black women are treated not as knowing subjects or informants but rather as objects possessing information. Exemplary of this is objectification is the case of Shelly Hillard, whom Patrisse Khan-Cullors and Asha Bandele (2018) reference in relation to Kimberlé Crenshaw’s Say Her Name Campaign:

Shelly Hillard, a 19-year-old Black Transwoman from Detroit who is threatened with being thrown in a men’s jail for smoking marijuana unless she turns over her dealer. She does, but the cops reveal to the sellers who informed on them and Shelly is killed, cut into pieces and the pieces of her precious body, set afire. (p. 228)

Rather than being recognized as a political subject in her own right, Shelly became an object, a source of information, and a life ultimately deemed unworthy of existence as exemplified by the police officers’ outing of her identity to those who would do her harm. According to Crenshaw, interactions such as these stem from the over-policing of communities of color caused both by the War on Drugs as well as the transplanting of domestic violence prevention from the sphere of social justice advocacy to that of the criminal justice system. As domestic violence began to fall within the purview of the criminal justice system, intersecting with the War on Drugs in communities of color, she argues, women of color became subject both to an increased risk of arrest due to perceived violent behaviors (stemming from the vestiges of the overbearing and masculine-like matriarch public identity) for which even men of color are not arrested, and to exorbitant sentencing for mere association with their abusers, particularly those thought to be simultaneously guilty of other drug-related crimes. In this way, rather than being treated as
political subjects who can testify to their own abuse; they became, to law enforcement, objects—

bodies that require both policing, owing to their perceived aggressiveness, and cajoling, due to

the information they may possess about their intimate partners’ involvement in drug-related

activities.

Thus, Black women are not only impacted temporally from one policy to another, but also spatially, across heavily policed urban spaces, which become yet another site of their epistemic objectification (Bass, 2001; Crenshaw, 1991, 2012; Hancock, 2004; Jordan-Zachery, 2009). Structural barriers, such as those initially identified by President Clinton, leading to such impacts as dependence on public aid and increasingly high rates of incarceration constitute the hidden variable, which, remaining unseen, renders the Black woman herself as the site of perceived deviance: “The structural and discursive abandonment of women of color—the normalization of their socioeconomic marginality alongside renewed fantasies of gender normativity—are key elements sustaining the beliefs that ‘people with problems are problems’” (Crenshaw, 2012, p. 1472). It is this occlusion of the structural impediments impacting upon women of color as well as the occlusion of women of color themselves, as authentic political subjects, that is countered and resisted through contemporary antiracist praxis. Through this praxis, activists contest the widespread belief among dominant groups that Black lived experience in relation to the policies of the state is no different from that of dominant groups. In this way, where visuality asserts universality, contemporary antiracist activism is marked by its focus on particularity (Davis, 2016, pp. 86-87). That is, the understanding that race, gender, class, sexuality, and other factors shape the diverse experiences various groups have with specific policies of the state (Crenshaw, 1991). As both policy feedback scholars and Black feminist intellectuals assert, policies are informed by the social constructions of target groups, and, as such, certain stereotypes remain salient public identities that can be appropriated for
political gain (Schneider & Ingram, 1993, 1997; Collins, 2000). Therefore, within contemporary antiracist resistance, it is acknowledged that these stereotypes likewise prevent the recognition of the structural impediments to political, economic, and social equity experienced by communities of color (Harris-Perry, 2011). In this context, the activism of groups such as Black Lives Matter, which contests problems of structural racism, are exemplary of the kind of “enfleshed work” to which Sharpe (2016) refers—a way of foregrounding Black lived experience in the wake.

Black Lives Matter

The literature on the Black Lives Matter movement, and, more broadly, The Movement for Black Lives, which includes organizations such as Dream Defenders and The Black Youth Project, embodies many of the themes addressed thus far in this section on Black feminist scholarship, such as the importance of intersectionality in resistance movements, the epistemic objectification of Black women across time and space, the ways in which stereotypes of Black women are deployed in ways that cause continual misrecognition, and the overriding theme of what Davis (2016) calls “the tyranny of the universal” (p. 87). The tyranny of the universal denies the particular experiences of Black individuals, and, specifically, women of color.

As a movement that begun following the acquittal of George Zimmerman, which has sought to move “the hashtag from social media to the streets” (Garza, 2014), Black Lives Matter has gained considerable attention from news media and politicians alike. For the first time, a Black radical movement has placed Queer Black women at the forefront of antiracist community organizing and protest and done so to such an extent that Angela Davis, in her forward to When They Call You a Terrorist (Khan-Cullors & Bandele, 2018), commended the movement for the ways in which it “call[s] for an inclusiveness that does not sacrifice particularity” (p. xiv). As Garza (2014) has made clear from the beginning:

Black lives matter affirms the lives of Black queer and trans folks, disabled folks, Black-undocumented folks, folks with records, women and all Black lives along
the gender spectrum. It centers those that have been marginalized within Black liberation movements. It is a tactic to (re)build the Black liberation movement.

In addition to this affirmation of women of color at the intersections of various demographics, the movement has also demonstrated a focus on local communities, which mirrors the decentralized forms of new governance that have characterized the late 1990s and the first decades of the new millennium:

We have built a decentralized movement that encourages and supports local leaders to name and claim the work that is needed in order to make their communities more just….We have centered and amplified the voices of those not only made most vulnerable but most unheard, even as they are on the front lines at every hour and in every space: Black women—all Black women. (Khan-Cullors & Bandele, 2018, p. 249)

The power of the movement rests in its focus on the local (where Lowi (1998) pinpointed the existence of the internal Cold War) while remaining committed to national and international solidarity across the Black diaspora as diverse communities of color assert that “Black Lives Matter.” Furthermore, the various modalities of social control, the violence that extends from the War on Drugs, the poverty in Black communities—all of these are conceptualized as forms of state violence on Black bodies. In a passage of “Herstory of the #BlackLivesMatter Movement,” Garza (2014) clarifies not only the meaning of the phrase “Black Lives Matter,” but also the meaning of state violence:

When we say Black Lives Matter, we are talking about the ways in which Black people are deprived of our basic human rights and dignity. It is an acknowledgement Black poverty and genocide is state violence. It is an acknowledgment that 1 million Black people are locked in cages in this country—one half of all people in prisons or jails—is an act of state violence. It is an acknowledgment that Black women continue to bear the burden of a relentless assault on our children and our families and that assault is an act of state violence. Black queer and trans folks bearing a unique burden in a hetero-patriarchal society that disposes of us like garbage and simultaneously fetishizes us and profits off of us is state violence; the fact that 500,000 Black people in the US are undocumented immigrants and relegated to the shadows is state violence; the fact that Black girls are used as negotiating chips during times of conflict and war is state violence; Black folks living with disabilities and different abilities bear the burden of state-sponsored Darwinian experiments that attempt to squeeze us into
boxes of normality defined by White supremacy is state violence. And the fact is that the lives of Black people—not ALL people—exist within these conditions is consequence of state violence.

In many ways then, this violence extends from the racialized and gendered policy referred to previously and the specific ways in which Black lived experience faces structural, material, and psychological barriers to social and political equity. Notably, it is in contesting this violence through community organizing and antiracist protest that the organizers have been labeled terrorists by swaths of the public, presumably for violating “the rules of the game,” the widespread core beliefs about the nation that are taught in public schools, in the home, and in other institutional settings (Truman, 1962). These beliefs rest on the notion of an abstract political subject (Davis, 2005) and an experience between citizen and state that is universal and democratic across all racial, gender, class, and other demographics; thus, this belief in the universality of all human experience denies the particular ways in which policies have been and continue to be tacitly racialized and gendered (Davis, 2005; Heclo, 1994; Taylor, 2016). In this way, contesting the universal means exposing it as myth by foregrounding the particularity of lived experience. As Taylor (2016) notes, “when the Black movement goes into motion, it throws the entire mythology of the United States—freedom, democracy, and endless opportunity—into chaos” (p. 218). Out of this chaos comes the newly minted stereotype of the Black woman as terrorist.

This notion of the Black woman as terrorist emerges from the crisis of visuality in which the War on Drugs coincides with the War on Terror. However, the War on Terror was subsequently relabeled as a “global counterinsurgency” so as not to conflate acts of terror with insurgents themselves who may at times utilize terrorism in effort to accomplish some political end (Roper, 2008). Domestically, the War on Drugs and the terrorist label hurled at movement activists has never received such semantical consideration. Due to the racialization of the
criminal justice system, i.e. the conflation of Blackness and crime (Taylor, 2016), however, the War on Drugs has become known in activist circles as the War on Black Bodies—a war in which “[l]iterally breathing while Black became cause for arrest—or worse” (Khan-Cullors & Bandele, 2018). As Khan-Cullors and Bandele (2018) explain, a widely circulated petition that “gained traction during the first week of July 2016 after a week of protests against the back-to-back police killings of Alton Sterling in Baton Rouge and Philando Castile in Minneapolis,” brought the label of the Black woman as terrorist into the public imagination (p. 6). It was then exacerbated when former Army sniper Micah Johnson, who had no direct affiliation with the movement, opened fire at a Black Lives Matter protest, killing five police officers and wounding others. According to Khan Cullors and Bandelle (2018):

[The police] used a military-grade bomb against Micah Johnson and programmed a robot to deliver it to him. No jury, no trial. No patience like the patience shown the killers who gunned down nine worshippers in Charleston or the moviegoers in Aurora, Colorado. (p. 6)

Thus, the killing of Micah Johnson coincides with what Mirzoeff (2011) refers to as the revised military strategy under RMA and COIN where the visuality of the state thrives on being unseen (as in the state’s deployment of a robot rather than a visible person) and where the state of emergency and the state of exception play out in local communities (in keeping with Lowi’s (1998) idea of the internal Cold War). What follows in these spaces is not just representative of the War on Drugs and a desire to maintain social control (on the part of the state) or a contestation of state violence (on the part of antiracist activists), but also a battle over meanings and thus lives. Indeed, the meanings of democracy and terrorism are contested as activists via countervisuality assert the right to exist in the context of a necropolitics where state sovereignty wields the power to decide who is worthy of life. Khan-Cullors, for example, reflects on these meanings as she wonders how she might respond if someone were to call her child a terrorist just as she has been labeled:
I will hold my child…close to me and I will explain that terrorism is being stalked and surveilled simply because you are alive. And terrorism is being put in solitary confinement and starved and beaten. And terrorism is not being able to feed your children despite working three jobs. And terrorism is not having a decent school or a place to play. I will tell them that what freedom looks like, what democracy looks like, is the push for and realization of justice, dignity, and peace. (Khan-Cullors & Bandele, 2018, p. 253)

In many ways, the above quote parallels the passage by Spillers (2003) cited earlier, particularly where she notes that “Blackness is vestibular to culture,” that Blackness neither has its own legitimated culture nor its own unique lived experience in relation to the policies of the state. Importantly, where the Black woman in Spillers’ account is the gateway, the marker, between slave and human, Khan-Cullors renders herself as the marker between terrorism and democracy, asserting that her existence and that of her offspring remain on the side of democracy, thereby turning the tables on the state and reclaiming the definition of terrorism.

Black Feminist Scholarship Summary

As this section has shown, life in the wake, in the afterlife of slavery (Sharpe, 2016), is complicated by issues of proximity and visibility (Soss & Schram, 2007) and by the push of market and state actors toward universalism at the expense of particularity (Davis, 2016). Conducting wake work (Sharpe, 2016) and dark sousveillance (Browne, 2015), then, requires a willingness to contest the salient, highly visible images and definitions of Black being put forth by elite actors. It requires an acknowledgement of the crooked room (Harris-Perry, 2011), exemplified by the hard work of tracing policy outcomes back to the political actors (Pierson, 1993), the stereotypes, and the policy decision-making that aided in the initial construction of that room. Black feminist scholarship, as wake work, as enfleshed work, as dark sousveillance, entails a battle of the particular, proximal, intersectional experiences of Black women in all their diversity against Davis’ (2016) notion of the “tyranny of the universal,” which serves only to reinforce the many structural barriers to social, economic, and political equity for Black women.
and all Black people. The antiracist and feminist praxis involved in exposing myth is ontological, as Black women fight to exist at the intersections of the War on Drugs and COIN. It is epistemic as Black women fight to be heard and believed as political subjects in a world that seems inherently antithetical to their own uprightness. And, it is semantic, as Black women contest the very meanings of democracy and terrorism in the context of state violence rationalized by visuality’s authority. The next and final section addresses some of the philosophical implications of these themes and presents a theoretical framework that synthesizes the literature conjoining public policy with visual culture and antiracist activism.

Critical Philosophies of Resistance

This section draws on themes from critical social theory in effort to uncover some of the philosophical underpinnings of the concepts that have arisen so far in the previous literature review sections. It seeks a synthesis between the notion of countervisuality as a claim to the right to exist against the necropolitics of the state (Mirzoeff, 2011), the ideas of proximity and visibility in public policy (Soss & Schram, 2007), the notion of the spectacle (Debord, 1983; Edelman, 1988), the hidden variable in visual culture (Azoulay, 2008), and the issues of particularity and intersectionality in Black feminist resistance (Crenshaw, 1991, 2012; Davis, 2005, 2016). In particular, the themes that arose in the last section—the ontological, epistemic, and semantic work involved in Black feminist resistance—reemerge in the philosophical literature of members of the Frankfurt School, the existentialism of Sartre, and Afro-pessimist theories of Black existence in contemporary society. As both Debord (1983) and Edelman (1988) noted, critical philosophy is integral to demystifying the spectacle and presenting alternative possibilities for the future. Through demystification, the hidden variables surrounding images are revealed, as citizens in action (i.e. the citizenry of photography) contest the state in action (i.e. public policy). This is because it involves questioning taken for granted assumptions; those that
make socially constructed phenomena, such as the institutions of both state and market, appear as a-historic and naturally given (Debord, 1983; Edelman, 1988). This seemingly natural “given-ness” is also that which denies the particularity of lived experience and thus the existence of Harris-Perry’s (2011) notion of the crooked room. As such, the spectacle is akin to Davis’ (2016) concept of the “tyranny of the universal,” asserting its positivistic impulses by constraining the analytical lens through which it might be viewed and rationalizing its own existence (Edelman, 1988). As Edelman claimed, the spectacle both causes and justifies the conditions of the disadvantaged while denying its perpetuation of the structural barriers to political and social equity that create those conditions.

Just as Edelman (1988) rejected the use of rational choice theory as an analytical approach to scholarly inquiries into the political spectacle, the Frankfurt School remained highly critical of the logical positivist approach to scientific inquiry for similar reasons—that positivism tends to support the conflation of appearance with reality and in so doing it justifies its own existence. As such, this section begins by providing a brief overview of some of the Frankfurt School and other critical theorists’ primary critiques of positivism and its deleterious impact on the classical liberal doctrine of progress and Enlightenment rationality. It then proceeds to relate these critiques to philosophies of race neutrality and race consciousness advanced by critical race theorists, with a focus on the ways in which race neutrality counterintuitively threatens rather than enhances democracy. Here, Adorno’s (1973/2007) negative dialectics are instructive as they explain on a philosophical level how this could be possible—i.e. how the doctrine of “all men are created equal” could possibly produce racial injustice and genocide rather than democracy. Again, in Adorno’s work, one can see how Davis’ (2016) idea of “the tyranny of the universal” seems to emerge as a means of destroying the heterogeneity associated with proximal, lived
experience. As such, this section on critical philosophies of resistance presents an overview of Adorno’s (1973/2007) concept of the cognition of nonidentity, which is, in turn, synthesized with some of the existential philosophies and theories of Afro-pessimism that contextualize such tyranny as a form of bad faith (Gordon, 1995; Sartre, 1956). Taken together, the philosophical issues highlighted in this section provide added depth and clarification to the principals underlying Black feminist resistance and countervisuality, particularly with respect to Sharpe’s (2016) call for more “enfleshed work” even and despite “…the tension between being and instrumentality that is Black being in the wake.” This section closes with the presentation of a theoretical model that extends from this and previous literature and that helps to contextualizes this research study’s focus on particularity at the expense of universalism. A final summary reiterates the connections between the concepts displayed in the model before moving onto the research methodology outlined in Chapter Three.

Philosophical Critiques of Positivism

Over the years, various forms of critical philosophy have endeavored to highlight the contrasts between appearance and reality as they emerge in the literature on the spectacle. Such work, involves, for example, overcoming the man-made dualisms of theory and practice, thought and action, and subject and object. Members of the Frankfurt School were particularly concerned about the implications of such dualisms, which they believed posed a threat to society by focusing the attention of scientists and government elites on only those social problems that can be addressed through technological-rational means, thereby excluding from their analyses many of the interpretive, contextual (i.e. hidden) variables, which are not necessarily amenable to such positivist-oriented approaches. As Edelman (1988) argued, despite many of the theoretically fruitful benefits of rational choice theory in public policy scholarship, the tendency for this broad
meta-theoretical lens to rationalize the spectacle, i.e. the visuality of the state and market, and thereby to constrain the analytical lens through which visuality is viewed, render it ill-equipped as a theoretical framework for research studies aimed at demystification.

In this vein, members of the Frankfurt school among other scholars who work with critical social theory have historically been critical of what they argue is the instrumentality associated with logical positivism. Positivist approaches to the philosophy of science, particularly as they emerged from the Vienna School, as both Max Horkheimer and Herbert Marcuse have argued, dictated not only a stringent method for solving scientific problems, but in so doing, constrained the kinds of social problems that could be addressed (Horkheimer, 2002). In one of his most famous essays entitled “Traditional and Critical Theory,” Horkheimer (2002) took issue with the lack of reflexivity among positivist scientists who took seriously the dualisms associated broadly with the Enlightenment doctrine of progress (i.e. between theory and practice as well as between subject and object) without attending to the tautological nature of the positivist lens:

In keeping with their own way of thinking, they can put into practice only what the closed causal system of reality determines them to do, or they count only as individual units in a statistic for which the individual unit really has no significance. As rational beings they are helpless and isolated. (p. 231)

In this context, the Frankfurt school viewed scientists’ desire to predict, explain, and control, as being in concert with the dehumanizing effects of capitalism, the commodification of culture, and the tyranny of bureaucracies dominated by technical rationality. All these effects, it was argued, extended from this “closed causal system of reality” espoused by philosophical positivism. As Marcuse (1964) contended, the conflation of appearance and reality, coupled with the concomitant dualism of subject and object, led to one-dimensional thinking (and visualizing) that presupposes untruth as fact, and mere appearance as a factual representation of reality:
“Appearance and reality, untruth and truth, (and as we shall see, unfreedom and freedom) are all ontological conditions” (Marcuse, 1964, p. 125).

Societal problems, then, from the perspective of many of the Frankfort School theorists, stem from a basic misunderstanding and misappropriation of the nature of reality as though what appears before the eyes is a-historically and naturally given rather than socially and historically produced. In some ways, these themes invoke those associated with the visibility-proximity framework proposed by Soss and Schram (2007), particularly the assertion that average citizens rely on the salience and visibility of policy issues in political discourse (i.e. social constructions as the appearance of things) in lieu of their lack of proximity to the direct effects of specific program components. Likewise, within the RCM (Soss, Fording, & Schram, 2011a), the salient stereotypes, which conflate appearance with reality, account for the manner in which racial disparities in welfare sanctions and carceral punishments (the two “arms” of state social control) manifest in local governance. From a critical interpretivist standpoint, existing in the wake, in the tensions between instrumentality and being (Sharpe, 2016) is akin to DuBois’ (1903/1994) concept of double consciousness and Sarat’s (1990) legal consciousness: the “sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity….An American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings…” (DuBois, 1903/1994, p. 2). Where positivism tends toward universalism, the American striving is recognized, and “the other,” in all its particularity and heterogeneity, is denied. As such, internalized within Black lived experience are the dissonant lenses of the visuality of the state in the form of, for example, the felt, interpretive impacts of policy coupled with the countervisuality and knowledge that can only come from one’s proximity to life in the wake. Just as Crenshaw (1991, 2012) advocated for an intersectional lens
in policymaking and activist circles as a means of acknowledging racial difference, so too do other critical theorists advocate a race conscious rather than race neutral approach to public lawmaking and state-societal relations.

Race Neutrality Versus Race Consciousness

Many critical theorists argue that although the civil rights movement addressed *de jure* racism it did not eradicate *de facto* racism, which continues in part via salient and highly visible social constructions and classifications of racial minorities (e.g., the mammy, the matriarch, the Black lady, the hoochie, etc.) reviewed in the previous section. Despite the prevalence of those images in society, contemporary legal scholarship primarily acknowledges an abstract, rather than racialized, a-historical subject, which means that neither the existence of those stereotypes nor their impacts (e.g., life in the crooked room) figure into contemporary legal jurisprudence.

As Davis (2005) argues:

> The grand achievement of civil rights was to purge the law of its references to specific kinds of bodies, thus enabling racial equality before the law. But at the same time this process enabled racial inequality in the sense that the law was deprived of its capacity to acknowledge people as being racialized, as coming from racialized communities. Because the person that stands before the law is an abstract, rights-bearing subject, the law is unable to apprehend the unjust social realities in which people live. (p. 89)

Thus, the abstraction of the subject under colorblind law focuses attention away from racism and onto the supposed neutrality of a merit-based system, precluding any acknowledgement of the material and ideological forms of racism that operate less visibly than racial segregation under Jim Crow (Crenshaw, 1995; Davis, 2005, 2016). It also opens the door to the “tyranny of the universal,” wherein “universal categories have been clandestinely racialized” (Davis, 2016, p. 87). As such, under the colorblind doctrine, these universal categories are presupposed as fact, and Black Americans remain racially subordinate but symbolically free, deprived of many
avenues for recourse that would necessitate the acknowledgement of institutionalized, systemic, and ideological forms of racial subjugation (Crenshaw, 1995).

In this regard, the myth of race neutrality and the notion of the abstract subject that pervade contemporary racial discourse and civil rights law parallels what Horkheimer felt was the collapse of the classical liberal doctrine of reason. That is, the liberal colorblind doctrine is associated with the supposedly neutral and highly salient American cultural values of reason and scientific progress to such an extent that any acknowledgement of race and difference in lawmaking, administrative rules, and in the courts, is rendered equally as dissonant to the ideal of reason as pre-Enlightenment myth was to scientific inquiry. Put simply, scientific progress precludes any discussion of the crooked room (Harris-Perry, 2011) and refocuses the state’s attention onto the abstract subject deemed incapable of standing upright. As Peller (1995) argues:

The meaning of race has been grafted onto other central cultural images of progress, so that the transition from segregation to integration and from race-consciousness to race neutrality mirrors movements from myth to enlightenment, from ignorance to knowledge, from superstition to reason, from the primitive to the civilized, from religion to secularism, and, most important, the historical self-understanding of liberal society as representing the movement from status to individual liberty. (p. 131)

In this view, the principles underlying the transition from a race-conscious society to a race-neutral one are also those used to justify the positivist appropriation of Enlightenment values. As Marcuse (1964) argued, this contorted version of secularism and progress engulfed society in ways that reason itself could not transcend: “The web of domination has become the web of Reason itself, and this society is fatally entangled in it. And the transcending modes of thought seem to transcend Reason itself” (p. 169). And, as critical race scholars argue, by equating race-consciousness with the myths that dominated premodernity, and race-neutrality with the liberal doctrine of a progressive and enlightened society, the former is de facto banished from American
legal discourse without regard for the ways in which the identification of race can lead to socially just outcomes, as revealed, for example, by Crenshaw’s (1991, 2012) work on intersectionality.

The idea that state actors and other public intellectuals may possess the seemingly noble vision of societal progress toward reason, justice, and individual liberty, along with a concomitant desire to move away from the dogma of past ages, and yet, despite those intentions, manifest a repressive, authoritarian society where myth begins to supplant reality, constitutes the primary paradox at the heart of Adorno’s (1973/2007) negative dialectics. And, as critical race theorists argue, just as state and societal actors’ focus on Enlightenment values brought about regress rather than progress, so too did the focus of legal jurisprudence on the abstract subject (without regard for race or history) bring about a society wrought with racial disparities and inequities. Thus, from the philosophy of the Frankfurt School and from critical race scholars, a major concern emerges as to how the classical liberal doctrine of progress vis à vis the technical rationality of the state renders invisible (like Azoulay’s (2008) hidden variable in photography) the proximal suffering of racial minorities in favor of the universality of the abstract subject. The next section aims to clarify how this happens and why racial progress via colorblindness may produce its antithesis by viewing these mysteries through the lens of Adorno’s (1973/2007) negative dialectics.

Adorno’s Negative Dialectics

The primacy that critical race scholars afford to issues of race-consciousness and race neutrality’s “grafting” onto classical liberal notions of progress is best understood in relation to the principles of negative dialectics and non-identity espoused by Frankfurt School theorist Theodore Adorno. In Negative Dialects, Adorno (1973/2007) aimed to make sense of how, in philosophy as in the world of lived experience, individuals and societies can possess aim A and
yet produce outcome $B$, particularly in instances where $B$ is the antithesis of $A$. He believed that the idealist philosophies of Kant and Hegel failed to account for such contradictions and that the philosophical modernism of Bergson and Husserl did nothing to reconcile them. Along these lines, Adorno focused wholly on the philosophical problems associated with object definition, that is, how objects and their concepts are defined in science and philosophy and elsewhere, for example, in the realm of state and market. Such an inquiry produces questions such as: How does one define $A$? and How might one define $B$? Following Adorno, there are two facets of $A$ and $B$: (1) the object or thing that is $A$ or $B$, and (2) the correlating concept or idea that seeks to represent $A$ or $B$. Where most scientific thought dictates that the concept should match its object to the greatest degree possible, Adorno argued that such precision was futile: “Philosophical contents can only be grasped where philosophy does not impose them. The illusion that it might confine the essence in its finite definitions will have to be given up” (p. 13). That is, to Adorno, the philosophical culprit that causes one thing to produce its antithesis was the positivist endeavor to confine an object’s essence, the object itself, so closely and narrowly to its concept without regard for the potential or latent heterogeneity of the object under consideration. Doing so, Adorno contended, carried with it the unintended consequence of misdefinition, which would then explain why aim $A$ could produce its antithesis, outcome $B$. To further unravel the mystery of such dialectics, Adorno’s (1973/2007) distinguishes between the cognition of nonidentity, which he refers to as the interrogation of an object in relation to its concept in such a way that allows its inherent heterogeneity to emerge, and what he refers to as the identitarian thinking associated with traditional methods of object definition within positivist philosophy:

Dialectically, cognition of nonidentity lies also in the fact that this very cognition identifies— that it identifies to a greater extent, and in other ways, than identitarian thinking. This cognition seeks to say what something is, while identitarian thinking says what something comes under, what it exemplifies or represents, and what, accordingly, it
The more relentlessly our identitarian thinking besets its object, the farther will it take us from the identity of the object. (p. 149). (emphasis added)

Therefore, to Adorno, the cognition of nonidentity, the philosophical refusal to pigeon-hole an object into a strict conceptual definition, comes closer to identifying an object than does traditional identitarian thinking. Furthermore, as noted in the above passage, the cognition of nonidentity takes a lateral approach to relating a concept with its object, whereas identitarian thinking comprises a hierarchal system of classification where the concept comes over the object itself. As such, the dialectical thinking that Adorno advocates seeks not to subsume or overpower a thing without regard for its uniqueness and particularity, but rather to relinquish the control of hierarchal classification associated with identitarian thinking by finding relationship with the object in and despite all its heterogeneity. This is Adorno’s philosophical remedy for the problem of misdefinition inherent in philosophical dialectics, which, counterintuitively, causes one thing (i.e. reason and progress) to bring about its antithesis (i.e. irrationality and regress).

The misdefinition of an object, then, to the Frankfurt School, parallels what Harris-Perry (2011) and other contemporary race theorists have described as problems of misrecognition, where the concept, image, or stereotype (i.e. appearance) does not match reality. Here, critical race theorists such as Peller and Crenshaw coalesce with Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse, and others, in explaining (1) why the liberal doctrine of progress and individual freedom could produce the very social and political regression it sought to avert, and (2) how race neutrality and the misrecognition of racial subjects became erroneously tied into notions of liberal progress. Specifically, the hierarchal system of classification associated with identitarian thinking, in the context of race consciousness and race neutrality, augurs Peller’s (1995) analysis of the ways in which integration strategies during the civil rights era were perceived by some activists as a threat to Black life rather than a promise of freedom:
The vision of integration as a form of ‘painless genocide,’ then, stemmed from an analysis of integration as meaning not the liberation of the black community from racial domination but, instead, the transcendence of the black community itself in favor of racial ‘neutral’ social practices; these could only be identified as historically situated and culturally particular from the outside, by those for whom their supposed universality is experienced as a particular form of Otherness. (p. 140)

Thus, as Peller argues, the race-neutrality of American civil rights legislation threatened, in keeping with Adorno’s negative dialectics, to subsume the Black community under the universality of the neutrality concept (i.e. “we are all the same”) while disregarding, rather than seeking relation with, its heterogeneity.

Peller’s description of the way in which Black nationalists regarded the race-neutral integrationist doctrine as a “painless genocide” is likewise similar to earlier sentiments expressed by Adorno in both Negative Dialectics (1973/2007) and in Minima Moralia (1974/2005) where Adorno regards the race-neutral idea “that all men are alike,” as a utopian one that stigmatizes difference, profoundly noting that similar sentiments taken to their extreme accompanied the universalizing and destructive tendencies of World War II era concentration camps: “The technique of the concentration camp is to make the prisoners like their guards, the murdered, the murderers. The racial difference is raised to an absolute so that it can be abolished absolutely, if only in the sense that nothing that is different survives” (p. 103). Therefore, to Adorno, the seemingly innocuous platitude that “all men are alike,” when taken to the extreme, becomes an attack against heterogeneity and a rationale for ethnic and racial genocide. In applying his dialectical philosophy to Black civil rights, Adorno (1974/2005) argued that the doctrine of equality (“aim A”) espoused by the state and the market in the tradition of identitarian thinking, rendered the antithesis of racial progress (“outcome B”):

To assure the black that he is exactly like the white man, while he is obviously not, is secretly to wrong him still further. He is benevolently humiliated by the application of a standard by which, under the pressure of the system, he must
necessarily be found wanting, and to satisfy which would in any case be a doubtful achievement…. The melting-pot was introduced by unbridled industrial capitalism. The thought of being cast into it conjures up martyrdom, not democracy. (p. 103)

The standard to which Adorno refers is, in the identitarian tradition, devoid of context and antithetical to heterogeneity. It is, in essence, engaging again Harris-Perry’s (2011) metaphor, a positivist standard that chooses to ignore the structural and contextual variables associated with the crooked room and rather focuses in on the individual seemingly incapable of standing upright—for that individual embodies racial difference and in so doing defies identitarian thinking. Of critical importance in the above passage is the role of racial difference and heterogeneity in Adorno’s juxtaposition of martyrdom and democracy. In tying martyrdom to the universalizing and controlling tendencies of positivist, identitarian thinking, and in tying democracy to those tendencies associated with the cognition of nonidentity, Adorno frames the problem of misdefinition (i.e. misrecognition) vis à vis equality as the antithesis of democracy and racial progress. Notably, this act of redefining traditional concepts as framed by the state through negative dialectics is similar in nature to Khan-Cullors’ reworking of the definitions of democracy and terrorism as highlighted in the last section (Khan-Cullors & Bandele, 2018). In addition to the theoretical and political implications of the problems associated with misdefinition that underpin both Adorno’s negative dialectics and critical race theory scholarship, they also bring to the fore the notions of ontology and consciousness upon which Afro-pessimism grounds its critiques of racial bad faith.
Existentialism and Afro-Pessimism

The problems of misrecognition to which Harris-Perry (2011) refers (similar to those of misdefinition taken up by Adorno) have also been taken up by scholars of Afro-pessimism, who often place racial solidarity movements, such as the American Black Power movement and Steve Biko’s (1978) South African Black Consciousness movement, in the context of Sartre’s (1956) philosophical treatise on good and bad faith. Charting a path from Hegel’s (1977) dialectics to Sartre’s (1956) philosophy of consciousness, scholars of Afro-pessimism begin by taking issue with the philosophical implications of consciousness in Hegel’s notorious slave-master dialectic.

Scholars argue that, in this often-cited passage of Phenomenology, Hegel ultimately conceives of consciousness, for both master (“Lord”) and slave (“Bondsman”), as being predicated on the slave’s complicity and docility. In other words, in Hegel’s view, in ultimately resolving (through the slave’s acquiescence) the tension that exists between master and slave, and that which, in his view, leads them both to true consciousness, it is best for the slave not to engage with his master in a fight to the death for freedom (for Hegel, death is the negation of consciousness) (Hegel 1977; More, 2015). Rather, it is enough, in Hegel’s view, that their exchange has led each to find true consciousness (i.e. Geist) through their fateful interaction. The master, through recognition of the slave, realizes that he is no master at all without the existence of the slave. In turn, the slave realizes that in and through his service, as master over the land upon which he labors, he gains his freedom and independence despite his condition of servitude:

The truth of the independent consciousness is accordingly the servile consciousness of the bondsman. This, it is true, appears at first outside of itself and not as the truth of self consciousness. But just as the lordship showed that its essential nature is the reverse of what it wants to be, so too servitude in its

---

12 The term “misrecognition” is used henceforward as Afro-pessimism is concerned with the consciousness of human subjects whereas Adorno’s negative dialectics focused primarily on objects and related problems of definition.
consummation will really turn into the opposite of what it immediately is; as a consciousness forced back into itself, it will withdraw into itself and be transformed into a truly independent consciousness. (Hegel, 1977, p. 117)

Yet, as Gordon (1995, 1997a, 1997b) argues, recognition, and thus consciousness, in Hegel’s account, remains hierarchical and constitutes a system of classification based on power relations. The master powers over the slave and the slave powers over nature (i.e. the ground upon which he toils). Through their mutual recognition, i.e. their coming together, each man finds his true consciousness of self and what follows is the dissolution of difference (Hegel, 1977; Gordon, 1995). However, to Gordon (1995), this dissolution takes on the form of antiblackness:

The Hegelian interpretation… suggests a few limitations. It suggests the possibility of a special form of mediation. Eventually, lords and servants will disappear in a condition of pure, egalitarian freedom commensurate with the Truth of Absolute Self-Knowledge—in this case, as it turns out, Western culture, although Hegel simply says Self-Recognition or Geist. From the standpoint of an antiblack world this simply means that blackness will disappear under the cultural situation of universal whiteness. (p. 111)

Consciousness and being, to Hegel, therefore, are based on a system of recognition, one that Adorno later argued is both hierarchical and antithetical to heterogeneity, progress, and democracy. Any such attempts to dissolve heterogeneity, no matter their seeming inocuity, constitutes what is, to Sartre (1956) and Gordon (1995), an act of bad faith.

Sartre and Good and Bad Faith

Gordon’s (1995) scholarship provides a tentative definition of bad faith “as the effort to hide from responsibility for ourselves as freedom” (p. 8). Sartre (1956) recognized two forms of consciousness—that of being-in-itself and that of being-for-self. Being-in-itself is a form of pre-reflective consciousness; it exists in the world but is incapable of the metacognition necessary to reflect on itself. Being-for-self, in contrast, is reflective, though on its own, it is merely a hypostatization without real substance. As being-for-self reflects upon itself, it realizes the
emptiness and banality of its existence as well as its inability to fully comprehend its pre-reflective state of being-in-itself. According to Sartre (1956), this emptiness of existence ushers in a state of anguish and in that state the individual is either able to confront the anguish and push forward to live intentionally a life of meaning, or the individual flees in fear from his or her own existence. The former is good faith and the latter is bad faith. Thus, good faith occurs when one takes responsibility for one’s existence in the world—when one recognizes one’s own subjectivity and humanity as well as that of others. Bad faith occurs when one flees one’s own consciousness, one’s being in the world, and the state of anguish in which one finds oneself. Bad faith is the rejection of one’s own subjectivity and humanity as well as that of others. As the rejection of self, it entails a form of masochism in which one makes oneself an object for another’s consumption. Through masochism, the subject is rendered “an ossified substance—limp, passive flesh straddled under the look of him who stands as the source of responsibility” (Gordon, 1997a, p. 72). As the rejection of the other, it is a form of sadism in which one supplants another’s consciousness with one’s own. The path of the sadist “leads to solipsism, the position in which one literally becomes the world, which in principle cannot raise the question of perspectivity” (Gordon, 1997a, pp. 71-72). Thus, the ways in which antiblackness engages in bad faith are twofold: (1) when an individual or a collective attempts to dissolve the heterogeneity of Black others by supplanting their consciousness with that of the racial majority (i.e. presuming their lived experience is the universal experience), and (2) when an individual or collectivity rejects the authenticity of their own being and consciousness, runs from the banality of their own existence, and opts instead to make themselves an object, devoid of consciousness, for the racial majority. At minimum, masochistic bad faith is a denial of one’s racial self. At worst, it becomes a form of internalized self-hatred.
This second type of antiblackness stems from Sartre’s (1956) assertion that “bad faith flees being by taking refuge in ‘not-being-what-one-believes’” (p. 115). It constitutes a denial of what one knows or believes to be true as well as an implicit or explicit choice not to acknowledge that truth as such. To live in good faith, in turn, involves addressing the reality of living with the ambiguity of an uncertain world. As Gordon (1997a) notes, “no human being is a subject alone, nor an object alone. It is even incorrect to say that a human being is both” (p. 72). Drawing from the philosophies of Simone de Beauvoir and Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Gordon argues instead that the natural self is an ambiguous self. In facing that ambiguity directly while refusing to usurp the heterogeneity of diverse others, one finds freedom in living a life of good faith. Likewise, in acknowledging the ambiguous self as part of a diverse and heterogeneous racial collective, one finds freedom in honoring that difference and in refusing the lure of masochism as a solution for (or a running away from) one’s racial difference. As Adorno argued in *Negative Dialectics* and elsewhere, and as Sartre and other Afro-Pessimist scholars have argued, it is the philosophical reliance on universalism, on identitarian thinking, and, ultimately, the dissolution of difference in the name of equality, that causes the conditions of racial misrecognition, and, hence, bad faith. That is, it is universalism in all its seeming inocuity that so threatens democracy, reason, and racial progress.

Presentation of Critical Theoretical Matrix

By synthesizing the work of Adorno and Sartre, a model is developed for attending to issues of race, gender, class and other differences in critical qualitative inquiry (See Figure 8). Although members of the Frankfurt School often disagreed with one another (with regards to their critical philosophies) and with other philosophical schools of thought regarding philosophical definitions of freedom and consciousness, each of the concepts reviewed in this section in many ways remain consonant with one another despite broader disagreements across
and within various schools of thought. This is consistent with Jameson (1971) who noted that Sartre’s interest in both Marxist and existentialist philosophy exemplified a distinctly European tradition in which one’s position on Marxism did not preclude one from membership in other philosophical schools: “Marxism…for whatever reason does not seem to exclude the adherence to some other kind of philosophy; that one can be both a Marxist and an existentialist, phenomenologist, Hegelian, realist, empiricist, or whatever” (p. 207). To Jameson (1971), rather, “Marxism is a way of understanding the objective dimension of history from the outside; existentialism a way of understanding subjective, individual experience” (p. 208). Following this line of thinking, it remains sensible to bring together the structural critiques of the Frankfurt School (critiques of positivism, negative dialectics, etc.) with the existentialist perspective of Sartre (1956) on consciousness and being, if only to provide a framework through which to link public policy, visual culture, and racial activism with the philosophical concepts discussed in this section.

Sartre’s bad faith, the idea of fleeing the truth as well as the objectification of the particularity of self and other is consonant with Adorno’s (1973/2007) identitarian thinking in which the particular is rejected in favor of the abstract – the identity of an object is made positively but is conceptually inaccurate. Conversely, Sartre’s good faith is consonant with that of Adorno’s nonidentity – both are forms of acceptance of particularity in self and other and in the objects to which one relates in the empirical world. Figure 8 presents the matrix that develops when these concepts are synthesized. This framework facilitates a critical analysis of race and class in public administration and public policy.
Figure 8: Critical theoretical matrix based on Sartre’s (1956) good and bad faith, Adorno’s negative dialectics (1973/2007), and informed by Debord’s (1983) and Edelman’s (1988) theorizing on the spectacle.

Importantly, the central issues Marcuse (1964) argued contributed to the one-dimensional society, i.e. the conflation of appearance and reality and the severance of subject and object, form the axes of this matrix. The upper boxes represent the subjective dimension, the experience of being in the world and encountering self and others. The lower boxes represent the ways in which individuals relate to that which seems external to the self—to objects and their concepts—i.e. materiality. The right boxes are truth, the real. The left boxes represent the false consciousness that occurs when individuals live by objectifying subjects and abstracting objects (as in Marx’s theory of use value and exchange value). The reflexivity promoted by critical theory involves distinguishing between appearances and truth and recognizing the
interdependence between subject and object. Doing so encourages individuals to think of “what changes would result if they were to apply the standards of rationality they tacitly accept in a consistent and thorough-going way to the whole body of their beliefs” (Geuss, 1981, p. 63). These ideas, as this and previous literature review sections have shown, are of critical importance for understanding the ways in which public policies, specifically through the social and racial construction of “the other,” impact individuals in material and interpretive ways (Pierson, 1993) and in turn shape subsequent political formations and group activism, as is consistent with policy feedback theory’s main premises.

Critical Philosophies of Resistance Summary

Contestation, in the context of antiblack racism involves resisting the universalization of self and others. It is recognition of “the other” through lateral rather than hierarchal social relations. It is the hard work of providing context in a world that denies its value: speaking about race, uncovering the hidden variables, and countering the visuality of the spectacle. It is also confronting the truth of one’s ambiguous nature (as well as that of others) as both subject and object and reaping the personal freedom that, following Sartre (1956) and Gordon (1995), comes with that understanding. It means grasping the nature of state-citizen interactions on consciousness and freedom as well as on the structures and institutions of society, particularly in the context of social protest, where Butler (2015) notes

[t]he bodies on the street redeploy the space of appearance in order to contest and negate the existing forms of political legitimacy—and just as they sometimes fill or take over public space, the material history of those structures also works on them, becoming a part of their very action, remaking history in the midst of its most concrete and sedimented artifices” (p. 85)

Countervisuality, as evidenced by the literature reviewed in this section, asserts the rights not of abstract, universalized subjects, but of the racialized, gendered, and classed bodies whose lived experiences are impacted upon by both time and space; those who remain in the wake, in the
crooked room, and in the hold (Harris-Perry, 2011; Sharpe, 2016). Thus, in the context of critical social theory and antiblackness, policymaking that centers on the a-historical universal subject, on race neutrality, and which denies intersectionality, acts upon society as a form of bad faith, counterintuitively producing the antithesis of racial progress and reason by perpetuating cycles of injustice and state violence through misrecognition. These concepts as well as those extending from the previous literature review sections on policy feedback, the spectacle, visual culture, and Black feminist scholarship, provide a broad theoretical framework that informs the critical interpretive approach taken to this interdisciplinary inquiry into the relationship between public policy and visual culture with respect to antiracist countervisuality of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research study is to explore the ways in which the photographs of Ieshia Evans, Bree Newsome, and Nona Faustine function as a form of policy feedback, aid in citizen meaning-making processes about the self and the social world, and shape political discourse and policy preferences among mass publics. This is accomplished by reverse searching the images and collecting digital media from the search results for inductive coding. The selection of research methods is broadly informed by the literature review in the areas of policy feedback theory, the spectacle, visual culture studies, Black feminist theory, and critical philosophies of resistance. As these chapters have revealed, contextual and historical variables are of critical importance for visual culture studies, particularly those aimed at contesting the spectacular images produced by state and market. This means that, with regards to this research inquiry, there must be a prioritization of particularity and context over the tendency toward universalism. In this regard, Sandywell’s (2011) seven theses for critical visual studies reinforce the important focus that visual culture studies must place on issues of contextual, historical, social, and political significance regarding the images of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine. These theses guide this research inquiry and help to address the research questions. The remainder of this chapter provides a restatement of the research questions, a plan of inquiry, including a detailed description of the methods and procedures utilized in the sampling and analysis processes, an explanation of the importance of researcher trustworthiness, and an overview of the study limitations and delimitations.

Sandywell’s Theses

The following framework lends a basic, overarching structure to research studies grappling with the cultural relevance and significance of contemporary visual images. In
conjunction with the concepts that arose in Chapter Two, the following theses are helpful for providing what Charmaz (2014) refers to as sensitizing concepts. Such concepts are derived from the literature or previous experience and orient a constructivist grounded theory researcher to the empirical data. They are most frequently used in the beginning of the research process to guide the researcher’s attention toward potential emerging themes in the inductive coding process.

Sandywell’s (2011) seven theses for a “radical transdisciplinary” critical study of visual culture include themes of historicity, artefactuality, language, technology, sociocultural, political, and reflexive dimensions of visual culture. He outlines them as follows:

(1) The historicity thesis holds that history (or ‘historocity’) enters into the fabric of visual phenomenon to shape diverse frameworks of visual experience and, correlative, that models of visuality generate different configurations of virtual existence and cultural experience.

(2) The artifactuality thesis holds that all visual objects, practices and institutions are socially constructed artifacts subject to situational analysis, deconstruction and revisionary transformation.

(3) The language thesis holds that visibility is correlated to the field of language and is as discontinuous and heterogenous as the spectrum of available language-games in a given society.

(4) The technopoieses thesis holds that visual phenomena are creatively mediated, shaped and transformed by available technologies.

(5) The sociocultural thesis contends that regimes of the visual are constituted by and constitutive of existing social relations and, more particularly, existing relations of authority and power as these are diagrammatically inscribed in social institutions.

(6) The political thesis holds that logics of visibility provide apparatuses of political self-identification, self-understanding and self-exploration for a given community or society.

(7) The reflexive praxis thesis proposes that visual practices and visual fields are active agencies in transforming social relations and prefiguring possible futures. (Sandywell, 2011, pp. 648-673)
These theses are used to inform the structure of this research study and help to focus the researcher’s attention toward underlying meaning-making processes and various means of producing and sharing images that impact the relationship between visual culture and public policy with specific attention to matters of context, particularity, and historicity.

Plan of Inquiry

This section includes detailed descriptions of the research methods utilized in this study. The research questions are restated below followed by a detailed description of the sampling procedures and analyses employed. The chapter closes with a discussion of the limitations and delimitations for this project.

Research Questions

1) How does the visual culture represented by these three photographs impact spectators’ perceptions of self, citizenship, nation, and government?

2) In what ways does countervisuality shape policy preferences?

3) What are the implications of countervisuality for the aporia between Black lived experience and the political ontology set forth by the Founding Fathers?

4) In what ways are citizen perceptions and meaning-making processes shaped by race, class, gender, and sexuality?

Sampling

This study utilizes extant public electronic documents as the unit of analysis. Public electronic documents were collected online by reverse searching the images using Google Images and the Chrome web browser and printing out the articles and other digital content provided in the search results. As evidenced by the search results, the images of Ieshia Evans and Bree Newsome began to attract attention online immediately following their activism, on July 10, 2016, and June 27, 2015, respectively. The image of Nona Faustine began to attract attention
following an interview she gave about her White Shoes series, which was published by Dodge & Burn (Mestrich, 2014) in November 2014.

According to Charmaz (2014), sampling in constructivist grounded theory is theoretical, emergent, and iterative. The sampling process utilized in this study was based upon a series of steps detailed in Figure 9. Steps two through five (data collection, initial coding, focused coding and categorizing, and theory building) were repeated until the concepts and categories that emerged from the inductive coding processes were fully saturated. Abductive theorizing, which is ongoing throughout these steps, refers to the process of stumbling upon novel concepts for which there does not seem to be a theoretical explanation, searching for new theoretical lenses through which to analyze the novel concept, or combining multiple theories in a new and creative way to provide a more relevant explanation for the empirical phenomenon under consideration (Charmaz, 2014).

Five sampling criteria were used for this study. First, the document (news article, blog, or social media post) needed be in English. Second, there needed to be an explicit reference to the photograph in the text of the document or the document should have elucidated the ways in which citizens (as in the “citizens of photography”) attribute meaning to the photographs. That includes the perspectives of the subjects and/or producers of the work as well as the spectators. Third, to the greatest extent possible, the researcher strove for sufficient cross-ideological variation such that the full political spectrum (from far left to far right and in between) was represented. Fourth, where possible, primacy was given to articles and posts with enabled commenting. The final sampling criterion was that all documents needed to be publicly accessible.
Each electronic document was selected for download according to the above criteria and in accordance with the sampling procedures established by Charmaz (2014) as shown in Figure 9. This process continued until the conceptual model stemming from the analysis was fleshed out and accounted for as much within-category variation as possible. The data consisted of a diverse range of publicly available news articles, blogs (single- and multi-user), and social media. After cycling through Charmaz’s constant comparative method, the final sample sizes were as follows: Ieshia Evans (N=57), Bree Newsome (N=52), and Nona Faustine (N=30). For Ieshia Evans, one
resource, a video produced by BBC (2016), was transcribed and incorporated into the analysis even though it did not appear in the initial search results. The decision was made to include it in the analysis because it featured Ms. Evans speaking at length regarding her photograph and the reasons for her activism. Two resources that did not appear in the initial search results were incorporated into the analysis for Ms. Faustine as well. One of them was a widely cited interview with Ms. Faustine by Mestrich (2014) for *Dodge & Burn*, a publication that features the cutting-edge work of African American photographers. The second resource was a promotional video for Smack Mellon (n.d.), which featured Ms. Faustine speaking about the impetus behind her *White Shoes* self-portrait series. This video was transcribed and incorporated into the analysis. All the resources for Ms. Newsome were drawn directly from the search results on the Chrome web browser after reverse searching her image using Google Images. Except for the aforementioned three resources that were included into the analyses due to their ability to provide information on the unique perspectives of the subjects in their own words, all other data were retrieved directly from the search results.

**Procedures**

Each photograph was reverse searched using the “search by image” function on Google Images (https://images.google.com/), which allows users to upload photographs into Google’s search field as metadata and then search the Internet to locate other digital content that have utilized similar images. This is made possible by what is commonly referred to as content-based image retrieval (CBIR) technology. Google’s Chrome web browser was used for each image search. The search results for each photograph were then assessed using the established sampling criteria to eliminate links that were deemed inappropriate for this study. Inappropriate digital content included pornographic websites, digital media that did not reference the photograph or the subject of the photograph and her activism, and redundant or reblogged content to which the
author of the document contributed nothing new. Documents that met the criteria were assessed for content and the extent to which they provided insight into citizen meaning-making processes surrounding the photographs. Once selected, a subset of the documents were printed off and stored in a three-ring binder (one binder for each photo) for initial coding. Relevant videos were transcribed by the researcher and included in the appropriate research binder with other digital content for analysis.

Analysis

The coding process utilized the steps prescribed by constructivist grounded theory. The first stage of coding involved line-by-line and/or incident-by-incident coding for general themes. Next, the researcher turned to focused coding for more abstract or theoretical concepts utilizing inductive and abductive reasoning (wherein consistencies and inconsistencies were explored with regard to emerging theoretical concepts) (Charmaz, 2014). Coding in this stage was focused upon participant (individuals involved within the “citizenry of photography”) actions, as this helped the researcher to begin to identify processes rather than static concepts. For example, coding proceeded according to what participants were doing rather than the repeated presence of a noun within the selected text: Historicizing instead of history, attributing instead of attribution, justifying instead of justification, etc. Steps 2 through 5 were repeated until emerging categories of codes were saturated. Following Charmaz, theory building was ongoing throughout the entire data collection process. The researcher relied on memo-writing to document codes and categories throughout the analysis. The processes of arranging codes, diagraming what was happening in the data, and combining research memos written throughout the coding process aided the researcher in developing an underlying theoretical logic for the ways in which people were making meaning around each of the images.
Once the categories were saturated such that additional data did not elicit any further dimensions or specifications within them, a conceptual model was developed for the processes observed. Importantly, the model depicts the theoretical logic connecting each of the processes associated with the concepts and categories that emerged during the coding process. The model is presented in the findings chapter along with excerpts and screen shots that help to tell the story of the data. Each stage in the coding process was performed by hand. Although this study did not utilize an a priori codebook, an inductively developed coding scheme is reported in the findings chapter and is provided in its entirety in Appendix II. Importantly, constructivist grounded theory can be distinguished from other approaches such as content analysis due to its reliance on social constructivism and symbolic interactionism, inductive and abductive epistemologies that require *in vivo* coding, and the presentation of a conceptual model in the findings chapter that extends directly from these methods.

Furthermore, one of the most important aspects of a constructivist grounded theory analysis is that it is, in and of itself, an interpretation of participant interpretations: “A constructivist approach theorizes the interpretive work that research participants do, but also acknowledges that the resulting theory is an interpretation. The theory depends on the researcher’s view; it does not and cannot stand outside of it” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 239; sidebar). Constructivist grounded theory holds that such an interpretive approach can still maintain analytical rigor as long as the researcher maintains the standards of credibility, originality, resonance, and usefulness. Credibility means that claims are backed up with evidence from the data, originality means that the researcher is dedicated to building theory and making novel insights where possible, resonance refers to the degree to which the findings actually resemble the lived experiences of participants (those taking part in the four sites of the image and three modalities), and usefulness refers to the degree to which the research helps to advance the field
(in this case, of public policy) and contributes to improving the world in some way (Charmaz, 2014). These are the elements at the heart of researcher trustworthiness.

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness is a means of applying the standards of reliability and validity to qualitative research (Hayes & Singh, 2012). In addition to ensuring credibility, originality, resonance, and usefulness, several more practical considerations are made. Reflexive journaling, memos, peer/mentor debriefing, theory development, and referential adequacy are all strategies to ensure that the findings are consistent with patterns observed in the data and are representative of participant experiences (Bazely & Jackson, 2013; Hayes & Singh, 2012). Reflexive journaling is a method of journaling for self-awareness throughout the research process. The researcher may outline her general concerns with the research, biases that surface throughout the process as well as her ideas about how best to address them, and philosophical conflicts as well as other considerations. This allows the researcher to “reflect upon how the participants, data collection, and analysis are impacting them personally and professionally” (Hayes & Singh, 2012, p. 205). Writing memos helps the researcher to record her rationales for making particular coding decisions and is a means for ensuring reliability: “Coding is designed to support analysis – it is not an end in itself. What becomes important, then, is that the coder records the way he or she is thinking about the data, keeps track of decisions made, and builds a case supported by the data for conclusions reached” (Bazely & Jackson, 2013, p. 93). Due to the interpretive nature of this kind of in vivo qualitative inquiry, Bazeley and Jackson (2013) prefer this method of record keeping for maintaining trustworthiness on single investigator projects over strategies like interrater reliability. Peer and mentor debriefing also provide constructive guidance and feedback to the researcher and provide her with an opportunity to reflect on the research process and communicate any issues that have surfaced throughout the coding process. The last two
strategies for ensuring trustworthiness are complementary. Theory building, the core purpose of constructivist grounded theory, allows the researcher to use “available evidence to inch toward a larger explanation [for study phenomena] without making huge, unsupported leaps” (Hayes & Singh, 2012, p. 211). Referential adequacy requires that researchers stay grounded in current literature, moving back and forth between their interpretations and the published findings of their peers in the field (Hays & Singh, 2012). Theory building, in this sense, necessitates referential adequacy. These strategies function not just as a way of ensuring trustworthiness but also as an ethical framework: The researcher has an “ethical obligation to make public their claims, to show the reader audience or consumer why they should be trusted as faithful accounts of some phenomenon” (Altheide & Johnson, 2013, p.389). Thus, the researcher maintains a transparent and truthful approach to any problems, conflicts, and tensions that arise throughout the study and demonstrates the ways in which they were attended to, transformed, or resolved. All five of these strategies—reflexive journaling, memo-writing, debriefing sessions, theory-building, and referential adequacy—were employed during the coding and analysis stages of this research endeavor.

Limitations

There are several important limitations to this research study. First, as mentioned previously, these analyses represent interpretations of interpretations; that is, they are the researcher’s interpretation of the symbolic and interpretive processes participants use to make sense of and form policy preferences based upon the images produced and circulated in the context of antiracist activism. Therefore, it is wholly possible that another researcher studying the same topic and using the same methodology could produce entirely different findings. This is the nature of constructivist theory building where the researcher’s subjectivity is viewed as an integral part of the research process and not an element that can (or should) be bracketed out of
the analysis. Indeed, constructivist grounded theory focuses on the particular experiences represented by the research sample and it does so intentionally at the expense of the universal. It is not and does not strive to be generalizable to other contexts. Rather, the analysis represents the beginnings of the theory-building process. Certainly, however, the implications derived from the study findings lend themselves to other policy and visual culture studies that may address similar topics. Second, this study relies only on information that is publicly available. This excludes the potentially large number of posts and interactions that exist on private social media accounts. It is possible that the exclusion of private information might bias the study results since the publicly available information may represent only those opinions that certain participants felt comfortable expressing in public forums. Third, digital content is always in flux and subject to change. Some of the digital media initially incorporated into this study has either disappeared from the Internet (i.e. the link is no longer valid) or may have changed in significant ways after the material was printed out for the initial coding process. In certain cases, some of the bloggers that initially utilized the photographs of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine later removed the images from their websites. Possibly, this was due to problems obtaining the appropriate permissions to use the image or images in question. For all these reasons, this research study should be considered cross-sectional rather than longitudinal, as it provides a one-time snapshot of the ways in which citizens making meaning around the selected images.

Delimitations

There are three primary delimitations for this study. First, this study is focused on evidence of interpretive meaning-making processes among mass publics as found in extant digital media documents. By design, there is no elicitation component to this study and therefore the processes and methods by which the existing documents have been produced and circulated online are beyond the control of the researcher and were not subject to the same ethical and
academic standards that would guide researcher-participant interactions during photo elicitation. The researcher, unless information points to the contrary, assumes that the documents collected in this study represent the authentic opinions of their authors who are considered participants in the “citizenry of photography” (Azoulay, 2008, 2012), and that no harm or force was used to produce them or circulate them online. The decision not to elicit meaning-making processes extends from the desire to observe naturally occurring processes online as the citizenry of photography make use of article comment sections, blogs, and social media forums that utilize the three images. Elicitation, in this instance, risks forcing participants to engage in processes of meaning-making that may not otherwise follow naturally from the creation and sharing of the photographs. The data produced from elicitation would therefore constitute a synthetically created form of policy feedback, an artefact of the study, rather than a naturally occurring response to the images. Second, and along the same line of thinking, an intentional choice was made to rely only upon public rather than private data, as theoretical models generated from private data may not be representative of the kinds of salient public opinions and interpretive processes among mass publics that are the focus of this study. Public digital documents, conversely, allow for analyses of naturally occurring visual culture that has the potential to provide great insight into the role of visual images as they relate to political arrangements and policy preferences among mass publics.

Third, a primary source of tension exists between the interpretivist and symbolic interactionist approach of the research methodology and the assertions of Afro-pessimist discourse, which, following Franz Fanon, asserts that Black individuals are overdetermined from the outside. This problem extends to any area of inquiry that depends upon a certain degree of symbolism for analyses of individual and collective behavior. Gordon (1997a) illustrates this in the context of Fanon’s critique of Freudian psychoanalysis: “Psychoanalysis cannot therefore
understand the black woman and the black man because both stand below the symbolic in the racist context of perverse anonymity: their alienation is not neurotic. It is the historical reality of a phobogenic complex” (p. 75). Afro-pessimism argues that there is no metaphorical or symbolic equivalent to Blackness or to Black pain (Dumas, 2016). Although there are descriptive heuristics and metaphors that guide antiracist resistance, such as the crooked room (Harris-Perry, 2011), dark sousveillance (Browne, 2015), and wake work (Sharpe, 2016), there is no symbolic comparison to Black suffering in the wake. This kind of tension, between the symbolic interactionism of constructivist grounded theory and the lack of adequate language to explain Black suffering is exemplified by Wilderson’s (2010) notion of the ontological aporia between Black being and humanity. The aporia, therefore, to some extent, is reproduced in this study between the assumptions of constructivist grounded theory, on the one hand, and the assertions of Afro-pessimism that blackness “is” as opposed blackness “is like,” on the other. This is both a delimitation of the study and a point of departure for the inquiry.

The perspective of this researcher is that the tension between the symbolism of constructivist grounded theory and the overdetermination/phobogenic thesis of Afro-pessimism is itself subject to erasure in the spectacle. That is, the universalizing tendencies of the spectacle may erase the particularities of Black lived experience and Black suffering. The concept of overdetermination is not frequently discussed in the media, and under the spectacle, implicit power dimensions are often occluded in favor of the overt and the spectacular. By examining the public data related to the three photographs under consideration, attending to the sensitizing concepts, and focusing on inductive and abductive processes of knowledge creation and theory building, these issues can be elaborated upon as the research questions are addressed and as theoretical models connecting public policy and visual culture studies emerge from the data. In other words, the tensions are beneficial to the study and provide the opportunity to go deeper into
theory building than were they nonexistent. As it pertains to antiracist and Black feminist
activism, this inquiry sheds light on the grey areas of amnesia that James (1997) argues have
clouded the history of Black women’s intellectual work and activism in and outside of the
academy.
CHAPTER FOUR:

FINDINGS

This chapter presents the findings of the grounded theory analysis. The first section presents an overview of the coding process as well as some of the abductive theorizing that extended from the analysis. Subsequent sections elaborate on the model presented in the first section and further detail the coding process, providing examples from the data. Last, the research questions are addressed based upon the data and the theoretical model. Importantly, the overall focus of this chapter is on the story that emerges from the data. As the next few sections reveal, the initial and focused coding as well as abductive theorizing involved in the analysis rendered a complex list of codes, categories, and classes, which are synthesized in the theoretical model. Beyond listing and describing the various themes that emerged from the analysis, this chapter focuses on telling the story of the circulation of the images of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine, detailing the processes of meaning-making observed around the images, and providing a variety of textual (i.e. quotes) and visual (i.e. screenshots) examples from the data.

Overview of Coding Processes and Development of the Theoretical Model

The initial and focused coding processes as well as the abductive theorizing that went into the analysis are detailed below. Notably, the initial coding process involved a somewhat complex process of searching for theoretical explanations for the novel processes identified during that stage. Through focused coding, these processes were synthesized and developed into a model that more clearly illustrates the actions of mass publics around each of the three images.

Initial Coding

The initial coding process revealed various themes in the data for all three photographs, where actions such as “reflecting,” “contextualizing,” “questioning,” “judging,” “ranking,” “censoring,” “curating,” and “gazing” were identified. Eventually, it became apparent that these
actions were associated with a learning process, which occurred as individuals engaged in
dialogue around the images. Although in his initial article on policy feedback theory, Pierson
(1993) did not specify a learning mechanism for mass publics, he did note that “applying an
interpretive approach to policy feedback has generally meant depicting policy development as a
process of political learning” (p. 611). The question therefore became “what kind of learning is
occurring among publics engaged in dialogue around the images?” As was mentioned in
Chapter Three, constructivist grounded theory utilizes a form of coding and abductive theory
building such that “any [theories] that you use must earn their way into your analysis through
their theoretical power to illuminate your data” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 201). As such, various
theories in the research literature were consulted for their explanatory power to illuminate the
processes identified during this initial coding phase. Broadly, the initial coding seemed to be
consistent with the concept of social learning, as identified in the policy literature by Hugh
Heclo, Peter Hall, and others. In his often-cited Modern Social Politics in Britain and Sweden,
Heclo (1974/2010) compared the collective process of social learning to a maze

  where the outlet is shifting and the walls are being constantly repatterned; where
the subject is not one individual but a group bound together; where this group
disagrees not only on how to get out but on whether getting out constitutes a
satisfactory solution; where, finally, there is not one but a large number of such
groups which keep on getting in each other’s way. (p. 308)

Hall (1993) later expanded the idea of social learning to encompass broader societal influences
rather than those stemming strictly from government actors and interest groups, noting that
policy learning and paradigmatic change “may well be a process that is intimately affected by
societal developments rather than one that takes place largely inside the state itself” (p. 276). To
aid in the analysis and to better understand the kinds of learning that might take place among
publics in accordance with these societal developments, additional literature outside of the field
of public policy was consulted. In some ways, the actions coded during this initial stage
resembled Bloom’s (1956) taxonomy, and so a list of line-by-line codes was compared side-by-side with Bloom’s six categories of learning: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. However, it soon became apparent that neither his taxonomy, nor even Anderson and Krathwohl’s (2001) revision, were able to adequately account for some of the processes observed in the data. Traditional learning theories such as Bloom’s taxonomy and adult learning theory, such as Knowles’ (2015) androgy framework, seemed ill-equipped to explain how a variety of processes, such as “gazing” and “curating,” might contribute to a learning mechanism among publics. How does one learn by gazing and curating? Curiously, some of the initial codes stood in defiance to traditional pedagogical theory as typically utilized in the classroom: No learning objectives, no instructor, no institution.

A breakthrough arrived through subsequent peer and mentor debriefing, memo-writing, and reflection, when the concept of public pedagogy emerged as a novel explanation for this unique, extra-institutional, and unmediated form of learning. Within the education literature, public pedagogies are defined as “spaces, sites, and languages of education and learning that exist outside the walls of the institution of schools” and which “are just as crucial…to our understanding of the development of identities and social formations as the teaching that goes on within the classroom” (Sandlin, Schultz, & Burdock, 2010, p. 1). And, in fact, according to Reid (2010), “social media have become important sites of public pedagogy, places where we go to learn, and places where we learn indirectly as we come to understand ourselves in relation to others and our culture through social media interactions” (p. 194). Thus, the concept of public pedagogy seemed: (1) in accordance with the nontraditional actions and processes observed in the data, (2) consistent with Heclo’s (1974/2010) analogy of social learning as a maze, and (3) in agreement with Hall’s (1993) contention that media, outside of political institutions, often plays an integral role in policy learning. Moreover, the news articles, blogs, and social media that
utilized the images of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine, were consistent with what Ellsworth (2005) refers to as “pedagogical pivot points,” by which she means “a fluid, moving pivot place that puts inside and outside, self and other, personal and social in relation” and a site that “create[s] the potential to disrupt and refigure both inside and outside—both self and society” (p. 38). For these reasons, following Charmaz (2014), public pedagogy “earned” its way into the analysis during the initial coding phase due to the concept’s ability to shed light on the nontraditional, novel learning processes identified in the data.

Focused Coding and Presentation of the Theoretical Model

During the focused coding stage, the initial codes were combined, collapsed, and rearranged. The focus of the coding also switched from identifying what people were doing in relation to the images (initial coding) to identifying what people were referencing while they were doing it (focused coding). This allowed for a more in-depth analysis of the specific learning processes occurring around the images, as informed by the concept of public pedagogy. Ultimately focused coding led to a series of 42 actions (i.e. codes) that fit within ten categories—learning blocks—connected seamlessly across and within the units of analysis and, with some exceptions, across all three photographs. The ways in which individuals make sense of the images and the world around them fit broadly into the following categories: (1) current events, (2) lived experience, (3) history, (4) popular culture, (5) politics and policy, (6) advocacy, (7) professional and academic knowledge, (8) God or mind/body/spirit practices, (9) art and photography, and (10) marketing. Again, with some exceptions, these categories and actions held across news articles, blogs, and social media, and across all three photographs. Furthermore, as Figure 10 illustrates, these categories fit into three classes: (1) a process of orienting in which the spectator situates the events of the photograph and the photographed events in context, within his or her lived experience and within that of others, connecting the image to current events, and to
historical facts; and (2) a process of sense-making in which individuals endeavor to make sense of the events represented in the image by connecting them to God or Spirit, to popular culture, or to professionalized forms of knowledge, and finally (3) a process of applying in which the learning and knowledge created is put to use either to advocate for a particular cause in civil society, to achieve some political goal, or to accomplish some end in the realm of the market.

Figure 10. Theoretical Model of Data.

Over time, the photograph achieves icon status in which the image has been circulated, discussed, and employed among the citizenry of photography (Azoulay, 2008) to such an extent that written language no longer seems needed to explain or justify its use. As the image is circulated, the spectators, subjects, and photographers participate together in meaning-making processes, bringing to light details surrounding both the event of the photograph (the events,
policies, and actors that brought the image into existence) and the photographed event (the actual event depicted in the image) (Azoulay, 2008).

The next few sections detail the various codes, categories, and classes that developed inductively from the data and the ways in which these processes represent aspects of social learning and public pedagogy—learning unmediated by formal institutions—across mass publics. The purpose here is not to detail and provide examples for each and every one of the 42 codes identified, but rather to tell the story of these photographs as they have been circulated online and to provide enough empirical evidence for the reader to ascertain how the data—the news articles, blogs, and social media—function as a form of learning among mass publics with regard to the images in question. The inductively generated coding scheme is provided in Appendix II followed by a log of the data for each photograph detailing how each document was coded during the analysis in Appendices III through V.

Before proceeding to the next section, it is important to highlight three general observations about the data. First, the transitions between codes within the same document, when these were observed, often appeared seamless. Multiple codes overlapped with one another and were nested together within and across sentences, paragraphs, and documents in their entirety. Nesting was frequently identified in news articles, multi-user blog posts, and certain single-user blogs on websites in which authors combined traditional journalism-style writing with online magazine formats. This style of writing often weaves together a wide range of topics, details, and quotes from various actors. Second, in other cases, though not as frequently, only a few codes were used for certain single-user blogs and social media postings. In contrast to news articles and multi-user blogs, these authors seemed to adhere to an informal and more simplistic writing style in which codes were less frequently nested within and across sentences, paragraphs, and documents. Third, the data very much resembled Azoulay’s (2008) notion of the citizenry of
photography, where citizens within and across news media, blogs, and social media encompassed spectators, the subjects of the images, and the photographers. These actors participated collectively in the processes detailed in Figure 10.

Orienting through Current Events, History, and Lived Experience

Many of the documents analyzed in this study utilized at least one or more references to history, current events, and lived experience. The inductive codes relating to current events consisted of “describing the scene of a recent event or series of events using secondhand information,” “contextualizing a recent event by linking it to other events or ideas,” and “inferring and/or explicating relationships between a recent event of series of events or ideas.”

For history, the codes generated included “comparing or connecting imagery or written/spoken language with a historical event or series of events,” “providing historical background on a particular topic (e.g., policing, slavery, etc.),” and “remembering or drawing attention to history (personal or otherwise).” Finally, for lived experience, the codes included “describing or summarizing [lived experience] by speaking for someone or something,” “narrating by speaking from one’s own experience,” and “quoting, summarizing, or describing the sentiments of another in effort to let them speak for themselves.” This “orienting” class most clearly resembles the themes of time, space, and proximity that arose in Chapter Two. References to the lived experience of self or others were essential in orienting the photograph and recent events in time and space and in creating a sense of proximity between the spectator and the image in light of those events. The photographs were contextualized in terms of questions of what, where, when, how, and why, and in many cases the documents referenced not only the photographed event, i.e. what the camera lens captured, but also other recent events that help the reader to make sense of the image in terms of time and space. For example, in the case of Ms. Evans, a Reuters article (Jenkins, 2016) described the scene in Baton Rouge as such:
Baton Rouge has become a flashpoint for protesters after Alton Sterling, 37, was shot and killed last week by city police who were responding to a call that he had threatened someone with a gun outside a convenience store where he was selling CDs.

Sterling’s death, followed by the fatal shooting of another black man, Philando Castile, 32, near St. Paul, Minnesota, revived a wave of protests over police treatment of minorities that has swirled for two years and given rise to a movement called Black Lives Matter.

Blogs, particularly single-user blogs, tended to refer to current events in less formal ways but still included references situating the photograph in time. For example, in Figure 11, Absurd Beats (2016), utilizing the image of Ms. Evans, references “a shit week,” leaving the reader to fill in the gaps as to what happened, likely because the author assumed his or her readership would already be aware of the week’s current events in Baton Rouge.

Figure 11. Screenshot of Absurd Beats (2016).
This post was followed by commenters on the blog who also reference history as a way of orienting the photograph of Ms. Evans in time and space. User dmf simply commented “Dorothy Counts 1957” and shared an image of Ms. Counts making her way to Harry Harding High School in Charlotte, North Carolina. (Figure 2).

Figure 12. Screenshot of user comment by dmf.

Blogger Mikal Drye (2016) also tried to make sense of the events portrayed in the image of Ieshia Evans by connecting historical events to current ones, such as the police shootings and protests that occurred in the wake of the deaths of Alton Sterling and Philando Castile.

I’ve spent a lot of time trying to process the events of the past few days. At first I felt numb and outraged. I think that as a nation we were too stunned by so much violence in such quick succession to do more than mourn. As things settle down and we wake from the stifling grief of the past week, we’ve moved on to accusations. The nation feels as if it’s splitting, and it’s enough to make you scream that the whole world has gone insane.
It hasn’t. As painful, frustrating, and heartbreaking as the process is, we’re growing.

For centuries, white Americans have operated in a comfortable, insular world where it is acceptable to discriminate against other Americans because of the color of their skin. Discrimination against black Americans was quite literally enshrined in our constitution. It was only partially rectified in the 1860s. Some thought it was overcome in the 1960s. The events of the past week show that this is far from the truth. The wounds of the past have only barely begun to scab over.

Buppert (2017) also attempted to connect the current events associated with the photograph of Ieshia Evans to his lived experience as a citizen. In the below passage, he critiques the militarization of the police and concludes by noting the chances of becoming a victim of a terrorist attack versus one of police violence as a gun carrying citizen:

> The police may dress the part with all the gifts rained on the departments by the Federal government to be “dressed to kill” but a large part of successful military action depends on training that realistically clones the anticipated conditions. This has not been the case. Every cop in America today wants to get their “operator” on and be there when the rounds fly to defend Team America from the terrorist hordes but the glimmering realization is that I stand a far greater chance of being struck by lightning twice and consumed by a Great White shark than being involved in a foreign-borne “terrorist incident”. But then again, I stand a far greater chance of being maimed and killed by a cop than a criminal in America today because I carry a gun as a turd civilian.

In the aftermath of Bree Newsome’s activism, Borden (2015) at the *Independent* focused on the lived experiences of citizens who believe that the Confederate flag ought to be displayed, citing the account (i.e. lived experience) of Southern Patriot Shop owner Robert Hayes on the history of the flag:

> Three people stand in line at the Southern Patriot Shop, Confederate flags tucked under their arms, waiting their turn at the cash register.

Owner Robert Hayes, a 75-year-old with crow’s feet and a lingering smile, has a bit of advice for his customers before they head back out into a world they say is drifting further and further from the America they believe in. ‘Don’t display them in your house but outside of your house,’ he says. ‘We need to be making a statement to the people that know their history and know that [the flag is] not what it’s being accused of.’
On the website Girltalk HQ (2015), the image of Ms. Newsome is used in an article in which the author connects Black Lives Matter to the Say Her Name campaign begun by Kimberlé Crenshaw, referencing a recent vigil in honor of Black women who have been murdered either by the state or in the context of the structural problem of sexual violence against women of color (Figure 13).

"We gathered to hear and say the name of the black women and girls who have been lost to state violence. We were not the same size crowd as we were when we marched for Trayvon, Mike, and Freddie. It felt as if the lives of these women did not matter as much. Our conditioning, this patriarchal bullshit, tells us not to acknowledge these women; most of us we are hardwired not to say her name," he wrote.

Figure 13. Screenshot of Girltalk HQ (2015).
The author then connects the Say Her Name campaign to the importance of Black women in leadership positions, in particular the election of Marilyn Mosby as the State Attorney of Baltimore, who came into the national spotlight after the death of Freddie Gray. Mosby is quoted extensively on her lived experience as a Black woman and a professional:

‘Despite dealing with the daily stresses of our jobs, our families and our faith … we as African-American women have to overcome so many obstacles, stereotypes and, all too often, self-imposed barriers in the exhibition of leadership,’ she said. Marilyn cited official government figures that outline women make 77 cents on the dollar to what a man earns, but for black women it is even less – 64c, and consistently have the highest unemployment rate among women of all races. Her mandate was for women to recognize each other’s struggles in order to be able to move beyond the popular public narrative of black women on society. ‘Most of us here are educated women, but we need to reach those who only see the videos and hear the music that downgrades them constantly. They are not the objects that they are portrayed to be. Every great movement toward progress began with warrior women who had channeled their confidence and were unafraid to challenge the status quo in the pursuit of justice and equality,’ she said.

Then Mosby’s experience is connected with the activism and lived experience of Bree Newsome:

One other woman who has gone beyond the stereotypes of black women is activist Bree Newsome who came to public attention in late June when she climbed up a flagpole outside the South Carolina state capitol building and took down the confederate flag in the wake of the shootings of 9 African-American church-goers by the hands of a young white male who had an affinity for both the flag and white supremacy. ‘I removed the flag not only in defiance of those who enslaved my ancestors in the southern United States, but also in defiance of the oppression that continues against black people globally in 2015…I did it for all the fierce black women on the front lines of the movement and for all the little black girls who are watching us. I did it because I am free,’ she wrote.

‘My African ancestors entered this continent through the slave market in Charleston. I am descended from those who survived racial oppression as they built this nation. The southern heritage I embrace is the legacy of a people unbowed by racial oppression. It includes towering figures of the Civil Rights Movement, [as well as] the many people who rarely make the history books but without whom there is no movement,’ she continued. ‘I encourage everyone to understand the history, recognize the problems of the present and take action to show the world that the status quo is not acceptable. New eras require new models of leadership. This is a multi-leader movement. I believe that. I stand by that. I am
because we are. I am one of many. This moment is a call to action for us all,’ she ended.

Similarly, the documents utilizing the photograph of Nona Faustine cite her at length as she discusses her passion for history and for highlighting the role of Black individuals in the making of New York City. In an article for the *Huffington Post*, Frank (2015/2017) quotes Ms. Faustine’s personal account of the photographed event as it unfolded:

‘Standing at Wall Street at the exact spot where they sold Native and African men, women, and children 150 years ago, I wasn’t able to feel any of the horrific sorrow and pain of the activities that once went on there,’ Faustine explained to *The Huffington Post*. ‘Perhaps it was a defense mechanism that wouldn’t allow me to tap into that for fear of crumbling. What I did feel was the energy of New York City, an incredible force. There I found myself at the curtain of time between two eras, past and present. I went into a deep reflection.’

In a frequently cited article for *Dodge & Burn*, Mestrich (2014) quotes Faustine’s desire to document history as a “time traveler” and a documentarian:

As a time traveler I’m very invested in the past and our future. I see myself, the people who built this city and country as one. They deserve so much recognition for their sacrifice and contributions, something that is still being denied them. There was a force deep inside of me that needed to pay homage to those who played a pivotal role in the early history of this city, and the spaces in which they existed. I wanted to uncover those places where a tangible link to the past exists. Being a documentarian at heart I wanted you to feel and see those spaces, let your mind wonder. What does a Black body look like today in the place where they sold human beings 250 years ago? No other medium but photography and film could do that.

In addition to citing Ms. Faustine’s lived experience as an artist and her desire to document history (specifically Black women’s place in it), reviews of her work also encompassed other individuals’ impressions and ways of making meaning of her images by connecting them to their own lived experiences. In a review of *A Constellation*, an exhibit of Ms. Faustine and others’ work at the Studio Museum in Harlem, Sargent (2015) connects her images with the Black Lives Matter Movement:
In the context of the Black Lives Matter movement, *A Constellation* is furnished with allusions to contemporary politics and, more so, how recent social affairs have become a part of how artists express themselves through language and art, which even further becomes a part of both Black identities and American identity—America does have the highest police murders of Black individuals, and Black and Hispanic people constitute the majority of the prisoned population, so, yes, this is part of our country’s identity. While Faustine and Ringgold embody historical and celebratory elements of Black identities, artists Tony Lewis (b. 1986) and Talwst (b. 1979) illuminate the dolor and urgency surrounding institutionalized violations of the body. Their configurations continue to serve as lessons in cultural competency, yet they operate as nonviolent protests against our justice system’s corruption.

After connecting the exhibit with Black Lives Matter and police murders of Black individuals, Sargent (2015) then proceeds to connect Ms. Faustine’s exhibit with the personal, lived experience of a Latina friend:

> Just as the works in *A Constellation* demonstrate the artists’ personal perceptions of tradition and culture, the exhibition urges us to recall our own congruities with its themes. An example, for me, involves a story from a cherished friend. She was living in a predominantly multicultural, gentrifying, Brooklyn neighborhood. She looks like what society would call “white,” but she actually is [and identifies as] half Hispanic. She was walking home when a Black man approached her for directions. However, he did not walk straight up to her. He held back, said, ‘excuse me’ from afar, and proceeded to ask his question—like he knew that she would be startled by his Black body and he tried his best, with such respect, to not appear threatening. Within this anecdote are details of socially constructed racial identities and how they alter human interactions.

Over all, one of the major functions of this class of orienting included conjoining the photographed event with the event of the photograph—the contextual variables across time and space that led to the event captured by the camera. Once the images were contextualized as such, another class of categories and codes emerged from within the data—that of sense-making. The next section looks at how individuals seemed to make sense of the images in a variety of ways through references to God or Spirit, to trends in popular culture, and to more professionalized forms of knowledge.
Sense-Making: Spirit, Pop Culture, and Professionalized Knowledge

The inductive codes generated for this class of categories focused on what was happening in the text after the images were oriented across time, space, and lived experience. For references to God or Spirit, the codes included “speaking for or on behalf of one’s God (e.g., ‘God says...’),” “justifying one’s actions or those of another as the will of God,” “critiquing one’s actions or those of another as going against the will of God,” “connecting beliefs about God or Spirit to recent or past events depicted through image or written language,” “quoting scripture or conducting biblical exegesis,” and “turning to God, placing one’s hope in a deity.” For popular culture, the codes included such items as “comparing or connecting an image or written language with pop culture (‘This is like...’),” “critiquing pop culture,” “refusing to be sidetracked by pop culture,” “describing current trends in pop culture,” “referencing celebrity opinions,” “purposefully engaging pop culture in effort to critique or praise a person, group, or event,” and “engaging in the creation of memes/mimicry.” Finally, with regards to professionalized knowledge, items were coded as “explaining or referencing academic or professionalized knowledge through summary or direct quote,” “appealing to authority to substantiate one’s claims or the claims of another,” and “critiquing academic or professionalized knowledge.”

References to God or Spirit or the spirits of ancestors and historical figures were observed in the data for all three women. For example, Edwards (2015) noted of Ms. Faustine that her images reveal her intentions to invoke the spirits of African American women from the past, women she refers to as “muses,” such as Saartjie Baartman and a South Carolina slave named Delia, whose bodies were photographed and exploited by White men as an insignia of racial inferiority:

Past and present interweave in her work; as she summons the spirits of Delia and Baartman, she allows them to author their own bodies, to speak for themselves. Faustine then creates photographs that revel in tensions: mournful and powerful, they excavate more than mere language would allow.
For Ms. Newsome, Nelson (2015) quoted her words as she brought down the Confederate flag:

“‘We come against...hatred, oppression, and violence. I come against you in the name of God,’ Newsome shouted as she climbed the flagpole. ‘This flag comes down today.’”

Similarly, a quote in which Ms. Evans references God was also cited in passage by Superselected (2016):

Evans, who was taken into police custody and released after a night in jail, spoke out on Facebook.

‘I just need you people to know,’ she wrote. ‘I appreciate the well wishes and love, but this is the work of God. I am a vessel! Glory to the most high! I’m glad I’m alive and safe. And that there were no casualties that I have witnessed first hand.’

Spectators also attributed the actions of the women in these images to the work of God. For example, one blogger compared Bree Newsome’s activism to Psalm 27 in the Bible. Noting that some may liken Ms. Newsome’s work to more contemporary gospel music, Clark (2015) encouraged readers to “put those songs out of your head and re-encounter the words of this Psalm afresh through the lens of Newsome’s prophetic sermon and her vivid exegesis and exposition of the text.” Figure 14 shows how Clark paired the second verse of Psalm 27 with the image of Ms. Newsome.
When evildoers assail me
to devour my flesh—
my adversaries and foes—
they shall stumble and fall.

One pagan blogger compared Ms. Newsome’s actions to the Tower card in the Rider-Waite Tarot deck with a blog title that included the words “The Tower: Falling thoughts, crumbling flags…” (Figure 15). Placed just above Newsome’s image, Panpanbrid (2015) wrote, “And speaking of Towers (or in this case, FLAGS) that just need to fall already…”

*Figure 14. Screenshot of Clark (2015).*
With regards to popular culture, a variety of memes were created for both Ms. Newsome and Ms. Evans. Hollywood star and activist Jesse Williams posted a video clip from the famous Super Mario Brothers video game in which the character, Mario, must bring down the flag to progress to the next level (Figure 16).
Other social media users drew renditions of the image of Ms. Newsome removing the flag (Figures 17 and 18). In Figure 17, Ms. Newsome is depicted as Wonder Woman. In Figure 19, Ms. Evans is likened to Princess Leia alongside Storm Troopers from Star Wars. This category in which the images were associated with pop culture had a particularly strong association with category 10 – knowledge of the image itself. As the images were circulated and compared with widely understood cultural references, the images achieved icon status.
Figure 17. Screenshot of Newsome as Wonder Woman (Carissimo, 2015).

Figure 18. Screenshot: Artist rendition of Newsome (Carissimo, 2015).
Ms. Faustine’s image, though less circulated online than those of Ms. Evans and Ms. Newsome, was used in an interview on the social media campaign by Micol Hebron called “Internet Acceptable Male Nipple Template” in which images exposing female nipples, usually banned on social media, were replaced with digital cut-outs of male nipples. This article was coded as pop culture (due to its popularity on social media, involvement of famous celebrities, and the memes that extended from the campaign) and therefore a form of sense-making. However, it was also coded as type advocacy and a means of utilizing the image to advocate for a particular cause – in this case gendered discrimination and censorship on social media (to be explicated in the next section). Figure 20 shows how the image of Ms. Faustine appeared alongside the nipple campaign in an interview by Thomas (2015).
Whereas blogs most often appealed to God or Spirit or to popular culture to make sense of the novelty of the photographs and to place them in reference to readers’ familiar knowledge of the Bible, the Tarot, of video games, and of famous movies, some bloggers also referenced professionalized and highly academic forms of knowledge in relation to the photographs. Although these references were less frequent, Ball’s (2016) article for the *Washington Times* exemplifies the ways in which the images, the one of Ms. Evans, in particular, were circulated online and combined with text in ways that appeal to or support connections between the image and academic or professionalized knowledge (Figures 21 and 22).
Using Bayesian Analysis of Police Killings

by David Ball  July 14, 2016  POLITICS

Figure 21. Screenshot #1 of Ball (2016).

What do we know? Based on the New York City stop and frisk data, much of the stopping in New York of all races wasn’t fruitful: about 6 percent of all stops (across races) resulted in an arrest, and about 3 percent turned up weapons or contraband. But black people were stopped much more often: about 58 percent of the total, more than twice their percentage of the population. Whites were stopped about 10 percent of the total. Fryer uses this data, but, unfortunately, it doesn’t include lethal events. For those, he uses the figures I quoted earlier, with an emphasis on Houston. I happen to agree with Fryer (p4) that there is too little good data. Here is what I think a good equation would look like, assuming that there are only two races for simplicity:

\[ p(\text{black stop}|\text{lethal}) = \frac{p(\text{black stop})p(\text{lethal}|\text{black stop})}{p(\text{black stop})p(\text{lethal}|\text{black stop}) + p(\text{white stop})p(\text{lethal}|\text{white stop})} \]

Figure 22. Screenshot #2 of Ball (2016).
Whereas the first class of categories and codes, i.e. orienting, focused on situating the image and related events in terms of time, space, and lived experience (i.e. proximity); this second class of codes, i.e. sensitizing, focused on more epistemological concerns. In this category, the images were connected to specific and often familiar types of knowledge, such as religious knowledge, knowledge of popular culture, and professionalized knowledge. The next section discusses the third class of codes in which the focus is on the ways in which the images were deployed for specific purposes in civil society, state, and market.

Applying: Advocacy, Politics, and Market

This final class, i.e. applying, encompasses the categories of advocacy, politics and/or policy issues, and marketing. This category is one of the clearest empirical examples of the open-endedness of the photograph as the images were often deployed and used in ways neither the photographers nor the subjects may have foreseen. The advocacy category encompassed codes such as “quoting, referencing, or summarizing the positions of individuals (self or other) or groups who organize and advocate for a particular issue,” “providing a rationale or endeavoring to make sense of the behavior of self or other regarding a particular issue (e.g., ‘I/They did this because…’),” “critiquing or questioning a person, group, or the state itself (includes ad hominem attacks and other logical fallacies),” “drawing on metaphors or images to advocate a particular position,” and “issuing a call to action, explicating the reasoning behind issuing one, describing a felt sense of responding to one.” The politics and policy category included codes such as “identifying relationships between various issues,” “articulating, explicating, and/or quoting the political opinions or policy preferences of self or other (person, organization, or the state),” “questioning the political opinions or policy preferences of others (person, organization, or the state),” and “describing the current political landscape surrounding one or more policy issues.” Finally, the marketing category, which, in the context of this study, applied solely to Pepsi’s
appropriation of the image of Ms. Evans, included such codes as “critiquing the marketing style of a company either directly or through satire,” “apologizing for a marketing mistake,” and “articulating lessons learned.”

The example of Ms. Faustine’s image in conjunction with the “Internet Acceptable Male Nipple Template” campaign from the last section is one example of the ways in which an image can be used to advocate particular causes for which the image may not have been created—again, supporting the thesis that photographs are, indeed, open-ended and continually open to reinterpretation within the citizenry of photography (Azoulay, 2008). In other ways, however, the image may be used in a way that is consistent with the photographer’s original purpose (Figure 18, from the last section, for example, illustrates the ways in which images can be mimicked and circulated as a welcomed form of adulation). Similarly, Ms. Faustine’s image was used in a *Mic.com* blog post that acknowledged the uncovering of the African burial site in New York City in 1991 when the GSA broke ground for its new office building in Lower Manhattan. This article also referenced Mayor de Blasio’s commemoration of a historical site in New York City with a plaque. As Levine (2015) wrote in reference to Ms. Faustine’s *White Shoes* series:

> In another shoot, taken not far away at City Hall, Faustine hoped to commemorate an 18th-century African cemetery where between 10,000 and 20,000 free and enslaved black people may rest. The site lay forgotten until 1991, when it was discovered during the development of a federal office building nearby. Recently, New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio and first lady Chirlane McCray commemorated the spot in a more traditional fashion with a plaque.

Likewise, certain articles and blogs referenced advocacy organizations such as the NAACP. Carissimo (2015), for example, quoted a statement released by then-president Dr. William J. Barber II:

> Dr. William J. Barber II, the president of the National Association for [the] Advancement of Colored People North Carolina chapter, praised Ms. Newsome and compared …her [to] Rosa Parks.
‘[Newsome] stands in a long tradition…Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and more recently hundreds of protesters in Moral Monday…were all considered, at first, criminals for their acts of conscience,’ he said. ‘We stand in solidarity with her as she is our family.’

The commenters on the news articles and blogs using the images of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine also expressed opinions advocating for certain issues. For example, one commenter named Sean remarked on Buppert’s (2017) blog post on Zerogov.com, which utilized the image of Evans, “pray this whole thing burns to the ground, it can’t happen soon enough” (Figure 23).

Figure 23. Screenshot of Buppert (2017).
It is important to note that not all users agreed with the activism depicted in the photographs. Articles were shared in various forums indicating extreme disapproval. For example, Shithead (2015) shared a link in a discussion forum to a *New York Daily News* article on Ms. Newsome’s activism entitled “Confederate flag raised again at South Carolina Statehouse after Bree Newsome climbs pole to remove it.” The link was posted with a brief comment by Shithead: “And rightfully so, she gets arrested and it goes right back up.” This comment was coded as a form of advocacy (rather than politics since he was advocating or arguing an opinion more to engage with forum users than to change actual policy). Notably, the perspective of Shithead (2015), other than his disapproval, is not as clearly elaborated as, for example, those of authors of formal op-ed pieces (Figure 24). This image is instructive in several ways. For one, learning exemplified by digital media and which takes place among mass publics does not resemble the kinds of polished work encouraged in formal educational institutions. Rather, social media and digital culture via public pedagogy “perform a role in shaping the changing possibilities of cultural discourse” (Reid, 2010, p. 199). Notably, this simple post—a news article with the photograph of Ms. Newsome embedded within it, reposted in a forum, accompanied by a brief comment by Shithead, initiated a dialogue among forum users that rendered 28 additional comments, many of them conforming to processes of orienting, sense-making, and applying.
The category of policy and politics also revealed the ways in which the spectacle, as conceived by Debord (1983) and Edelman (1988), in light of the data reviewed for this study, seems quite permeable. That is, the flow of information, images, and, most importantly, power, is not nearly as one directional, i.e. flowing from elites to mass publics, as previously theorized.

Based on the data in this study, information, images, and power seem to flow in a multiplicity of ways, as the language that policymakers use on the floors of Congress makes its way to Internet memes circulated on Twitter, and images of countervisuality, such as those considered in this study, make their way onto the websites of Congressmen. For example, the data in this study revealed that text taken directly from the Congressional Record found its way to Internet memes featuring Bree Newsome. This happened in the case of Senator Mitch McConnell’s now famous admonishment of Senator Elizabeth Warren in which he argued that she had violated Senate floor rules: “She was warned. She was given an explanation.
Nevertheless, she persisted.” (Figure 25). Likewise, Ms. Newsome’s image appeared on the congressional website of House Representative Hakeem Jeffries in a press release regarding the passage of his House Amendment 606 (2015) to HR 2822 Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016 (Figure 26).

Figure 25. Screenshot of Twitter capture from Stomach-vs-heart (n.d.).
With regards to the market, the image of Ieshia Evans presented a unique case exemplifying both the open-endedness of the photograph and the ways in which mass publics, through the citizenry of photography, can hold the market accountable to the appropriation of countervisual images for private gain. The Internet was quick to respond when Pepsi released a commercial featuring model Kendall Jenner who, in the middle of a photo shoot, ventures outside into an ongoing protest and offers a police officer a can of Pepsi in a way that seemed to many spectators to mimic the iconic photograph of Ms. Evans (Figure 27).
Figure 27. Screenshot of Jenner and Evans from Williams (2017).

As Williams (2017) wrote:

The cringe-worthy climax comes when Jenner approaches riot police, dissolving all previous echoes of camaraderie and humility, with a can of Pepsi, and a magic resolution is reached. The gesture is an overt reference to the iconic photograph of Ieshia Evans in Baton Rouge taken during a Black Lives Matter protest, turning a tense and life threatening stand off in the name of a growing tally of murdered African Americans into a picture-perfect scene of cheers and laughter, a marketing departments [sic] desperate plot to latch on to what it evidently views as a trend to be exploited. Not what the protesters had in mind, I’m sure.

In all, this class of categories and codes—application—represents the ways in which the images were used in news articles, blogs, and social media, to promote change in the world or to act on the world for a specific cause in the realms of civil society, politics, and market. Notably, as the photographs of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine are used in this way—in a way to act on or change the world toward some end—the photographs themselves achieve a kind of icon status such that accompanying text, explanations, and other attempts to say, “This is like…” (Azoulay, 2012) are no longer needed. This occurs as knowledge of the photograph spreads across the citizenry of photography. The next section looks at this final category of codes: Knowledge of the photograph itself.
Knowledge of the Photograph Itself and Achievement of Icon Status

One category that emerged and extended across the previous classes of orienting, sense-making, and applying, is that of knowledge of the photograph itself. This category is labeled “art and photography” in Appendix II. It encompasses codes such as “describing or deconstructing the composition of an image or set of images,” “awarding, praising, critiquing, or referencing an image or the creator/curator of an image,” “applying professionalized knowledge to an image or work of art,” “articulating best practices,” “comparing a work of art (written or visual) with another image,” and “referencing the processes of creating the image or series of images.” The purpose of this category is that it elucidates knowledge pertaining directly to the photographed event. Notably, all three women spoke to the media regarding their role in each of the images. For example, Ms. Newsome spoke out about her activism just following the event as well as several years later, reflecting upon both her work and the visual dynamic of it. She described the decision among her and fellow activists to have a Black woman scale the flagpole to Joiner (2017) as follows:

Everybody couldn’t risk being arrested or everybody wasn’t necessarily physically able to do it. That narrowed it down to about three of us. Of those three I was the only person of color. Of course at that point when we were looking at the situation I mean, we recognized like how powerful that is. Not just the visual of it, the visual image of the black woman scaling the pole, but of course as people learned who I was and I’m not just a symbol at that point.

I am a descendant of the people who for whom this flag represented enslavement. My ancestors were in South Carolina at the time when South Carolina seceded from the Union to fight this war to keep them enslaved. For me it was just powerful to represent all of that, you know? I don’t know any other way to put it and I just kind of remain humbled by it because it’s like, yes, it’s Bree Newsome scaling the flagpole but that moment was so much bigger than me. It really is. It represents so much more than me.

Ms. Newsome’s photograph also appeared in curated collections online, such as in an article entitled “A woman’s place is in the revolution. These powerful images from around the world &
throughout history prove it,” which featured images of both Ms. Newsome and Ms. Evans alongside many other photographs of women’s activism, past and present (Girtalk HQ, 2017). The photograph of Ms. Evans also received much praise and adulation within activist circles. For example, one blog, which included her photograph as the main image at the top of the post and included other notable photographs of activists, remarked “The picture of a defiant young woman has become the image of our time” (Bate, 2017).

Additionally, in the case of Ms. Evans, Reuters provided the space for a reunion between photographer (Jonathan Bachman) and subject (Evans) in which both clarified what happened on that day of the photographed event. Reuters (2016) quoted Bachman as such:

‘What she did on that day is courage that I have never seen before in my career. And it was a real honour to take this image and to finally meet her and just have some time to sit and talk and catch up,’ Bachman said, adding that it happened so fast that he felt that ‘instinct took over’ when he was taking the photograph.

The same article cited Ms. Evans’ reflections on the events of that day:

‘I was literally as the photo depicts, standing in the middle of the street, just staring into the faces of those officers,’ Evans recalled about the instant.

‘And it was just like a rush and overwhelming feeling of emotion, it was just so many questions going into my mind, going through my mind.’

‘I really wasn’t concerned with the consequence because there is a bigger reason there. We are there for the murder of Alton Sterling. We are protesting, we shouldn’t be pushed off to the side.’

Within this article, she was also able to clarify an important impetus behind her activism as captured in the photographed event, telling Reuters: “A lot of people have come back to me, from a feminist standpoint, and that is not the reason why I was there. I was there from an African standpoint, from a whole different reason…” Thus, although within the citizenry of photography many interpreted her work as a form of feminist activism, Evans was able to clarify the reasons for her actions on that day, contributing to the publics’ knowledge of both the event of the photograph and the photographed event. Though Ms. Evans may disagree with the ways in
which her image was interpreted within feminist circles, the popularity of the image, the reasons for which the image became an icon, according to Bachman’s account, seem to have to do with the hunger of the public to have a symbol representing this particular aspect of American culture—the activism of Black Lives Matter, for example, and the disagreement and conflict among publics as to the ways in which American citizens are policed, particularly in communities of color. In many ways, this echoes Heclo’s (1974/2010) analogy of the maze where various groups cannot even agree on whether finding an exit would be an ideal solution to a policy problem. As Reuters quoted Bachman, “I read an article that America was hungry for an image like this to represent an issue of this magnitude, and I guess this is the image that the public picked.”

Bachman’s photograph of Ms. Evans went on to win an award in 2017 from the World Press Photo Foundation, coming in first in the category of “contemporary issues – singles” (Phmuseum, 2017). Additionally, many spectators focused on the composition of the photograph. One notable example is the attention blogger Murphy (2016) drew to a particularly distinctive crack in the sidewalk in a post entitled “Can I interrogate this photograph?” (Figure 28).
The more the photographs were circulated online, the more attention drawn to them, the focus on
the composition, the photographers, and the subjects, through the aforementioned processes of
orienting, sense-making, and application, the more the photographs seemed to achieve icon
status such that the images come to stand on their own, requiring little explanation as to their
symbolism. For Ms. Faustine, unlike the images of Ms. Evans and Ms. Newsome, this process
occurred both online and in real time as her photographs have been exhibited in various
museums around the country. Pank Magazine (2016), for example, publicized her showing at
Smack Mellon, an arts organization located in Brooklyn, New York, and noted her accolades as
follows:
White Shoes opens at smack Mellon on Jan. 9th at 5pm. It runs until February 21st. Faustine’s work was selected as an Honorable Mention in the 2014 Camera Club of New York Competition, and it has received coverage at The Huffington Post, Hyperallergic, Greybook Magazine, Dodge and Burn Blog, and other publications. Faustine’s work has been exhibited in “For Colored Girls” at the Schomberg Center for Black Research in Harlem, ‘Respond’ at Smack Mellon, and in ‘Take 10 at the International Center of Photography’…

Thus, the significance of this stand-alone category, i.e. knowledge of the photograph itself, reinforces the powerful role of the image among the citizenry of photography, as artists, subjects, and spectators, situate the image in time (orienting), connect it epistemologically with previous knowledge (sense-making), and utilize the photograph to engender change in civil society, in politics, and in the market (applying). Although the image’s underlying meanings are always contested, the photograph comes to represent and stand for something. That something may be highly controversial and there may be varying opinions about the circumstances that contributed to the photographed event and the event of the photograph, but over time those contested meanings seem to become symbolized by the photograph itself. The next section draws on this and the previous sections that explicated the model presented in Figure 10 to address the research questions.

Addressing the Research Questions

This section addresses the research questions based on data and the theoretical model (Figure 10) as outlined in previous sections of this chapter. With regards to question one (“How does the visual culture represented by these three photographs impact spectators’ perceptions of self, citizenship, nation and government?”), it appears that the impacts are both intrapersonal and highly collective. As members in the citizenry of photography, spectators, artists, and subjects, orient the image in terms of theirs’ and others’ lived experience, an understanding of related current events, and history. Their perceptions of self, citizenship, nation, and government seem
to be impacted by the image to the extent that they can situate it within these experiences. Though not every spectator agrees with the activism depicted in the images, the images come to represent a political moment in the nation—a marker of how and in what ways the government responds to its citizens, whether the state is more or less responsive to certain individuals over others, and what it means to be a citizen at this particular juncture in history when many citizens are increasingly taking to the streets to protest perceived societal and political wrongs. It seems that the impact of these images is to bring previously latent conflict to the forefront of the spectacle and to initiate conversations that may be at times highly contentious. However, the effect of surfacing this conflict is that it allows individuals to reflect on where they stand on issues concerning racial and feminist activism, previous policies, and the demands made on government by a heterogeneous body of citizens who may or may not feel as if their needs are adequately met or represented by state actors. The processes outlined in the previous sections, i.e. those of orienting, sense-making, and applying, seem to help various factions of society to clarify their worldviews and to outline their positions, for example, on police violence, on how the US government acknowledges (or fails to acknowledge) the lingering impact of slavery on Black Americans’ lived experiences in contemporary society, and on the protest of Black Lives Matter. Again, this conflict unfolds in keeping with the discord evident in Heclo’s (1974/2010) metaphor of social learning as a maze.

As these images are circulated, and as conflict and dialogue occur around them, it seems that individuals’ policy preferences become more solidified. Therefore, with regards to question two (“In what ways does countervisuality shape policy preferences?”), it seems that the answer, so far as this study is concerned, is in the dialogue that emerges from the photograph itself. With regards to the image of Ms. Evans, for example, many individuals who may have been on the fence about whether policing reforms were necessary found themselves outraged at the
juxtaposition in the photograph between the peacefulness of Ms. Evans in her sundress and the riot gear-clad police officers rushing toward her. The image of Ms. Newsome also brought to the surface a contentious dialogue over the Confederate flag and whether it should be allowed on government property. Likewise, Ms. Faustine’s photograph brought to light the ways in which the unique history of Black New Yorkers has shaped the cultural and economic landscape of the city yet has remained long unacknowledged by political elites.

What became apparent in this study is that these elites along with average citizens are part of the citizenry of photography. In the data, elites seem to participate and seem to be subject to the processes outlined in this chapter, that of orienting, sense-making, and applying, on par with average citizens. It is not necessarily that the countervisuality expressed in these images changes individuals’ policy preferences per se, or alters the actions of political elites, but that the images seem to allow for an eruption of sorts—a moment in which the circulation of the image engenders dialogue and individuals are able to articulate their passionate beliefs about state-citizen relations as exemplified within the photographs. Here, the Internet plays a significant role in allowing this dialogue to emerge. Within this dialogue, citizens articulate their respective views of the “maze” and the ways in which it might be navigated to come to a policy solution. In contrast to previous literature on the spectacle, the digital age seems to have provided a platform for the expression of a number of diverse and alternative viewpoints such that the media is no longer monolithic. The heterogeneity of digital media, evident in this study, makes it difficult for government and market elites to manipulate citizens’ preferences. Outlets such as Reuters, The Washington Post, and the New York Times, are frequented by Internet users alongside other blogs and social media sites that pride themselves on presenting alternative positions and seem to gain a following of their own primarily for that reason. In this way, the spectacle, evidenced by the
news articles, blogs, and social media in this study, has become far more democratic and diverse than when it was initially theorized by Debord (1983) and Edelman (1988).

This democratization of the spectacle, in relation to the circulation of the images of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine, seems to afford individuals not only with a platform to share policy preferences and alternative viewpoints about state, market, and civil society, but also to share their unique lived experiences and to make those experiences proximal to others via their readership and following online. Therefore, with regards to question three (“What are the implications of countervisuality for the aporia between Black lived experience and the political ontology set forth by the Founding Fathers?”), countervisuality seems to be emboldened by the Internet, by a democratized spectacle, which allows the controversial images considered in this study, to come to the forefront of public discussion. As Castells (2015) has highlighted, the Internet has allowed social movements to become not only networked but globalized. This means that as news articles, blogs, and social media highlight users’ experiences, preferences, and unique histories, they are made proximal to those who lack direct experience these phenomena. The aporia is reflected in the distinct differences between these experiences, in individual and collective accounts, for example, of Black lived experience with government policies such as the “Cops on the Beat” program or the 1033 program that allows for the Department of Defense to contribute military equipment to local police departments. Due to the structural nature of the aporia, its embeddedness in the Constitution and in public law, and its seeming intransigence, it is certainly not overcome through the networked nature of the Internet and the web’s ability to link together a plethora of diverse lived experiences among the citizenry of photography. However, with regards to this study, the chasm between visibility and proximity, between sublime and aura, seems to be overcome to the extent that everything on the Internet seems to be made equally proximal to diverse constituencies of artists, subjects, and spectators alike.
This proximity does not necessarily change public opinion, but it does allow for individuals to articulate the ways in which race, class, gender, and sexuality have colored their individual experiences. Therefore, with regards to question four (“In what ways are citizen perceptions and meaning-making processes shaped by race, class, gender, and sexuality?”), it seems that these demographics differentially color the ways in which individuals orient the images in terms of time, space, and proximity, the types of previous knowledge they use to make sense of the images (religion, pop culture, professionalized or academic knowledge), and the ways in which they choose to use (or not) that image to affect change in the world. In this way, the impact of the Internet as the democratization of the spectacle brings these processes to the forefront of public dialogue. As such, the circulation of the images, and the dialogue engendered by them, seems to foreground the lived experiences of citizens within the citizenry of photography. These experiences, as citizens orient themselves to the images, seem to become networked together in ways that enhance themes of proximity and closeness. Although conflict emerges within this dialogue, so too does solidarity, advocacy, democracy, and kinship. As the NAACP president commented of Ms. Newsome, “she is our family.”

Summary of Findings

These images, as countervisuals to the spectacle, function in society not only as a form of policy feedback in response to previous policies, but also as prompts for social learning among mass publics; learning like that which has been theorized by Heclo (1974/2010) and Hall (1993). This learning is unique in that, like public pedagogy, it is extra-institutional, unfiltered, and unmoderated; independent of formal instruction and traditional styles of instruction and learning within the academy. This learning occurs as individuals orient the photographs in terms of time, space, and proximity to their own and others’ lived experiences; as they engage in processes of sense-making by connecting the photographs to their pre-existing cosmologies, to popular
culture, and to more professionalized forms of knowledge; and, finally, as *individuals seek to apply what is conveyed in the photographs* by advocating for particular social causes, by drawing connections to politics and public policy, and by relating these concepts to other images produced by the market. Importantly these processes are overlapping and continuous; the more they occur, the more knowledge of the photograph itself is circulated along with the image, the more the image’s status as an icon becomes secured within the citizenry of photography. Thus, the image comes to represent a political moment in the nation. These processes of orienting, sense-making, and applying become evident primarily in the aggregate—as a network news articles, blogs, and social media, connected through the shared use of photographs, and hence, through complex content-based image retrieval (CBIR) technologies capable of seeking out like images across the web. As such, the findings reported in this chapter reveal two primary purposes of the countervisual images in this study: (1) as metadata, connecting an entire network of user-generated and news media content, and (2) as visual images spurring policy and other types of learning in the form of individual and collective meaning-making processes related to the photographed event (the image itself) and the event of the photograph (the context that led to the photograph). The implications of these findings, particularly for the field of public policy, are discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE:

DISCUSSION

This chapter provides a discussion of the research findings—the processes of orienting, sense-making, and applying—contextualizing them in terms of the social learning literature in public policy and the public pedagogy literature in the field of education as well as the various theories reviewed in Chapter Two. In the first section, additional reflections are outlined on the role of the image with regards to policy feedback theory and another theoretical model is presented. The second section discusses the connections between previous literature on social learning in the field of public policy and the study results. Subsequent sections address additional themes extending from the data analysis and theory-building portions of this research, including the uniqueness of public pedagogy, the critical theoretical matrix and democratic learning, lessons learned from Pepsi, and some concluding remarks on the three photographs. The last section outlines four key implications for future research at the intersections of public policy and visual culture before moving on to the final chapter.

Reflections on the Role of the Image

Based on the study findings, it is possible to develop a more accurate picture of the role of these images in social learning and policy feedback (Figure 29). Between the processes of orienting and sense-making is an overlying theme of visualizing in which, together, the citizens of the citizenry of photography begin to use the content of the image to visualize a way forward. This is not to say that all citizens are in accord. Of course, as has been revealed, the meanings of the images of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine are continuously contested. Nonetheless, these images as countervisuality seem to allow for a more democratic conversation as to the overall direction or vision of society and of state-citizen relations. Likewise, the overarching process that occurs between sense-making and applying seems to reflect a form of
collective learning through which publics begin to attach novel information (as brought forth by the image) to previous knowledge. Although the entire process is conceptualized as a form of social learning consistent with the literature on public pedagogy, traditional aspects of the learning process, such as connecting novel information to that which is already known, seem to become most evident in this stage.

Moreover, policy feedback occurs again (following previously outlined forms of policy feedback: (1) the initial act of protest and (2) the image of that protest) as citizens apply novel information gained from the image to various causes and the changes they would like to see within civil society, state, and market. Last, as these images take on icon status, they too become a part of the historical record—as a symbol, as learned information, as representation—to which future artists, subjects, and spectators in the citizenry of photography may refer when new images emerge, and individuals proclaim, “This is like…” (Azoulay, 2012). Thus, it seems visual images, in particular the countervisuality engaged in this study, contribute in meaningful ways to bringing critical issues to the forefront of public dialogue. They aid in connecting citizens to one another through the sharing of unique lived experiences, through sense-making processes in which novel phenomena associated with the images are connected to previously learned information, and as individuals apply that knowledge to affect change in the world. As policymakers and business elites as well as organized interest groups are and always will be a part of the citizenry of photography, they too, are impacted by these processes and receive the public’s feedback to previous policy decisions. Based on the data analyzed in this study, it seems that the democratization of the spectacle allows power, information, and images to flow in a multitude of different directions in direct contrast to the relatively helpless and agency-less spectator in Debord (1983) and Edelman’s (1988) renderings of the spectacle.
As the literature review revealed, visual culture—images—function much like stereotypes (as in Soss, Fording, & Schram’s (2011a) RCM), as heuristics, guiding not only policy decision-making but also citizen interpretations of those policies. Whereas stereotypes are often discussed as mental schema, intrinsic to the self; visual culture functions, in many ways, externally to the self, enabling inter-social meaning-making processes from which individuals may learn about the world around them. It was Edelman’s (1971) contention that most people cannot handle the onslaught of information directed their way on a daily basis; therefore, images allow for the simplification of what is a complex, nuanced, and continuous stream of data produced by (post)modern society. It is within this context that artists, subjects, and spectators can order and make meaning of the world around them. Images are connected laterally to other
current events, longitudinally to the historic record, and intimately, in both directions, as people make sense of their lived experience and begin to apply what they have learned in civic society, in politics, and in business. Therefore, scholars and political actors would do well, following Rose (2016), to take seriously the production, creation, audiencing, and circulation of images, particularly forms of countervisuality produced in the context of contemporary social movements where marginalized publics assert the right to exist and policy learning as public pedagogy engenders new forms of feedback to previous policies.

Furthermore, the public pedagogy exemplified in the data seems to represent a democratized version of Panofsky’s (1982) influential work on iconography and iconology, a branch of art history. In keeping with the democratizing ethos of visual culture studies, rather than one critic possessing the “good eye,” conducting the three-step analysis laid out by Panofsky; spectators, subjects, and the artists themselves engage collectively in the work of describing the objects and events represented by form (pre-iconographical description), endeavoring to uncover the themes and concepts underlying the objects and events (iconographical analysis), and interpreting the psychological factors underlying those themes and concepts (iconological interpretation). In so doing, participants in the citizenry of photography uncover, contextualize, and reinterpret important historical and cultural influences that shape individual and collective meaning-making processes around the photographed event (the image) and the event of the photograph (the context) (Azoulay, 2008). In turn, these processes reveal a form of social learning among mass publics.

Based on the observation of these processes in the study data, Sandywell’s (2011) theses for visual culture seem to hold true. Certainly, these photographs function as artifacts subject to a variety of analytical methods to better understand the social, cultural, and political language used
within the citizenry of photography to contextualize the images and to say “This is like…” (theses 2 and 3). They signal history while also aiding the spectator, the artist, and the subject in the kinds of self-identification, self-exploration, and self-understanding to which Sandywell refers (theses 1 and 6). This kind of understanding seems to unfold as a result of the social relations among publics and between publics and elites, signaling the role of power relations in terms of state authority as well as public resistance to that authority (thesis 5). Likewise, such social relations are transformed and inevitably altered by the technology that allows for the rapid circulation of images and the public pedagogy that emerges in the wake of that circulation (thesis 6). The visual enables both interpersonal relations and the kinds of self-reflexivity needed for citizens in the citizenry of photography to orient themselves to the image, to make sense of it in terms of previously learned information, and to apply it in ways that create alternative visions for the future (thesis 7). It is through these processes that an important form of learning takes place among mass publics, organized interests, and elites alike.

Public Pedagogy as Social Learning

The public pedagogy observed in this study at work among mass publics, organized interests, and elites alike, has the potential to fill a gap in the research literature regarding the interpretive mechanisms outlined in Pierson’s (1993) influential article where, notably, there was no learning mechanism specified for mass publics. However, as Chapter Three outlined, the methodology engaged in this study, constructivist grounded theory, intentionally sacrifices universalism for particularity, and thus is not generalizable to other contexts. Therefore, the purpose of this section is to contextualize the findings of this study—the public pedagogy surrounding the images of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine—in light of Hall’s
Hall’s (1993) theorizing on social learning and paradigmatic policy change built upon the concept of social learning as put forth by Heclo (1994/2010). In his study, Hall outlined various factors that he believed had contributed to a paradigmatic shift in British macroeconomic policy following the election of Margaret Thatcher in 1979. Notably, he found that the election of Thatcher was not, in and of itself, enough to account for the policy change that ensued. Rather, Hall identified three factors that significantly altered the policy perspectives of political actors: (1) the media, (2) the financial markets, and (3) the market place of (economic) ideas. As he concluded, “the ensuing struggle to replace one policy paradigm with another was a society wide affair, mediated by the press, deeply imbricated with electoral competition, and fought in the public arena” (Hall, 1993, p. 287). Therefore, Hall’s notion of social learning as policymaking highlighted the ways in which broader societal factors such as ideas stemming from outside of traditional political institutions can contribute to large shifts in policymaking. These findings led him to call for “more nuanced analyses of the multiple ways in which state and society can be linked” (Hall, 1993, p. 292).

Berman (2013), reflecting on the influence of Hall’s scholarship on social learning and policy paradigms, noted the ways in which Hall’s findings led to historical institutionalist scholarship and ideational scholarship responding to this call, primarily by focusing on the impact of exogenous variables (as opposed to state-centric endogenous ones) on policy change. This, in Berman’s view, gave way to institutionalist approaches that began to define institutions along the lines of culture, ideology, norms, and beliefs, rather than as static, a-historic black boxes. In the years since Hall’s influential writing, ideational scholars have focused on the rather undertheorized connections between ideational change and policy change (Berman, 2013).
Reflecting on this scholarship, Berman (2013) argues that “there is a tendency…to attribute ideational change to either broad structural changes and exogenous shocks or local political contexts and local political actors rather than to an interaction between them,” therefore she emphasizes the importance of “moving beyond structural changes and exogenous shocks and shifting our attention to the ideas themselves and the contexts within which they arise” (Berman, 2013, p. 228). This includes “how actors’ subjective understandings and particular thought processes along with the objective conditions they face shape behavior and outcomes” (p. 232).

The study findings contribute to this area of scholarship by highlighting the ways in which the visual culture associated with Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine contributes to social learning via public pedagogy as publics seek to (1) orient the image across time and space and in regard to the lived experiences of self and others, (2) connect novel information from the photograph to previously learned information, and (3) apply that information in the realms of civil society, state, and market. Across the news articles, blogs, and social media analyzed in this study, ideas play a central role in the dialogue that emerges around images of countervisuality. Furthermore, Azoulay’s (2008) notion of the citizenry of photography, which centers meaning-making processes and artistic judgements among average spectators, yet does not exclude elites and professionals, is instructive in delineating how such ideas are circulated and debated within the public arena. As Berman (2013) notes, ideational change is a two-stage process:

During the first stage, existing ideas are questioned and tarnished, opening up political space new ideas can fill. In this phase, in other words, a demand for new ideas is created by the perceived failures or inadequacies of the reigning one(s). Once a political space has begun to open and a demand for new ideas begins to appear, the second stage of the process begins. During this stage, a variety of new ideas may arise as political actors champion alternatives to the ideas being questioned and perhaps abandoned. (p. 227)
The images focused upon during this study brought forth such perceived failures (stage 1) in the form of antiracist activism as captured by the photographed event. For Ms. Evans, the perceived failure consisted of over 25 years of law enforcement agencies utilizing DoD military-grade equipment in counterdrug and other domestic law enforcement activities up to and including, as evidenced by the photographed event, police presence during peaceful protest. For Ms. Newsome, the perceived failure included the South Carolina General Assembly’s decades-long resistance to proposals to remove the Confederate flag from Statehouse property despite the flags’ ideological connection to pro-slavery and antiblack sentiment and the violence of the Charleston massacre. Finally, for Ms. Faustine, the perceived failures were twofold: (1) the lack of formal acknowledgement of African Americans’ contributions to the historical, cultural, and economic development of New York City, and (2) more broadly, the historic appropriation and degradation of Black women’s bodies as well as the continual misrecognition of Black womanhood due to perceived stereotypes and negative images in policymaking as well as in the media. Arguably, the circulation of these photographs across digital culture aided in creating the political space (stage 2) necessary for new ideas to emerge in the public arena and for dialogue to occur among heterogeneous collectivities who, in Heclo’s (1994/2010) words, neither agree on the specifications of the maze (i.e. its nature, its walls, its shape) nor on the view that a way out of the maze necessarily constitutes a political win for which society, and political actors specifically, ought to strive. However, in the context of the policy literature on social learning (Hall, 1993; Heclo, 1994/2010) and Berman’s (2013) ideational scholarship, the public pedagogy that occurs around the three images of countervisuality in this study seems to play an integral role in explicating processes that lead to the emergence of and debate over new ideas.

On this note, it is important to emphasize once again the issue of causality as it relates to this study. The primary assumption is that, in accordance with the tenets of policy feedback
theory (Pierson, 1993), previous policies have shaped the contemporary terrain of racial politics and antiracist activism. From that activism, images of countervisuality emerge and are heavily circulated online among publics. This circulation then leads to a form of social learning that is consistent with theorizing on public pedagogy, through which citizens within the citizenry of photography (Azoulay, 2008) come to orient the image, make sense of novel information brought forth by the image in light of previously learned information, and apply that novel information in civic society, state, and market. These pedagogical processes are not necessarily the sole causal mechanisms that bring forth the “marketplace of ideas” that Hall (1993) referenced as an important factor in accounting for policy change. Rather, the creation and circulation of these images seems to aid in surfacing the necessary conflict and dialogue out of which this marketplace may emerge. Notably, this occurs in a digital environment in which elites, organized interests, and mass publics seem to participate equally (at least far more so than when Edelman (1988) first conceptualized the political spectacle) and in which the voices of average spectators are given primacy on par with more powerful actors.

The Uniqueness of Public Pedagogy

As the study findings revealed, the news articles, blogs, and social media seem to function in similar fashion to Ellsworth’s (2005) concept of the pedagogical “pivot point,” a space that allows for both the disruption and the refiguring of knowledge: “both inside and outside—both self and society” (p. 38). These points become the ground upon which meanings are contested—meanings, for example, of democracy, of terrorism, and of resistance. The lived experience of the marginalized with various policies and under various state actions are made more proximal to mass publics, thus allowing for the chasm to be overcome between visibility and proximity (and between sublime and aura). The ways in which citizens in the citizenry of
photography (Azoulay, 2008) learn unmediated and without the presence of an instructor or formal learning objectives is what makes public pedagogy distinct from other forms of learning. Indeed, public pedagogy, unmediated by institutions, looks nothing like traditional forms of learning and is not held to the same tenets of professionalism as within the academy. Just as scholars and cultural critics have pointed out that the discipline of art history has sometimes succumbed to an over-professionalization of the field, with credentialed experts exclaiming, “This is art” or “This is not art” (Azoulay, 2012) so too, has pedagogical theory, traditionally an academic subject, where educators who are often pressured to measure learning outcomes might exclaim “This is learning” or “This is not.” Public pedagogy (extra-institutional learning), on the other hand, is messy, and far less amenable to traditional learning metrics. Rather, learning occurs through connections between people, ideas, and data, unmediated by formal instructors and their carefully outlined learning objectives. Posts and comments wrought with ad hominem attacks and other forms of logical fallacies may preclude those in academia from identifying the pedagogical impulses among networks of mass publics, particularly on the web, where exchanges between individuals often do not follow the guidelines of critical thinking so treasured in the academy. Where academics may be tempted to write off the contributions of Shithead (2015) and other users, it is important to see the ways in which online public pedagogy, though not conforming to traditional learning theory (i.e. Bloom’s (1956) taxonomy or the revision by Anderson and Krathwohl (2001)), or academic standards of critical thinking and writing, is in fact ubiquitous within and across news articles, blogs, and social media. It is linked together in networks referencing embedded images such as those of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine, and made retrievable via digital technology such as the complex algorithms that support Google’s content-based image retrieval (CBIR) technology. Notably, it is the dialogue
and debate that emerges from within this context that is capable of disturbing traditional power relations where political and business elites shape the beliefs of mass publics through the manipulation of images and the dominance of appearance over reality (Debord, 1983; Edelman, 1988). Indeed, it seems that digital culture has altered power relations between elites and publics in important ways.

The Critical Theoretical Matrix and Democratic Education

The research findings revealed that digital culture, in the context of the circulation of the three images in this study, allows for the emergence of human relations grounded in good faith and provides a platform from which the authentic heterogeneity of mass publics may reveal itself in contrast to Davis’ (2016) concept of the “tyranny of the universal.” From these photographs emerged a form of dialogue in keeping with the boxes on the right side of the Critical Theoretical Matrix (Figure 8) presented in Chapter Two. Recall that the upper boxes of the matrix represented ways of relating to one another either through good or bad faith while the lower boxes represented ways of relating to the material world— to that which is presumed to be external to the self. The boxes on the left side of the matrix favor hierarchal relations, universalism, objectification, and defining people and things according to concepts that subsume the very people and things the concepts are supposed to represent. The heterogeneity evident in digital culture, as exemplified in this study, seems to provide a relatively more lateral platform through which individuals and collectivities can assert their various experiences with public policy and with state actors, with the market, and from within civil society, thus countering the universalist impulses associated with neoliberalism. This kind of dialogue is in direct contrast to the hierarchy evident in society’s institutions and the tendency of state and market to fold in and to subsume that which is different and authentic as Marcuse (1964) once argued.
Countervisuality rallies against bad faith (Sartre, 1956), the tyranny of universalism (Davis, 2016), and the cultural genocide that Adorno (1973/2007) had once associated with assimilation and extremist versions of equality. In much the same way as the state of exception allows for the suspension or exception of juridical rule, as the state claims emergency status (Mbembe, 2003; Mirzoeff, 2011), the photographic enoncé becomes the subject of the countervisual, asserting her right to state her own emergency claim for a more democratic and socially just society (Azoulay, 2012).

In this context, public pedagogy becomes a powerful tool against the necropolitics and neovisuality of the state. Yet, the idea of education as a means to counter societal injustices and to empower the marginalized is certainly not new. Indeed, both Mirzoeff (2011) and Giroux (2005) have advocated for a critical pedagogy within the institutions of higher education to counter the injustices associated with neoliberalism. As Mirzoeff argued, “the tools of democratization, education, and sustainability are to hand and have not exhausted themselves” (p. 308). However, Mirzoeff (2011) also posed the following question, which this study’s findings seem to address: “Can universities democratize themselves or should there be an emphasis on alternative modalities?” (pp. 308-309). Although Mirzoeff argued that universities were best equipped to educate a populous capable of thinking critically about democracy and sustainability, it is important to acknowledge the ways in which digital culture may supplement the work of higher education in this regard. Giroux (2005), however, has remained critical of public pedagogy, fearing that it has been so infused with neoliberal and neoconservative ideologies as to render it incapable of countering the spectacle:

Opposing the authoritarian politics of neoliberalism, militarism, and neoconservatism means developing enclaves of resistance in order to stop the incarceration of a generation of young Black and Brown men and women, the privatization of the commons, the attack on public schools, the increasing
corporatization of higher education, the growing militarization of public life, and
the use of power based on the assumption that empire abroad entails tyranny and
repression at home. (Giroux, 2005, para 3, section heading “From a Pedagogy of
Understanding to a Pedagogy of Intervention”)

Yet, this study has revealed that news articles, blogs, and social media, through posting,
commenting, and sharing, have the potential to act as the “enclaves of resistance” to which
Giroux refers. The caveat, however, as has been noted previously, is that digital culture is not
monolithic, and like the photograph, it is open-ended and always subject to contestation. This
means that various forms of ideology, whether conservative, liberal, or otherwise, exist together
within and across diverse networks of actors, which makes it difficult to predict the outcome of
the dialogue and debate around countervisual images. Additionally, public pedagogy, as it exists
online and through social media, may overlap with traditional methods of education in the
academy, as teachers incorporate it into their curricula, or it may serve as a stand-alone method
of critical education open to all citizens as they engage with one another in the production and
sharing of content. What is important is that the space that digital culture affords citizens in the
citizenry of photography remains lateral rather than hierarchical and that the opportunity to
participate, and the technology that affords participation, be open to all the public. As Reid
(2013) notes

Social media are a part of our pedagogical experience from conventional
classrooms to the many sites of public pedagogy, even if we have a limited
understanding or even awareness of these emerging technologies at work around
us. At the same time, social media have the potential to bring critical pedagogical
work into public spaces even as social media redefine what ‘public’ might mean.
(p. 199)

Certainly, the “public” as exemplified by the news articles, blog posts, and social media in this
study, is transformed by digital culture in ways that alter and globalize how citizens in the
citizenry of photography relate to one another. The potential for digital culture to facilitate
individual and collective learning by surfacing latent conflict, allowing users to learn from one another’s lived experience, providing platforms where the meanings of democracy, terrorism, and publicness are contested, and alternative visions for society are presented, seems limitless despite no one knowing beforehand exactly what the outcome of this learning will be or in what direction it will head. Yet, based on the findings of this study, and contrary to Giroux (2005), it seems that the public pedagogy digital culture affords is in fact well-poised to critique, rather than propagate, dominant ideologies such as neoliberalism.

Lessons Learned from Pepsi

The marketing category from the analysis, extending from the Pepsi and Kendall Jenner debacle, denotes the ways in which the market may appropriate images for private gain. However, the very nature of visual culture in the digital age, in this instance, allowed for an immediate, negative response among mass publics to the appropriation of the image of Ms. Evans, thereby revealing the ways in which neoliberal attempts to marketize countervisuality can be thwarted, unmediated by a pedagogue or formal instructor. Consistent with Debord’s (1983) rendering, the spectacle is, in many ways, filled with images that advertise products and promote services, doing so in ways that become overwhelming to mass publics. However, publics are not helpless in this regard, as they can and do find ways to resist. Furthermore, it is important to make a distinction between (1) the time in which Edelman (1971) hypothesized that images were the primary means by which mass publics could make sense of an ever-growing complex world in which they are bombarded with data, and (2) the current digital age in which individuals are overwhelmed with images much the same as they were with data decades previously. Two important shifts have occurred since the initial scholarship on the spectacle, one vertical and one horizontal, in terms of time and space, respectively. First, with the digitizing of photography and
the advent of Web 2.0 utilizing user-generated content, over time, photographs themselves have become data (and as this study shows, metadata), and individuals both create and are bombarded by these images on a daily basis through news articles, blogs, and social media, made easily accessible through smartphone technology. Second, Web 2.0 has broadened the platform upon which activists can produce, circulate, and audience countervisual images, widening the spectacle itself as it tethers at the edges where marginalized communities make inroads by contesting the spectacular images produced by and in service of the state and the market, and doing so on an equal platform with traditional news media. Thus, in many ways digital culture has transformed the “one-dimensional society” (Marcuse, 1964). Certainly, the countervisual can be, and often is appropriated and folded into the spectacle, as the Pepsi commercial illustrated, but not without rapid contestation emboldened by the web, which is, as Castell (2015) noted, a powerful democratizing tool in the hands of the oppressed.

In the wake of the American Spring, digital culture has afforded antiracist and other social justice activists with tools to counter the visuality of state and market and to equalize the spectacle. Although Debord’s (1983) and Edelman’s (1988) conceptualizations of the spectacle emphasized almost a totalitarian power of the market and the state, technological innovations, such as those that brought about Web 2.0, have undoubtedly altered relations between political and business elites, on the one hand, and mass publics, on the other. Within this study, it became evident that neither the state, the market, the spectacle, nor mass publics are impermeable or static entities. This means that studies of policy feedback as it relates to mass publics, and particularly in the context of public pedagogy, warrant considerations of state-society relations that account for (1) agency on the part of spectators who interpret, acquiesce, or contest the dominant ideologies inherent in the spectacle, and (2) the ways in which state actors, and the
political and business elite, are embedded within society and therefore not immune to the impacts of visual culture (countervisuality in particular) through which mass publics make meaning of the world around them. These facets of society (i.e. the state, the market, the spectacle, and countervisuality itself) are, in fact, imbricated. Where theory development often warrants the simplification of such concepts in ways that make them distinct from one another; empirically speaking, these variables cannot long be isolated owing to their dynamical and ever-intersecting qualities. Just as the photograph is open-ended, so too, as the aggregation of images, is the spectacle; always open to interpretation and contestation, continually remade by overlapping groups with varying and intersecting interests. It also represents a highly technological and advanced version of the relations between competing factions to which Madison (1787/2009) referred in *Federalist 10*. And, just as Hamilton (1787/2009) sought to explain the relations between the states under the federal government as an “assemblage of societies,” so too might these diverse constituencies, engaging in the creation, circulation, and contesting of spectacular images, be thought of as an assemblage of relationships extending across and between the entities of state, market, and publics, whether consisting of elite or average citizens, whether formerly organized or latent. Considering these and previously discussed insights, the next section provides some concluding remarks on the images of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine.

**Concluding Remarks on the Photographs**

The countervisual images of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine stand as powerful exemplars of wake work (Sharpe, 2016), dark sousveillance (Browne, 2015), and Black feminist resistance (even if Ms. Evans did not intend for her activism to be interpreted as such), emboldened by a democratized spectacle that refuses to look away from social injustice. In these images, the subjects are standing erect despite the faultiness of the crooked room (Harris-Perry,
2011); calling attention to the structural damage that racism and misogynoir have inflicted on society and challenging both the plantation complex and the military industrial complex (Mirzoeff, 2011), which, in the context of the internal Cold War (Lowi, 1998), have been emboldened by the necropolitics and the neovisuality of the state (Mbembe, 2003; Mirzoeff, 2011). These examples reveal that salient visual images, from stereotypes utilized by policymakers to images of countervisuality, seem to impact both elites and publics in similar ways. Images of Black women as countervisuals to the spectacle figure prominently across news articles, blogs, and social media platforms such as Twitter. This renders Black women’s contestation of policy decisions through the appropriation of visual culture a particularly powerful form of resistance that touches not only at the enclaves of political elites but also at the wider cultural context in which said elites are embedded with publics, joining together in the interpretive practices of meaning-making and social learning.

Ieshia Evans

The countervisuality of Ieshia Evans stands in juxtaposition to the military-industrial complex and the neoconservative social control policies associated with the internal Cold War. Although in the wake of Ms. Evans’ activism the Trump administration halted the Law Enforcement Working Group’s previous efforts to place controls on the 1033 program, the image of her will likely remain an icon in American culture as a symbol of the power of peaceful protest, the call for policing reforms, and the extent of access to military-grade equipment that policymakers and bureaucrats afford law enforcement agencies. Due to the open-endedness of the photograph, and the likelihood that future images as countervisuals to the spectacle will be compared in one way or another to Evans’ image (“This is like…”) (Azoulay, 2012), the prospects for change and reform are never fully foreclosed and will likely remain open for debate among mass publics, interest groups, and elites well into the future. From the policies discussed
in the introductory chapter, the expansion of the 1201 program into the 1033 program, Executive Order 13688 (2016) signed by President Obama, and the findings of the Law Enforcement Working Group (2015), it is easy to see how the photographed event serves as a form of policy feedback in response to previous government decisions. The photograph quickly became an iconic representation of this current political moment in which issues of police brutality and police militarization have become popular issues in public debate. Online, among the citizenry of photography, the image of Ms. Evans was quickly situated in terms of the deaths of Alton Sterling and Philando Castille, historical acts of antiracist resistance associated with the civil rights movement, and a plethora of diverse, proximal experiences among mass publics regarding police violence. Across social media, Ms. Evans was likened to Princess Leia and the police in the photograph (clad in the type of riot gear on which the Working Group had recommended the DoD place increased controls), to Storm Troopers. Despite (1) the feedback among publics that emerged online from the circulation of the photograph of Ms. Evans, (2) the Law Working Groups’ (2015) findings, and (3) the findings of the 2017 GAO Report (US Government Accountability Office, 2017), President Trump issued Executive Order 13809 (2018) reversing the efforts of President Obama to curtail the excesses of the 1033 program. In hindsight, and in light of the literature on policy feedback theory, it is important to note that the 1033 program has become thoroughly routinized in the decades since it was codified into public law. Moreover, following Schneider and Ingram’s (1993, 1997) typology, the target group for this program—law enforcement agencies—represents a particularly powerful constituency and one that, in the context of the War on Drugs, policymakers have deemed deserving of rewards. Notably, the image of Ms. Evans is the only image of the three in this study that was not followed by some sort of conciliatory action on the part of the state. This should not come as a surprise given the
routinization and popularity of the 1033 program. Certainly, it is much easier for government actors to remove a flag (as in the case of Ms. Newsome) or to install a plaque (as in the case of Ms. Faustine) than it is to reverse a decades old DoD program emboldened by neoconservative and neoliberal ideologies (Harvey, 2005).

Despite the 1033 program proving rather intransigent, the image of Ms. Evans has certainly served as a teaching moment in which citizens in the citizenry of photography were able to learn, debate, and critique the various types of government action and policies that had preceded the photographed event (e.g., Bupper, 2017; Drye, 2016). The image, in the process, became such an iconic representation of the current debate about police militarization that Pepsi endeavored to capitalize off the image and the current atmosphere of antiracist and feminist protest in the US. The public quickly denounced Pepsi’s advertisement as an attempt to capitalize on Ms. Evans’ activism (e.g., Williams, 2017), revealing the ways in which the flow of power, information, and images is not unidirectional moving from political and business elites to unsuspecting mass publics, but rather flows in multiple directions. Thus, the case of Ms. Evans stands as a powerful exemplar of the ways in which publics can engage digital culture to counter the hegemony of market and state actors, to teach others, to make proximal that which was once distant to dominant groups, and to provide alternative visions for the ordering of society.

Bree Newsome

The image of Bree Newsome provided a countervisual to lingering symbols of the plantation complex (Mirzoeff, 2011), namely the Confederate flag. Moreover, the placement of her image on Congressman Jeffries’ website (Jeffries, 2015) is a significant indicator of the ways in which visual culture and the public pedagogy it affords impacts upon elites as much as average citizens. The image of Ms. Newsome became a potent form of policy feedback in response to SC Bill 4895 – The Heritage Act (2000), which allowed for the placement of the
Confederate flag on Statehouse grounds. As the image of Ms. Newsome was circulated, people related it to the Charleston Massacre at the Emmanuel AME Church, to President Obama’s eulogy of State Senator Reverend Clementa Pinckney, and, like Ms. Evans’ activism, to a long line of civil rights activists. Although Ms. Newsome’s activism alone was not the only form of policy feedback in response to the Confederate flag on Statehouse property, the photographed event and the circulation of the image provided a platform for publics to engage in dialogue about the presence of Confederate symbols on government property. Additionally, her activism was most clearly connected to Biblical scriptures, particularly because she referenced them as she took down the flag, but also because these scriptures became a salient means of sense-making among spectators, wherein the novelty of Ms. Newsome’s actions could be connected with already-known religious knowledge. As evidenced by the data in this study, publics also began linking Ms. Newsome’s image together with the lived experiences of Black women professionals like Marylin Mosby and Kimberlé Crenshaw as well as the experiences of citizens such as shop owner Robert Hayes (Borden, 2015), who proudly advocate the use and display of the Confederate flag as a representation of southern heritage. The dialogue and debate among publics served as a powerful response to Ms. Newsome’s énoncé. Although the South Carolina government initially restored the flag after Ms. Newsome removed it (Shithead, 2015), ultimately, then-Governor Nikki Haley conceded to pressure from within and outside of the state to remove it indefinitely and the South Carolina State Assembly passed the “Act to Amend Section 1-10-10, Code of Laws of South Carolina, 1976” (2015), ending a debate that had raged in the State Assembly for decades (Chaffin, Cooper, & Knotts, 2017; Webster & Lieb, 2001).

Nona Faustine

The countervisuality of Nona Faustine presents a unique case in that several of the policies that preceded her image worked for rather than against her activism, which challenged
the lingering plantation complex and its roots in the neoliberalism of contemporary society. It is evident how her image functioned as a form of policy feedback to the ordinance that allowed for the slave market on Wall Street and to the policies of the 1960s, which prioritized the preservation of important historic and cultural sites around the nation. Additionally, the events of the 1990s when the GSA uncovered the African burial site in the process of constructing an office building in Lower Manhattan ultimately established a precedent of government responsiveness to public calls for historical preservation. As with Ms. Newsome’s activism, Ms. Faustine’s self-portrait series was not in and of itself the only form of feedback that led to Governor de Blasio’s dedication of the plaque commemorating the slave market on Wall Street. However, the presence of her work both in museums and online, the circulation of her self-portrait, “From Her Body Sprang their Greatest Wealth,” clearly served as a pedagogical resource in educating the public about the presence of the slave market, the lingering impact of slavery on Black women in contemporary American society, and the artistic and cultural contributions of African Americans to New York City. More broadly, her work can also be contextualized as a form of policy feedback to the ways in which negative stereotypes of Black womanhood and the Black female body itself have been appropriated by the media and by state and market actors. In this regard, it is ironic that Ms. Faustine chose the site of a Wall Street intersection for her self-portrait. As Mirzoeff notes, “[t]hroughout the Atlantic world, the crossroads is a dangerous place” such that “[i]n England, gibbets were placed there, like the infamous Tyburn Tree, and the bodies of the condemned were buried on the spot to prevent them from returning to seek vengeance” (p. 127). And yet, there stands Ms. Faustine, at the crossroads, calling upon the spirits of her ancestors, of her muses, Saartjie Baartman and Delia, reminding spectators of historical truths that can no longer be denied. This site of the former
slave market that now takes the form of the world’s pre- eminent symbol of global capitalism, indeed, originated from the liminality of the Black woman. In this way, the site of the Black female slave body, as rendered by Ms. Faustine, haunts her spectators as she reminds them that she, the embodiment of her ancestors, is first and foremost the original site of global wealth.

On Neovisuality

As Mirzoeff (2011) argued, the current neovisuality of the state justifies its existence by the very presence of those who would oppose it; however, as exemplified by this study, the democratization of the spectacle brought about by digital technology—the fact that cameras and Internet access are ubiquitous among mass publics through cell phones and other forms of visual technology—seems to facilitate the resistance of the marginalized. The production and circulation of the images of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine reveal the ways in which mass publics may utilize images of countervisuality within the citizenry of photography to contest the perceived injustices of public policy and the actions of business elites. If Mirzoeff is correct in his assertion that under COIN the state is always watching from the “non-place” of the state of exception; then the findings of this study have revealed the ways in which mass publics, too, are always watching back and seeking out new and innovative ways to provide alternative and more equitable visions of society via countervisuality. Technology itself, in this regard, much like the photograph, is open-ended, providing publics with the tools to counter the necropolitics of the state and to claim the right to exist and the right to contest punitive policies, such as those Lowi (1998) associated with the internal Cold War. Indeed, the images in this study, which have in the last few years become iconological representations of antiracist resistance, and their circulation across digital culture, are symbolic of the multiplicity of ways in which citizens in the citizenry of photography may assert the right to look and the right to exist. Furthermore, the act of looking back, as exemplified by the countervisuality of Ms. Evans, Ms.
Newsome, and Ms. Faustine, stands in direct contrast to Hegel’s (1977) slave master dialectic, in which the bondservant is encouraged to return to his (her) work rather than fight the master to the death, and more consistent with the good faith described by Sartre (1956) in which the subject refuses to flee from who she is (or what society has made of her existence) and rather decides to face her condition head on—refusing on her own terms to make herself an object for the other any longer.

Implications for Future Research

There are four primary implications for future research that extend from this study. First, and arguably most important due to this study’s focus on neoliberalism and the power of public pedagogy to contest it, is the issue of “net neutrality” and its impact upon the nature of the spectacle. Given the ways in which contemporary digital culture seems to contribute to an equalizing of power relations within the spectacle, it is likely that the issue of net neutrality will determine in the future the extent to which the Internet will remain a powerful tool for the citizenry of photography to counter dominant ideologies. US Internet regulation will most certainly shape the nature of human relations across digital culture. Who and what entities will have the power to shape public opinion, to spin the machinations of political operatives, and in that context, what will happen to the voices of the marginalized? Of those who offer alternative possibilities for a more equitable future? For this reason, it is important to consider the ramifications of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Restoring Internet Freedom Order (Federal Communications Commission, 2017) on the ways in which mass publics interact

---

13 The American Civil Liberties Union (2017) defines net neutrality as the application of “well-established ‘common carrier’ rules to the internet in order to preserve its freedom and openness. Common carriage prohibits the owner of a network that holds itself out to all-comers from discriminating against information by halting, slowing, or otherwise tampering with the transfer of any data (except for legitimate network management purposes such as easing congestion or blocking spam)”
with visual culture to make sense of the social world. Depending on how the courts react to this order and how FCC officials react to present and future challenges to the rule, media companies may be afforded a much larger role in determining which of their clients gain access to certain elements of visual culture, or at minimum, how quickly their clients are able to do so. At worst, this could result in a reemergence of the asymmetrical spectacle, controlled by corporations (Debord) and the political elite (Edelman), giving them far more coercive power and control over the types of images and information that mass publics are able to access. The focus of visual culture on democratizing art, on ensuring that spectators are afforded an equal platform on par with artists and the subjects of the images themselves, in combination with the development and proliferation of digital media, may hang in the balance depending on how the US government decides on this matter. Therefore, future research should attend to and monitor closely the ways in which changes in Internet speeds, access to specific sites, and fees for access, may impact the spectacle in its current form.

Second, as this study focused solely on publicly accessible data, future research might consider the ways in which publicly available news articles and blogs utilizing countervisual images are circulated and discussed across private social media accounts to assess the ways in which private dialogue may differ in any significant way from publicly accessible dialogue. Individuals, in their private social media interactions, are likely to insulate themselves among like-minded individuals with similar worldviews and thus may resist some of the lessons that the heterogeneity of public pedagogy attempts to teach regarding diverse lived experiences. Third, future research may consider using photo elicitation to better understand the link observed in this study between visual culture and various cognitive and embodied forms of learning and public pedagogy. For instance, there may be types of previous knowledge beyond what has been specified in this study (i.e. spiritual, popular culture, and professional) that publics engage in
order to make sense of other images. Likewise, mass publics—the citizenry of photography—may apply the knowledge gleaned from other photographs in ways that differ from those observed in this study. Fourth, policy scholars may wish to attend to photographs in other areas outside of the countervisuality that pertains to issues of race and social control. It will be important for those scholars to assess differences in the patterns and modes of production and circulation of countervisual images and the ways in which public pedagogy may or may not manifest itself in other highly contested policy areas. This is particularly important since constructivist grounded theory is not generalizable to other contexts. Rather, in its focus on theory-building and particularity it produces the beginnings of theory that can be subsequently investigated and tested in other contexts. By attending to these implications, policy scholars and other scholars concerned with the impact of visual culture on mass publics, can continue to investigate the various ways in which images may either promulgate or counter the dominant ideology of state and market and the various forms of policy feedback that enable publics to exert their right to exist in a society that is increasingly more responsive to the needs of a heterogeneous body politic.

Discussion Summary

This chapter has focused on the ways in which the circulation of the countervisual images in this study across digital culture engenders a form of social learning among publics that is consistent with the literature on public pedagogy. This is a unique form of learning, unmediated by experts, and one that does not preclude the involvement of elites and organized interests. Just as they breathe the same air as mass publics and access the same digital culture, they too, are participants in the citizenry of photography. Although digital culture is in no way a utopian cure for societal injustices, it does allow for the emergence of a unique form of policy feedback among mass publics that should be acknowledged and better understood by policy scholars. The
images of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine stand as powerful exemplars in this regard. Just as Mirzoeff (2011) called attention to the ways in which the Cartesian system spawned a call for alternative ways of seeing, noting that “…power always creates resistance…” so it is likely that technology will continue to spawn alternative and more democratic ways of producing and circulating countervisuality, enabling marginalized individuals to continue to assert their right to exist against the necropolitics of state.
CHAPTER SIX:

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between visual culture and public policy via three examples of countervisuality. The images of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine were chosen due to their depictions of state-citizen interactions and the ways in which each act of resistance portrayed in the images implicated previous policies that have shaped contemporary antiracist politics. This study took seriously Lowi’s (1998) notion of the internal Cold War on American communities, which has been shaped by liberal trade policy at federal and multilateral levels of government and social control policies at state and local levels in the areas of welfare and criminal justice. Furthermore, Mirzoeff’s (2011) concept of neovisuality—a type of visuality in which the entity doing the seeing remains unseen (from the “nonplace” of the state of exception), which is associated with the RMA and COIN, and spurred on by the very existence of those who would resist it—emphasized the ways in which the plantation and military-industrial complexes (as well as the imperial complex) linger on in contemporary society disempowering the marginalized through the punitive policies of the state. In Mirzoeff’s view, countervisuality not only resists the neovisuality of the state but it takes place in the context of Mbembe’s (2003) concept of necropolitics wherein the power of the sovereign exerts its right over the citizenry to determine who may live and who must die. Therefore, Mirzoeff conceives of countervisuality not just as the right of an individual or collectivity to look back at the state, to provide a counter to state authority, but as the critical assertion of the right to exist on the part of the marginalized.

Focusing on three types of policy feedback, (1) the activism of Ms. Evans, Ms. Newsome, and Ms. Faustine, (2) the photographed events (i.e. the actual images), and (3) the circulation of those images that engender a form of social learning among mass publics, this
study brought to the fore the ways in which digital culture has impacted the nature of the spectacle as initially conceptualized by Debord (1983) and Edelman (1988).

The literature review emphasized the connections between policy feedback theory, the spectacle, visual culture, Black feminist activism, and critical philosophies of resistance. Pierson’s (1993) articulation of policy feedback theory provided the necessary framework in which to situate Mirzoeff’s (2011) notion of countervisuality. By highlighting the interpretive feedback mechanism within policy feedback theory, connections were drawn between the role of images as stereotypes in shaping citizen deservedness (e.g., Schneider & Ingram, 1993, 1997), in impacting the ways in which publics see themselves through the eyes of the state, and in highlighting the ways in which punitive policies disparately impact communities of color. These in turn shape such factors among publics as political participation and political efficacy.

Furthermore, Edelman’s (1988) and Debord’s (1983) scholarship revealed the ways in which the state and market, through the appropriation of images, shape the beliefs of mass publics who rely on such images to simplify and order the increasingly complex world around them. Literature in visual culture studies revealed parallels in the relationships between (1) art history and visual culture studies’ focus on democratizing spectatorship, on the one hand, and (2) traditional policy theories (with their focus on elites and organized interests) and policy feedback theory’s focus on mass publics, on the other. Just as visual culture sought to refocus the attention of art history from the professional with the “good eye” onto average spectators within the citizenry of photography, so has policy feedback theory refocused the attention of policy scholars from elites and organized interests onto the impact of public policies on mass publics.

Furthermore, connections were drawn between Soss and Schram’s (2007) notion of proximity and visibility, on the one hand, and the concepts of sublime and aura within visual culture, on the other. Issues that are highly visible within public policy, such as welfare and
criminal justice policy, are often the very same issues with which many Americans lack direct experience. Similarly, the very notion of the sublime connotes a necessary distance from some awe-inspiring phenomena that threatens to overtake the spectator should she find herself too close to it for her own good. Aura, in contrast, necessitates proximity and direct experience with a phenomenon. In the case of public policy, this direct experience is that which derives from intimate interactions with the policies of the state. Wedged between these two themes of visibility/sublime and proximity/aura is Wilderson’s (2010) notion of the ontological aporia, which exists between the political ontology of the citizen, the fully human political subject as set forth by the Founding Fathers, and that of the lived experience of Blackness, of Black being “in the wake” (Sharpe, 2016), that often connotes inhumanity.

As Black feminist scholarship revealed, the aporia is further complicated by the experiences of Black women who are often sacrificed in the “in-between” of feminist and antiracist activism. That is, within antiracism circles, Black women often must set aside their feminist concerns in favor of racial ones. Conversely, within feminist circles, Black women are often asked to deprioritize racial concerns in favor of feminist ones. As Crenshaw’s (1991) concept of intersectionality makes clear, this “either-or” approach to race and gender issues must be supplanted by a “both-and” approach to bring to the fore of racial and feminist dialogue the unique predicament of women of color in American society and across the diaspora. Harris-Perry’s (2011) notion of the crooked room provided a metaphor for Black women’s suffering via the impact that stereotypes such as “the mammy,” “the matriarch,” and “the jezebel” have on the lived experiences of Black women as they go about their lives and attempt to resist them. This is one way in which the state, as Mirzoeff (2011) notes, exerts “visuality’s authority.” Therefore, resistance in the form of wake work (Sharpe, 2016) and dark sousveillance (Browne, 2015) provide a methodology of sorts for Black women’s “looking back” at the state, a refusal to look
away from injustice, and for contesting universalism with the particularity of their own lived experiences. In this way, Black feminist scholars may contest who and what is believed about Black women’s lived experience, and as Patrisse Khan-Cullors’ account revealed, they may contest on semantic grounds the very definitions of democracy and terrorism that recent changes in military strategy, as exemplified by COIN, have brought to the fore of public dialogue in the West.

Various critical philosophies of resistance were highlighted from members of the Frankfurt School, contemporary critical race theorists, and Afro-pessimist philosophers. The critical theoretical matrix presented in Chapter Two and discussed further in Chapter Five was derived from (1) a review of Adorno’s (2007/1973) negative dialectics, (2) Peller’s (1995) critique of race neutrality, and (3) Afro-pessimism’s critique of the Hegelian slave-master dialectic and embrace of Sartre’s (1956) philosophy on good faith and consciousness (Gordon, 1995; More, 2015). The purpose of the matrix was to draw comparisons between the ways in which beings relate to self and others and to the material world, sometimes reaping the very antithesis of what they set out to achieve. Indeed, Adorno’s theory of negative dialectics is instructive in explaining, in the tradition of policy feedback theory as outlined by Pierson (1993) and others, how certain policies at one time may reap unforeseen politics at a subsequent time. Likewise, in accordance with the social construction of target groups as outlined by Schneider and Ingram (1993, 1997), the assumptions and socially constructed images that elites make of target groups often results in a form of bad faith—in the supplanting and objectification of an individual or collectivity’s particularity and consciousness with that of dominant group consciousness. This often occurs, as Fricker (2013) points out, when the accounts and experiences of minorities—the particularity of their lived experiences—are invalidated by those in power.
After reverse searching the photographs through Google Images using the Chrome web browser and collecting a sample of news articles, blogs, and social media postings that utilized the images, constructivist grounded theory was used to code and analyze the data, providing a theoretical model of the ways in which citizens in the citizenry of photography (Azoulay, 2008) make meaning from images of countervisuality. The findings revealed the ways in which the actions of citizens around these images represented a unique form of social learning—that of public pedagogy. Data was coded into nine categories, comprising three classes: (1) that of orienting the image in terms of lived experience, current events, and history; (2) that of sense-making by connecting novel information associated with the image to individuals’ previous knowledge of God and spirit, popular culture, and to professional/academic forms of knowledge; and (3) that of applying learned information to create change in civil society, in politics, and in business. The tenth category—that of icon-making, in which the photograph becomes an iconographic representation of a political moment of time that no longer requires language to explain—occurred within and across these processes of orienting, sense-making, and applying.

These processes identified in the data were instructive in addressing the research questions. For question one (How does the visual culture represented by these three photographs impact spectator’s perceptions of self, citizenship, nation, and government?), it became clear that the impact of the photographs on these perceptions hinges on the extent to which spectators are able to engage in the processes of orientation, sense-making, and applying. The processes of orientation and sense-making are particularly integral as are engaging in dialogue with others around the photographs. Connecting one’s lived experience with those of others and with current events and the historical record and reflecting on these interrelations allows one to situate one’s self, citizenship, nation, and government in terms of the policy maze (Heclo, 1974/2010).
latent conflict surfaces, citizens are able to clarify where they stand as well as the meanings they impute to government actors and various policy decisions.

With regards to question two (In what ways does countervisuality shape policy preferences?), it seems that the images in this study allowed for the emergence of latent conflict, a time for citizens in the citizenry of photography to reflect on and articulate their views on the “maze” of policy problems and solutions. As the nature of the spectacle seems to have changed, becoming far more democratized since the writings of Debord (1983) and Edelman (1988), elites do not seem to have as much power over citizens’ policy preferences—at least as observed in this study. Rather, the findings indicated that publics’ engagement with the photographs and the diverse experiences reflected in the heterogeneity of the spectacle leads to a multiplicity of ideas that come to the surface through dialogue and debate. The extent to which policy preferences are shaped by countervisuality seems to be dependent on how citizens engage in the processes of orienting, sense-making, and applying, and do so in relation to others. Likewise, these relations with others in the citizenry of photography and the processes of orienting, sense-making, and applying are as highly personal as they are collective and thus colored by individual’s lived experiences.

For question three (What are the implications of countervisuality for the aporia between Black lived experience and the political ontology set forth by the Founding Fathers?), it became clear during the analysis that the chasm between visibility/sublime and proximity/aura seemed to dissipate as the power relations within the spectacle seem to be more democratized and heterogeneous than originally theorized. This allows for diverse citizens to make their lived experiences more proximal to others as they engage in collective learning around the images. In so doing, they are able to fill in the blank to Azoulay’s (2012) “This is like ____ .” The heterogeneity of digital culture does not ameliorate the aporia because the aporia is structural and
it has been historically and socially constructed through public law. However, it does seem to allow for the intimate sharing of lived experiences that in other contexts might not be readily accessible to distant publics who have no other point of reference for those experiences. Lived experience is very much colored by demographics. Thus, in answer to question four (In what ways are citizen perceptions and meaning-making processes shaped by race, class, gender, and sexuality?), race, class, gender, and sexuality seem to shape the ways in which people orient themselves to the photographs, make sense of them in terms of previous knowledge, and apply them in civil society, state, or market. They reflect, whether, for example, one sees the image of Ms. Newsome as a call to take a stand against racist oppression or as a threat to one’s southern heritage.

The concept of public pedagogy as a form of social learning (Hall, 1993; Heclo, 1974/2010) has the potential to fill a gap in the literature where a learning mechanism for mass publics as an interpretive form of policy feedback remains unspecified. In contrast to critical and visual culture theorists who advocate the university as the focal point from which the public may receive a critical democratic education capable of dismantling the dominant ideologies (i.e. neoliberalism and neoconservatism) of state and market, public pedagogy is a naturally occurring phenomenon whereby individuals and collectivities learn unmediated by formal instructors and set curricula. Like Azoulay (2008) theorized the open-endedness of the photograph, public pedagogy, too, is open-ended and continually (re)negotiated among publics trying to make sense of the world around them.

Importantly, the findings also revealed the ways in which the spectacle seems to have been altered by the technology associated with digital culture. No longer does the spectacle seem to be a monolithic entity in which power, images, and information flow in one direction from elites to spectators who lack the agency to resist the dominant visuality of state and market.
Rather, the digital culture examined within this study has revealed relations between publics and elites that are more lateral and democratized. In this way, the heterogeneity of the web and the range of alternative voices and perspectives exemplified by the data in this study, are far more capable of countering the dominant ideologies of state and market than was the case in Debord and Edelman’s accounts of the spectacle. Although, as previously stated, the Internet is no utopian cure for the social and political problems of the day, it does allow for publics to overcome the chasm present between visibility/sublime and proximity/aura in ways that allow individuals and collectivities, through public pedagogy, to connect together a multiplicity of views and lived experiences and to make these experiences proximal to dominant groups.

The implications of this study for future research are fourfold: (1) that scholars should monitor the impact of the FCC’s stance on net neutrality on the nature of the spectacle as evidenced by relations between publics across digital culture; (2) that scholars may want to study the sharing of public data across private social network accounts such as Facebook to better understand how such relations shape, constrain, or support public pedagogy in relation to visual culture; (3) that scholars may wish to consider methods of photo elicitation to better understand and perhaps further specify the ways in which the circulation of images may or may not engender public pedagogy; and (4) scholars may wish to focus on images that relate to policy areas outside of race and social control and to determine whether public pedagogy occurs in these areas and, if so, to what extent it differs from the patterns observed in this study.

Importantly, this study revealed the ways in which marginalized publics, in engaging in the production and circulation of countervisuality, refuse the politics of acquiescence inherent in both Debord and Edelman’s notions of the spectacle as well as in the Hegelian slave-master dialectic, and engage in Sartre’s (1956) concept of good faith by refusing to flee from what one is or what society has made out of one’s life. Indeed, the subjects in the photographs, the énoncé
that issues the emergency claim (Azoulay, 2008, 2012) for racial justice refuses to look away from the state, from previous policies that have shaped the current landscape of antiracist protest, and from the alternative and future possibilities inherent in the dialogue and meaning-making processes surrounding the circulation of antiracist imagery.

Scholars of public policy, in the tradition of Murray Edelman, would do well to take visual culture seriously in the future to better understand how visual images, as produced and circulated among the citizenry of photography, impact upon mass publics, how they may initiate social learning in the form of public pedagogy, and how they may shape the very nature of public response to, support for, and contestation of particular policy decisions and state actions. Likewise, policy actors and bureaucratic elites may benefit from tracing the kinds of countervisual images circulated among mass publics back to previous policies, even and especially when such political outcomes were unintended by state actors. By paying specific attention to the relationship between policies at one time and the subsequent countervisuality that emerges in the wake of those decisions, scholars may gain new insight into the ways in which mass publics contest perceived injustices of previous policy decisions, refuse to look away from them, and assert their right to exist and resist “visuality’s authority” as exerted by state and market actors.
When I defended my research prospectus for this study on three photographs of antiracist resistance (i.e. countervisuality), my dissertation committee presented me with a deceptively simple question: Why these photographs? The short answer is because I believe that each one on its own depicts powerful state-citizen interactions and contestations of public policy in the form of what scholars often refer to as policy feedback. The longer answer is that these acts of resistance appealed to me in the sense that Black women have historically been the recipients of both racism and misogyny, a defacto lower caste in American society—yet through these acts of resistance, and contemporary antiracist praxis, women like Ieshia Evans, Bree Newsome, and Nona Faustine are managing to make their voices heard and their bodies seen in public spaces. From a scholarly perspective, I find these images intriguing and telling of our times. The online discussions surrounding them, the ways in which people make meaning of these photographs, have much to tell us in the academic community about how mass publics engage in meaning-making practices in our highly visual culture. On a personal note, I feel empowered by these images, as they depict the best of what I feel Black women have to offer American (and global) society: creativity, vision, leadership, intellectually informed praxis, and love—love for Black people and love for all of humanity in envisioning for the future a more just and equitable society.

My dissertation research sits at the nexus of my own subjectivity and lived experience as a biracial woman who identifies as Black and my intellectual curiosity as a policy scholar. Undoubtedly, these attributes of myself are intricately woven together. As I know other scholars of color who have gone before me have already expressed much more eloquently, when I enter the academy, I can neither leave my blackness or my woman-ness, nor my lived experiences as a Black woman, at the door. Likewise, when I come home to my family, check social media, or
read a news article online, the academic in me follows inquisitively along, posing questions, such as those explored in this dissertation, about what I see and read, how I raise my children, where I shop, the images I encounter on a daily basis, the God I worship, and the people with whom I interact. All these actions and interactions, as a woman and a scholar, are part and parcel of the interpretivist perspective, and have led me headlong, critically aware of my own biases and those of others, into this explorative study. Throughout my dissertation research I have remained committed to a praxis of self-reflexivity. As Cunliffe and Jun (2005) explain:

> Self-reflexive individuals become aware of the limits of their own knowledge and institutional practices…. They critically examine the underlying assumptions of normalized policies, programs, and regulations and try to understand why such policies might marginalize groups or make meeting clients’ needs impossible. (pp. 232-233)

Such awareness comprises an open-ended, ongoing process of interrogating my personal beliefs and suppositions even as I question the underlying assumptions of previous policies and the actions of political elites who have undoubtedly shaped the nature of contemporary racial politics and antiracist protest. Following Panofsky (1982), I realize that my intuition and my “Weltanschauung,” though they may account for what initially attracted me to these three photographs, are necessary but not sufficient conditions for the iconological analysis engaged in this dissertation and, as such, they must be continually checked against the historical record, i.e. the various historical conditions, political and social, that have led to this moment in time.

Perhaps what is most shocking to me is that I found myself as I read the historical account of Taylor (2016), and the formative years leading to the Black Lives Matter movement, realizing how my development as a critical qualitative researcher, a scholar, and as a feminist segued with that of the rise of contemporary antiracist activism. My first encounters with Black feminist theory occurred when I was a master’s degree student in the Human Relations program at The University of Oklahoma, in the aftermath of the death of Trayvon Martin, the acquittal of
Martin Zimmerman, and as protesters were taking to the streets across the country and around the world in the Occupy movement. As I began to read bell hooks, Patricia Hill Collins, Audre Lorde, Kimberlé Crenshaw, and Angela Davis, I found myself, my pain, and my struggles expressed on paper more beautifully than I think I could have ever articulated myself. I realized that there were many times in my life when I had lacked the right words (as have many women before me), the right framework, what Amanda Fricker (2007) might call the “hermeneutical lens” to make sense of my lived experiences. Finally, I came home to myself. I found my physical, social, spiritual, and psychic body at the intersections of race, gender, and class – a place where the bodies of women of color are often violated and treated as refuse, subject to others’ judgment and misogynoir, sometimes by individuals (collectively or one-on-one), and sometimes by the ubiquitous entity we often refer to as “the state,” in the form of public policy. Put simply, my engagement with the aforementioned scholarship culminated during my dissertation research in a lifting of the “hermeneutical darkness,” which I felt had engulfed me for most of my life (Fricker, 2007, p. 179).

This is my story and this is where they intersect with the historical record. As I believe my research has shown, the intersection of subjective lived experience, that is, one’s personal history, with that of formally documented history (either by professional historians or the occasional bystander or participant in history-making activity), is one of the most critical ways in which individuals and, indeed, communities, have of making sense of the world around us, of learning about politics and culture, and somehow managing to find meaning in all of the mayhem that human experience entails. Thus, I began my dissertation research at the juncture between lived experience and what I felt at the onset of this study was a dire need for a scholarly inquiry into contemporary antiracist activism through the lenses of policy feedback theory, visual culture, and theories of Afro-pessimism and Black feminist resistance.
Only upon completion of this study did I realize that my pattern of interaction with the images of Ieshia Evans, Bree Newsome, and Nona Faustine followed the process that I laid out in the findings and discussion chapters of this study: I oriented myself to the images in terms of my lived experience as a scholar of color, the current events in the wake of the American Spring, the antiracist activism of Black Lives Matter, and the history of Black women’s marginalization and exploitation in American culture and throughout the diaspora. When I selected these images to use as the focus of my dissertation research, I made sense of them in terms of my previously learned academic knowledge in the areas of public policy, visual culture, Black feminist intellectual work, and critical philosophies of resistance. Finally, I applied my knowledge in the realm of politics and policy with the intention of producing a critical interpretive study exploring the relationship between public policy and visual culture by way of Mirzoeff’s (2011) concept of countervisuality. As a qualitative researcher, I chose to use Charmaz’s (2014) constructivist grounded theory because I wanted to focus on these images and the news articles, blogs, and social media that utilized them, in context. I was neither interested in applying quantitative methods to my data nor in trying to isolate causal mechanisms between previous policies and the photographed events as depicted in the images. It is not that I felt such an endeavor was not worthwhile, only that I simply believed that there was a story to be told here—one that must be told through language rather than statistical analyses.

In academic life, it seems, we constantly straddle the perceived divide between theory and practice and the concomitant conflict between theoretical parsimony and the seemingly random and chaotic reality of lived experience. When it comes to race and social policy, we must remember that context matters. Theoretical parsimony often means the loss of context, and the loss of context can make the difference between isolating the individual (much as one would
variable) as the cause of her suffering or viewing the individual in the context of her suffering. Here, I encourage the reader to recall Harris-Perry’s (2011) reference to the crooked room.

Devoid of context, an individual standing in such a room appears deficient: What is wrong with this person? Why can’t she just stand up? Conversely, by panning out and considering the context – the structure of the room along with the person – the answer becomes clear: Nothing may be wrong with the person who appears incapable of standing upright. She is likely no more fallible than any other person, of any other race, gender, class or ability. However, something most certainly is wrong with the room in which she finds herself. Through parsimony, we often come to see the individual as the problem. Through context, we realize that we must work together in good faith to rebuild the room on more equitable grounds.

In many ways, this dissertation was my own countervisual to the spectacle, to all of the misogyny and racism embedded in American culture and throughout the diaspora, and an articulation of my right to exist on my own terms as critical-qualitative policy scholar, as a mother, as a woman of color, as a feminist, etc., who believes that the best of democracy has yet to be realized in this country. In this way, my dissertation is a form of policy feedback in its own right. As a member of the citizenry of photography, I too, exclaim “This is like…” when I see images of Black women standing and taking a stand, women like Ieshia Evans, Bree Newsome, and Nona Faustine, standing in and despite the crooked room. I say, “This is like…” Browne’s (2015) “dark sousveillance,” and “This is like…” living in the wake, in the “afterlife” of slavery (Sharpe, 2016), and, finally, “This is like…” my favorite stanza in Aimé Césaire’s (1979/2001) Notebook of a Return to the Native Land (p. 48):

- standing under the sun
- standing in the blood
- standing
- and
free
standing and no longer a poor madwoman in its maritime
freedom and destitution gyrating in perfect drift
and there it is:
most unexpectedly standing
standing in the rigging
standing at the tiller
standing at the compass
standing at the map
standing under the stars

standing
and
free
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APPENDIX I

DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

Afro-Pessimism A branch of philosophical and cultural inquiry that theorizes a structurally antagonistic relationship between blackness and humanity (Dumas, 2013).

American Paternalism The historical tendency in American public policy to mete out policy benefits based on the good (desired) behavior of the target population rather than need alone (Soss, Fording, & Schram, 2011a).

American Spring A period of awakening in the US, heavily influenced by the Arab Spring, in which activists began calling for direct democracy and redress for structural economic and racial inequalities, and which Taylor (2016) identifies with three events: (1) the State of Georgia’s execution of Troy Davis, (2) the organization of Black Occupy activists, and (3) the murder of Trayvon Martin and subsequent acquittal of Martin Zimmerman.

Aura The sensual experience of being present with a work of art. Benjamin (1968) believed this was lost with the mass reproduction of photographs and with the advent of Hollywood cinema.

Bad faith The denial of the ambiguous ontological status of a human being as both object and subject. Sartre (1956) articulated two primary forms of bad faith: masochism (making oneself an object for another outside of consensual sexual play) and sadism (the denial or occlusion of another’s subjectivity). Africana existentialist philosophers use this term in reference to various forms of racism.

Citizenry of photography Any person who may, at any given time, become the subject, spectator, or photographer in relation to a visual image; membership in the citizenry of photography is irrespective of the status of one’s political citizenship and the physical borders of the state in which one resides. A term intended to be broader in scope than political citizenship.

Cognition of nonidentity A term that extends from Adorno’s (1973/2007) *Negative Dialectics*. It refuses the logical positivist approach to object definition in which a concept powers over the object it seeks
DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS (CONTINUED)

to define. It endeavors to define objects according to what they are not. In this way, the concept associates laterally (rather than hierarchically) with the object and in so doing it accounts for the various heterogeneous ways in which the object may manifest.

**Countervisuality**
According to Mirzoeff (2011), a form of visual culture that encompasses practices among minorities of contesting dominant ways of seeing and picturing, usually by asserting “the right to look” in places and at times when that right is denied.

**Crooked room**
A metaphor that Harris-Perry (2011) utilizes to explain the impact of the shame and misrecognition associated with stereotypes of Black women in policy and in the media on Black women themselves.

**Daguerreotype**
An early predecessor of the modern camera, created in the 1830s simultaneously by Hippolyte Bayard in France and Fox Talbot in Britain (Mirzoeff, 1999).

**Dark sousveillance**
According to Browne (2015), processes of “chart[ing] possibilities and coordinat[ing] modes of responding to, challenging, and confronting surveillance that was almost all-encompassing,” also, “the use of a keen and experiential insight of plantation surveillance in order to resist it” (pp. 21-22).

**Distant-visible policy**
A type of policy that is highly salient in public discourse but one with which most Americans have little personal experience. This term extends from a model proposed by Soss and Schram (2007). Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) is an example of a distant-visible policy.

**énoncé**
The representation of the “I” (the subject) in the photograph as compared to the flesh and blood “I” (the actual person) on the scene of the photographic event who consents (theoretically, at least), in the context of the citizenry of photography at least, to being photographed. Extends from the analysis of Azoulay (2008).

**Epistemic objectification**
A form of testimonial injustice in which the speaker (i.e. informant) is objectified or undermined by a hearer (Fricker, 2007, p. 133).

**Event of photography**
The interaction between the photographer, the photographed, and the spectators at the site where the photograph is taken. This event is always a possibility in
DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS (CONTINUED)

contemporary society even when cameras are not apparent to participants (Azoulay, 2008).

**Good faith**
According to Sartre (1956) and subsequent Africana existential theorists, this is the recognition of one’s own subjectivity and humanity as well as that of others. The realization that human beings are an ambiguous mix of subject and object. It is a refusal to engage in the sadist practice of objectifying the other and the masochist practice of objectifying the self.

**Identitarian thinking**
A term that extends from Adorno’s (1973/2007) *Negative Dialectics*. It is a form of hierarchal thinking associated logical positivism in which the concept of an object powers over the object itself. The concept is so closely defined that it does not allow for the expression or manifestation of the object’s inherent or potential heterogeneity.

**Interpretive mechanism**
One of two policy feedback mechanisms posited by Pierson (1993). The interpretive mechanism encompasses the subjective and psychological dimensions of policy learning (for government elites and interest groups) and policy visibility and traceability (for interest groups and mass publics). Compare with the resources and incentives mechanism.

**Irreversible time**
Universalized time that is made to seem “given” when in fact it is constructed in the interests of the market (Debord, 1983).

**Liminality**
Refers to Patterson’s (1982) reference to the ontology of the slave as both socially dead (marginalized and outside the sphere of social relations within society) and as “essential for [society’s] survival” (p. 46)

**Lock-in effects**
The extent to which the likelihood that alternatives to a policy will be adopted declines over time as that policy becomes routinized in and through the institutions of government and society. Endogenous elements to public policy that can engender positive feedback after a policy is enacted (Jordan & Matt, 2014).

**Necropolitics**
The sovereign’s “power and the capacity to dictate who may live and who must die” (Mbembe, 2003, p. 11).

**Neoconservatism**
An ideology that supports class hierarchy and capitalizes on neoliberalism’s contradictions by offering solutions for its
DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS (CONTINUED)

Predicaments based on law and order as well as moral conduct (Harvey, 2005). See neoliberal ideology.

Neoliberal ideology A widespread belief that “the social good will be maximized by maximizing the reach and frequency of market transactions,” and therefore “seeks to bring all human action into the domain of the market” (Harvey, 2005, p. 3).

Neovisuality A form of post-panoptic visuality associated with the revolution in military affairs (RMA) where the one doing the watching (i.e. the state) remains unseen in relation to the one being watched (i.e. mass publics) (Mirzoeff, 2011).

Net neutrality According the American Civil Liberties Union (2017), “[n]etwork neutrality means applying well-established ‘common carrier’ rules to the internet in order to preserve its freedom and openness. Common carriage prohibits the owner of a network that holds itself out to all-comers from discriminating against information by halting, slowing, or otherwise tampering with the transfer of any data (except for legitimate network management purposes such as easing congestion or blocking spam).”

Overdetermination thesis The thesis in Afro-Pessimism that Black individuals are determined from the outside, i.e. by their skin color. The idea that where there is one Black individual there exists too many and that one black person, as such, may be capable of representing an entire race.

Perspectivism A visual system based on the idea that there was only one way of seeing. A device that created paintings based on the “idea of symmetrical visual pyramids or cones with one of their apexes the receding vanishing or centric point in the painting, the other the eye of the painter or the beholder” (Jay, 1998).

Phobogenic Franz Fanon’s (2008) argument that the Black individual constitutes an object that evokes an irrational fear in the other. This supports the overdetermination thesis of Afro-Pessimism.

Photographed event The event captured by the camera (Azoulay, 2008).

Policy feedback Following Pierson (1993) and Mettler and Soss (2004), for the purpose of this study, policy feedback is defined as the form, quality, and extent of citizen participation in political and civic life, which is implicitly impacted by material resources and informed by the subjective interpretations and
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Social meanings imputed to government actors by citizens in the wake of new public policies or changes to existing policies through legislative, executive, or judicial action.

**Political ontology**
Individual and collective understandings of self and citizenship as situated in the world and as communicated both symbolically and materially by and through public policy.

**Political spectacle**
A mirage of images, constructed by dominant political actors, of policy problems (for which ready-made solutions are available), leaders, and enemies (Edelman, 1985). An overtaking of reality by appearances (Debord, 1983).

**Professional gaze**
A way of looking that is based on one’s professional expertise in the judgment of a work of art, also known as “the good eye” (Azoulay, 2012, p. 46; Rose, 2016, p. 57).

**Proximity**
The extent to which an individual has personal experience with a policy issue (See Soss and Schram, 2007).

**Punitive turn**
The use of sanctions in public policy, especially those used in criminal justice and poverty policies; associated with neoliberal ideology and neoconservatism.

**Public pedagogy**
A mode of learning defined by Sandlin, Schutz, and Burdock (2010) as the “spaces, sites, and languages of education and learning that exist outside the walls of the institution of schools” and which “are just as crucial…to our understanding of the development of identities and social formations as the teaching that goes on within the classroom” (p. 1).

**Resources and incentives mechanism**
One of two policy feedback mechanisms posited by Pierson (1993). The material benefits to government actors within public agencies, to interest groups, and to mass publics, which impact the relative power a group has as well as the level of access, ability to organize, and other benefits that may affect participation in policymaking and political bargaining. Compare with the interpretive mechanism.

**Reverse image search**
A means of searching the web for an image by uploading or dragging and dropping that image into the search field of an image search engine, such as Google Images, to retrieve links to sites that have used that image (or like images) in some fashion.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revolution in military affairs (RMA)</td>
<td>The RMA refers to a revision in US military strategy due to the technological advances of the digital age. It departs significantly from the classic warfare strategies of Karl von Clausewitz (1730-18310) and embraces a deception-based military strategy more in keeping with Lao Tzu’s <em>Art of War</em> (Mazzar, 1994).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublime</td>
<td>“The pleasurable experience in representation of that which would be painful or terrifying in reality, leading to a realization of the limits of the human and the power of nature” (Mirzoeff, 1998).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimonial injustice</td>
<td>A term used by Fricker (2007) to refer to the ways in which an informant is treated as “a source of information” (i.e. an object) rather than as a person capable of testifying to a matter (p. 133).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>The salience of a policy issue in public discourse regardless of the public’s personal experience with it (Soss &amp; Schram, 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility and traceability</td>
<td>The extent to which a public policy is evident to the public and can be traced back to its origins or a sponsoring individual (Pierson, 1993).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visuality</td>
<td>A means of picturing, or envisioning, phenomena (beyond the capability of the body’s physiological/neurological systems). Visuality has its origins in bureaucratic and military history (as in the need to visualize a battlefield to large too large for the naked eye to capture in its entirety) and in the scholarship of conservative historian, Thomas Carlyle (Mirzoeff, 2011).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II

INDUCTIVE CODING SHEET

1. **Current events**
   a. Describing the scene of a recent event or series of events using secondhand information.
   b. Contextualizing a recent event by linking it to other events or ideas.
   c. Inferring and/or explicating relationships between a recent event or series of events or ideas.

2. **Lived experience**
   a. Describing or summarizing by *speaking for* someone or something
   b. Narrating by *speaking from* one’s own experience
   c. Quoting, summarizing, or describing the sentiments of another in effort to let them *speak for* themselves

3. **History**
   a. Comparing or connecting imagery or written/spoken language with a historical event or series of events
   b. Providing historical background on a particular topic (e.g., policing, slavery, etc.)
   c. Remembering or drawing attention to history (personal or otherwise)

4. **Popular culture**
   a. Comparing or connecting an image or written language with pop culture (“This is like…”)
   b. Critiquing pop culture
   c. Refusing to be sidetracked by pop culture
   d. Describing current trends in pop culture
   e. Referencing celebrity opinions
   f. Purposefully engaging pop culture in effort to critique or praise a person, group, or event
   g. Engaging in the creation of memes/mimicry

5. **Politics and/or policy issues**
   a. Identifying relationships between various issues.
b. Articulating, explicating, and/or quoting the political opinions or policy preferences of self or other (person, organization, or the state).

c. Questioning the political opinions or policy preferences of others (person, organization, or the state).

d. Describing the current political landscape surrounding one or more policy issues.

6. Advocacy
   a. Quoting, referencing, or summarizing the positions of individuals (self or other) or groups who organize and advocate for a particular issue
   b. Providing a rationale or endeavoring to make sense of the behavior of self or other regarding a particular issue (e.g., “I/They did this because…”)
   c. Critiquing or questioning a person, group, or the state itself (includes ad hominem attacks and other logical fallacies)
   d. Drawing on metaphors or images to advocate a particular position
   e. Issuing a call to action, explicating the reasoning behind issuing one, describing a felt sense of responding to one

7. Professional and academic knowledge
   a. Explaining or referencing academic or professionalized knowledge through summary or direct quote
   b. Appealing to authority to substantiate one’s claims or the claims of another
   c. Critiquing academic or professionalized knowledge

8. God or mind/body/spirit practices
   a. Speaking for or on behalf of one’s God (e.g., “God says…”)
   b. Justifying one’s actions or those of another as the will of God (e.g., “I did this because God says…”), including giving praise to God for what self or other has done.
   c. Critiquing one’s actions or those of another as going against the will of God and/or presuming to know what God thinks or feels about an issue
   d. Connecting beliefs about God or Spirit to recent or past events depicted through image or written language
   e. Quoting scripture or conducting biblical exegesis
   f. Turning to God, placing one’s hope in a deity.

9. Art and Photography
a. Describing or deconstructing the composition of an image or set of images
b. Awarding, praising, critiquing, or referencing an image or the creator/curator of an image
c. Applying professionalized knowledge to an image or work of art
d. Articulating best practices
e. Comparing a work of art (written or visual) with another image
f. Referencing the processes of creating the image or series of images

10. Marketing
   a. Critiquing the marketing style of a company either directly or through satire
   b. Apologizing for a marketing mistake
   c. Articulating lessons learned
### APPENDIX III

#### IESHIA EVANS DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>In-Text Citation</th>
<th>Media Type</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/10/16</td>
<td>(Sterbenz, 2016a)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1b, 5a, 5b, 6a, 7a,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/10/16</td>
<td>(Absurd Beats, 2016)</td>
<td>Single user blog</td>
<td>1c, 4c, 3a (comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/10/16</td>
<td>(Khan, 2016)</td>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/10/16</td>
<td>(Pharyngula, 2016)</td>
<td>Single user blog</td>
<td>6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/10/16</td>
<td>(Cole, 2016)</td>
<td>Multi-user blog</td>
<td>4a, 2a (comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/10/16</td>
<td>(Huges07.1, 2016)</td>
<td>Online forum - gaming and entertainment website: IGN</td>
<td>6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/16</td>
<td>(Jenkins, 2016)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2a, 2c, 8a, 9a,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/16</td>
<td>(Aadan, 2016)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>2a, 2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/16</td>
<td>(SuperSelected, 2016)</td>
<td>Single user blog</td>
<td>2a, 2c, 3a, 8b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>In-Text Citation</th>
<th>Media Type</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/11/16</td>
<td>(Searle, 2016)</td>
<td>Single user blog</td>
<td>1c, 2b, 3b, 4a, 5a, 5b,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/16</td>
<td>(Murphy, 2016)</td>
<td>Multi-user blog</td>
<td>9a, 9b, 9c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/16</td>
<td>(Julia, 2016)</td>
<td>Multi-user blog</td>
<td>4a, 6a, 6c, 8a, 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/16</td>
<td>(Williams, 2016)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/16</td>
<td>(Traveler at the Edge &amp; Drye,</td>
<td>Single user blog</td>
<td>3a, 3b, 6b, 6c, 7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/16</td>
<td>(Graves, 2016)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>2a, 2c, 9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/16</td>
<td>(Enlow, 2016)</td>
<td>Multi-user blog</td>
<td>3a, 9c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/16</td>
<td>(Logical Meme, 2016)</td>
<td>Single user blog</td>
<td>6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/16</td>
<td>(Outlaw, 2016)</td>
<td>Single user blog</td>
<td>2a, 2b, 2c, 8a, 8b, 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/16</td>
<td>(Tate, 2016)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>2a, 2c, 8b, 9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>In-Text Citation</td>
<td>Media Type</td>
<td>Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/16</td>
<td>(Quirk, 2016)</td>
<td>Multi-user blog</td>
<td>1a, 2a, 2b, 2c, 6b, 9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/16</td>
<td>(Drabinski, 2016)</td>
<td>Single user blog</td>
<td>1b, 2b, 6b, 6c, 9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/16</td>
<td>(Pollack, 2016)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1a, 2b, 3b, 5a, 5b, 6a,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/16</td>
<td>(WITW Staff, 2016)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1b, 2c, 9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/13/16</td>
<td>(Armstrong, 2016)</td>
<td>News media (Nonprofit)</td>
<td>1a, 2a, 3b, 5b, 5d, 6a,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/13/16</td>
<td>(Greco, 2016)</td>
<td>Single user blog</td>
<td>9a, 9c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/13/16</td>
<td>(Sketchuniverse, 2016)</td>
<td>Single user blog</td>
<td>3b, 6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/14/16</td>
<td>(Ball, 2016)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>7a, 7c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/15/16</td>
<td>(Blay, 2016)</td>
<td>Multi-user blog</td>
<td>2c, 9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/16/16</td>
<td>(Powell, 2016)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>In-Text Citation</td>
<td>Media Type</td>
<td>Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/16/16</td>
<td>(Smarsh, 2016)</td>
<td>News media (Nonprofit)</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3b, 4d, 5a, 7b, 8d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/18/16</td>
<td>(Friedman, 2016)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1a, 3a, 4b, 9a, 9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/16</td>
<td>(Budd, 2016)</td>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>2c, 3b, 5b, 5c, 6a, 6c, 9a, 9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/25/16</td>
<td>(Sterbenz, 2016b)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1a, 5d, 6a, 6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/22/16</td>
<td>(BBC, 2016)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>(Reuters, 2016)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1b, 2a, 2c, 9b, 9f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/24/16</td>
<td>(GK86, 2016)</td>
<td>Gamer site</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/26/16</td>
<td>(Rediff.com, 2016)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/27/16</td>
<td>(Peters, 2016)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1b, 2a, 2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/16</td>
<td>(Tapp, 2016)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2a, 6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>In-Text Citation</td>
<td>Media Type</td>
<td>Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/13/17</td>
<td>(Phmuseum, 2017)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1b, 9a, 9c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/22/17</td>
<td>(Amnesty International, 2017)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 6b, 6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/22/17</td>
<td>(Buppert, 2017)</td>
<td>Single user blog</td>
<td>1b, 2b, 3a, 5b, 6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/04/17</td>
<td>(Lubin, 2017)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1a, 4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/04/17</td>
<td>(Payton, T. 2017)</td>
<td>Multi-user blog</td>
<td>1a, 2b, 4b, 10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05/17</td>
<td>(Snarly, 2017)</td>
<td>Multi-user blog</td>
<td>2a, 2b, 10a, 10b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/17</td>
<td>(Williams, 2017)</td>
<td>Single user blog</td>
<td>1b, 4b, 10a, 10b, 10c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/17</td>
<td>(The Wire, 2017)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1b, 3a, 4b, 10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/17</td>
<td>(The Telegraph, 2017)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/17</td>
<td>(Edible, 2017)</td>
<td>Corporate blog</td>
<td>2a, 10a, 10c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>In-Text Citation</td>
<td>Media Type</td>
<td>Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/18/17</td>
<td>(Baird, 2017)</td>
<td>Single user blog</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>(Girltalk HQ, 2017)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1b, 2a, 3a, 6a,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/02/17</td>
<td>(Laughland, 2017)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 5d, 6a, 6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/04/17</td>
<td>(Kinstler, 2017)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2c, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/17</td>
<td>(Whack, 2017)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1b, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 6a, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/10/17</td>
<td>(Payton, C. 2017)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1a, 6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/17</td>
<td>(Bate, 2017)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1b, 9a, 9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td>(War Resisters League, n.d.)</td>
<td>Corporate blog</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2c, 6a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX IV

**BREE NEWSOME DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>In-Text Citation</th>
<th>Media Type</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/19/09</td>
<td>(Short, 2009)</td>
<td>Multi-User Blog</td>
<td>6a, 8e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/15</td>
<td>(Adams, 2015, June 27)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/15</td>
<td>(Blidner &amp; Hensley, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2c, 5b, 6b, 8a, 8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/15</td>
<td>(Charky, 2015)</td>
<td>Multi-User Blog</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 3a, 4e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/15</td>
<td>(Mardoll, 2015)</td>
<td>Single-User Blog</td>
<td>1a, 2b (comments), 9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/15</td>
<td>(Edwards, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 3a, 3b (comments), 6a, 6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/15</td>
<td>(Simply Wholly, 2015)</td>
<td>Single-User Blog</td>
<td>1b, 2b, 5d, 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/15</td>
<td>(atlnightspots.com, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2c, 4f, 4g, 9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/18</td>
<td>(Nelson, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 5d, 8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/28/15</td>
<td>(Adams, 2015, June 28)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 5b, 6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/28/15</td>
<td>(Thompson, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 4e, 5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>In-Text Citation</td>
<td>Media Type</td>
<td>Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/28/15</td>
<td>(Burrell, 2015)</td>
<td>Multi-User Blog</td>
<td>1a, 6c, 3b, 7a,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/28/15</td>
<td>(Daily News &amp; Analysis, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 3b, 6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/28/15</td>
<td>(Oogeewoogeecom, 2015)</td>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 3a, 3b, 6a, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/28/15</td>
<td>(Americans Perspective, 2015)</td>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>1a, 4e, 5b, 6b, 8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/28/15</td>
<td>(Clark, 2015)</td>
<td>Single-User Blog</td>
<td>1a, 2c, 8a, 8e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/28/15</td>
<td>(Shithead, 2015)</td>
<td>Discussion Thread</td>
<td>1a, 2b, 5b, 6a, 6c,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/15</td>
<td>(Taylor, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2b, 2c, 3b, 4d, 5b, 6b, 6e, 8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/15</td>
<td>(Borden, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2b, 2c, 3c, 5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/15</td>
<td>(Panpanbrid, 2015)</td>
<td>Single-User Blog</td>
<td>1b, 2b, 6d, 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/15</td>
<td>(Ladyrayne, 2015)</td>
<td>Single-User Blog</td>
<td>1a, 2c, 4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/15</td>
<td>(Carissimo, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 4a, 4e, 4f, 4g, 6a,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>In-Text Citation</td>
<td>Media Type</td>
<td>Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/15</td>
<td>(BBC Trending, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 2c, 4d, 4g, 4f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/15</td>
<td>(Girltalk HQ, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1b, 2c, 3b, 6a, 6c, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/1/15</td>
<td>(Cantiello, 2015)</td>
<td>Single-User Blog</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2c, 3b, 4b, 4e, 4f, 5b, 6c, 8c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/2/15</td>
<td>(Democracy Now, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2b, 2c, 3b, 4b, 5b, 6a, 8a, 8b, 8e, 8f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/2/15</td>
<td>(Newsome, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2b, 2c, 3b, 5a, 6c, 6e, 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/2/15</td>
<td>(Garrett, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media - Nonprofit</td>
<td>1a, 2b, 3b, 4a, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/15</td>
<td>(Jeffries, 2015)</td>
<td>House Representative Website</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/09/15</td>
<td>(Molinet, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2c, 3b, 5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/10/15</td>
<td>(Taylor, 2015, July 10)</td>
<td>News Media - Black Owned</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/15</td>
<td>(Washington, 2015)</td>
<td>Religious Organization</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2b, 3b, 5b, 5c, 6e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/13/15</td>
<td>(Sapphire Unbound, 2015)</td>
<td>Single-User Blog</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3b, 5a, 5b, 5c, 6c, 6e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>In-Text Citation</td>
<td>Media Type</td>
<td>Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/13/15</td>
<td>(Moorehead, 2015)</td>
<td>World Workers Party Website</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 3b, 5a, 5b, 5c, 6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/18/15</td>
<td>(Baldwin, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2a, 2c, 3b, 4f, 5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/15</td>
<td>(Tegethoff, 2015)</td>
<td>Multi-User Blog</td>
<td>1b, 3b, 4b, 5b,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/15</td>
<td>(Madden, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>4f, 4g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/28/15</td>
<td>(Sidner, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 2c, 5b, 5d, 6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/15</td>
<td>(SOMETHINGINTHEWAYSHEMOVES, 2015)</td>
<td>Single-User Blog</td>
<td>4b, 4d, 6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/06/16</td>
<td>(Solaire, 2016)</td>
<td>Multi-User Blog</td>
<td>1b, 2c, 3b, 4a, 4b, 5c, 6a, 6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/16</td>
<td>(Clark, 2016)</td>
<td>Single-User Blog</td>
<td>6a, 6c, 8c, 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/16</td>
<td>(Budd, 2016)</td>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>2c, 3b, 5b, 5c, 6a, 6c, 9a, 9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/24/16</td>
<td>(NC Safe Coalition, 2016)</td>
<td>Nonprofit - Grass Roots</td>
<td>5a, 6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/27/17</td>
<td>(Bradley, 2017)</td>
<td>Single-User Blog</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2c, 3b, 6a, 6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>In-Text Citation</td>
<td>Media Type</td>
<td>Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/17</td>
<td>(Moore, 2017)</td>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td>2a, 2b, 2c, 4d, 6b, 10a,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/27/17</td>
<td>(Girltalk HQ, 2017)</td>
<td>News media</td>
<td>1b, 2a, 3a, 6a,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/17</td>
<td>(Joiner, 2017)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2b, 2c, 3b, 6a, 6b, 8f, 9a, 9f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/17</td>
<td>(Warner, 2017)</td>
<td>Religious Organization</td>
<td>2b, 6d, 6e, 8a, 8d, 8e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/18/17</td>
<td>(Anderson, 2017)</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>1b, 3b, 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, 6a, 6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td>(stomach-vs-heart, n.d.)</td>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>1b, 3a, 3b, 4g, 4f, 5a, 5d, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td>(Adams, n.d.)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1b, 3b, 5b, 5d, 6a, 6b, 6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td>(Not In My Coulour, n.d.)</td>
<td>Corporate Blog</td>
<td>1b, 3b, 4g, 5b, 5c, 5d 6a, 6b, 6c, 7a, 7c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V

NONA FAUSTINE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>In-Text Citation</th>
<th>Media Type</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/30/13</td>
<td>(Perez, 2013)</td>
<td>Single-User Blog</td>
<td>2a, 3a, 3b, 8d, 9a, 9b, 9c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/04/14</td>
<td>(Mestrich, 2014)</td>
<td>Multi-User Blog</td>
<td>3a, 3b, 3c, 9a, 9b, 9f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/05/15</td>
<td>(Frank, 2015/2017)</td>
<td>Multi-User Blog</td>
<td>2c, 3a, 3b, 3c, 8d, 9a, 9c, 9f, 9e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/06/15</td>
<td>(MadD BlakK News, 2015)</td>
<td>Multi-User Blog</td>
<td>2c, 3a, 3b, 3c, 8d, 9a, 9c, 9f, 9e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/15</td>
<td>(McPepple, 2015)</td>
<td>Traditional News</td>
<td>1a, 2c, 3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/15</td>
<td>(Charity, 2015)</td>
<td>Cultural News</td>
<td>1a, 2c, 3c, 6a, 6b, 6c, 6e, 9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/04/15</td>
<td>(BGLH, 2015)</td>
<td>Beauty Blog and Boutique</td>
<td>2c, 3b, 3c, 6a, 9f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/06/15</td>
<td>(Artnet News, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2c, 3b, 3c, 5b, 5d, 6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/06/15</td>
<td>(This is Africa, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 2c, 3a, 3b, 3c, 9a, 9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/07/15</td>
<td>(Coneybeare, 2015)</td>
<td>Multi-User Blog</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2c, 3c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/15</td>
<td>(Bernie, 2015)</td>
<td>Corporate Blog</td>
<td>3a, 3c, 6b, 6c, 9e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>In-Text Citation</td>
<td>Media Type</td>
<td>Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/10/15</td>
<td>(Ms. Vixen, 2015)</td>
<td>Online Magazine</td>
<td>1b, 2c, 3c, 9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/15/15</td>
<td>(Dunne, 2015)</td>
<td>Online Magazine</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 3c, 6a, 6b, 6c, 6e, 9a, 9f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/15/15</td>
<td>(Thomas, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1b, 2a, 3c, 4a, 4b, 4d, 4e, 5d, 6a, 6b, 6c, 6d, 8d, 9b, 9f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/17/15</td>
<td>(Levine, 2015)</td>
<td>Multi-User Blog</td>
<td>1b, 2c, 3b, 3c, 5b, 5d, 6a, 6b, 6c, 9f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/20/18</td>
<td>(Unigwe, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>2c, 3c, 6a, 6b, 9a, 9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/04/15</td>
<td>(Rodney, 2015)</td>
<td>Multi-User Blog/Online Magazine</td>
<td>1a, 2a, 3a, 3c, 6c, 6d, 8d, 9a, 9e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/05/15</td>
<td>(Jones, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>2a, 3c, 6c, 9a, 9b, 9e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/05/15</td>
<td>(Schrelber, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 3a, 2a, 3b, 4c, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/05/15</td>
<td>(Edwards, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>2c, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4b, 7a, 8d, 9a, 9f, 9e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/15</td>
<td>(Clasupo, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>2c, 3b, 3c, 9a, 9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/15</td>
<td>(Sargent, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3c, 9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/29/15</td>
<td>(Nefetiti, 2015)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>6a, 6c, 6e, 7a,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NONA FAUSTINE DATA (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>In-Text Citation</th>
<th>Media Type</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/09/16</td>
<td>(Pank Magazine, 2016)</td>
<td>Cultural News Media</td>
<td>2a, 2c, 3b, 3c, 3c, 5a, 5b, 6b, 6c, 6e, 7a, 7b, 9b, 9f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/16</td>
<td>(Fowle, 2016)</td>
<td>Independent News Media</td>
<td>1b, 2c, 3c, 6a, 6e, 7a, 9a, 9b, 9e,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/16</td>
<td>(Raw Africa, 2016)</td>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>2c, 3b, 3c, 9a, 9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/16/17</td>
<td>(Shelton, 2017)</td>
<td>Art &amp; Culture News Media</td>
<td>2c, 3c, 6b, 7a, 9a, 9f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>(Brooklyn Arts Council, n.d.)</td>
<td>Arts Council</td>
<td>1a, 2c, 3c, 9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>(Faustine, n.d)</td>
<td>Professional Website</td>
<td>2c, 9a, 9f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>(Smack Mellong, n.d.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2c, 3c, 9f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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