

STUDENT PROTEST SURVEILLANCE & CAMPUS DEFENSIBLE ARCHITECTURE

[UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA POLICING+ PROTEST ACTIVITY](#)

[CAMPUS / PROTEST SURVEILLANCE](#)

[DEFENSIBLE SPACE](#)

[DEFENSIBLE CIVIC SPACES + SCHOOLS](#)

[UC BERKELEY](#)

[COLUMBIA](#)

[YALE](#)

[BUFFALO](#)

[SIMON FRASER](#)

[UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS @ CHICAGO](#)

[UT AUSTIN](#)

[UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA](#)

[UNIVERSITY COLLEGE DUBLIN](#)

[UNIVERSITY OF UTAH](#)

[OTHERS](#)

[CAMPUS PLANNING + BRUTALISM](#)

[CAMPS / TENTS](#)

[HISTORY OF CAMPS + TENTS](#)

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA POLICING+
PROTEST ACTIVITY

AAUP Penn, News: <https://aaup-penn.org/news/>

Elea Castiglione, Emily Scolnick, Ethan Young, Diany Wang, Katie Bartlett, Ella Sohn, and Jasmine Ni, "Police in Riot Gear Arrest 33 Protesters, Including Penn Students, at Gaza Solidarity Encampment," *The Daily Pennsylvanian* (May 10, 2024):

<https://www.thedp.com/article/2024/05/penn-palestine-gaza-protests-arrests>

Kelly Heinzerling, “With 120 Officers Penn Has the Largest Private Police Force in Pennsylvania,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian* (October 8, 2017):

<https://www.thedp.com/article/2017/10/with-120-officers-penn-has-the-largest-private-police-force-in-pennsylvania>

Katherine Knott, “Antisemitism Probe of Penn Kicks Off with Document Request,” *Inside Higher Ed* (January 25, 2024):

<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/quick-takes/2024/01/25/house-committees-antisemitism-probe-penn-kicks>

Police Free Penn, “A Brief and Violent History of Campus Policing,” *Penn Disorientation Guide* (August 28, 2023):

<https://penndisorientation.com/2023/08/28/a-brief-and-violent-history-of-campus-policing/>

“Temporary Standards and Procedures for Campus Events and Demonstrations,” PennBook (June 7, 2024): <https://catalog.upenn.edu/pennbook/temporary-standards-procedures/>

Diamy Wang, “The Graduation Issue 2024: Penn’s Gaza Solidarity Encampment, From Beginning to End” *The Daily Pennsylvanian* (May 16, 2024):

<https://www.thedp.com/article/2024/05/penn-gaza-solidarity-encampment-recap>

CAMPUS / PROTEST SURVEILLANCE

Chris Gilliard, Jesse Stommel, Audrey Watters, Lindsay Weinberg, and Ben Williamson have all been tracking campus surveillance technologies and warning about their abuse and overreach!

Roderick A. Ferguson, *We Demand: The University and Student Protests* (University of California Press, 2017).

The New York Times, “Where Protesters on U.S. Campuses Have Been Arrested or Detained,” *The New York Times* (Updated June 6, 2024):

<https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2024/us/pro-palestinian-college-protests-encampments.html>

Erik Baker, “The Fortress University: Protest and Policing on Campus,” *the drift* 12 (July 11, 2024): <https://www.thedriftmag.com/the-fortress-university/>

The university is a “community” whose safety is in jeopardy, and it must be defended by armed police officers. The crime of the encampment is to draw this force inward, when it must be ceaselessly projected outward, securing the border between UChicago and its perilous environs.

It’s not a secret that the school’s leadership feels this way. The university has been working to reinforce the frontier between the campus and the poor black communities of Chicago’s South Side since at least the mid-twentieth century. Under the auspices of “urban renewal” and crime reduction...

Activists have long decried the prevalence of exchange programs that send American police officers to Israel for instruction. ... As part of a wide range of philanthropic initiatives that aim to spread pro-Israel sentiment among American youths, some donors have worked to bring Israeli counterinsurgency expertise directly to college campuses. ... In addition to training Americans in Israeli military strategy, American universities also perform research that both indirectly and directly aids Israel’s war machine....

the firms in which universities now invest heavily are not only acquiring companies that sell arms to Israel; they are also making it harder to identify which companies sell arms to Israel in the first place. Universities’ endowments, like their campuses, are encircled by protective barriers....

“But whether they like it or not, [university leaders] have found themselves acting like ethnostate autocrats, clamping down on dissent while striving to eliminate “security threats” from dispossessed racialized communities over whom they exert significant power but to whom they are not accountable.”

Samuel P. Catlin, “The Campus Does Not Exist: How Campus War Is Made,” *Parapraxis* (2024): <https://www.parapraxismagazine.com/articles/the-campus-does-not-exist>

My employer has a campus—three, actually—meaning that it has a physical plant. I navigate one of these campuses as my workplace, but it almost never figures for me as “the campus.” In fact, the first time since beginning the job when I felt myself caught up in an affective relation, not to the particular institution where I work, but rather to “the campus” was when I looked up into that security camera and felt myself being “watched” by it. Only then did I think, a couple of months into my temporary contract, that I was not just at my workplace. Now I was on “the campus.”...

To judge by the American mass media, the campus is the most urgent scene of political struggle in the world. What is happening “on campus” often seems of greater concern than what is happening in Gaza, where every single university campus has been razed by the IDF....

Like the campus panic of the 1960s–70s, this one is aroused by the spectacle of young people speaking out against the inhumane actions of the US and its imperial client states, as well as against the complacency and complicity of their own educational institutions. Now, as then, the act of protesting against injustice undergoes a curious transfiguration in the media, which refashions this action into the object of frantic scrutiny, surveillance, and suppression....

Perspectives from a range of academic disciplines can help us understand campus panic's persistence. From political economists, media critics, American historians, and sociologists, we can learn about higher education as a switching-point of class mobility and reproduction; about how legacy media institutions serve as clearing-houses for the best, or least most expensively, educated Americans; about simmering populist anti-intellectualism and resentment of the academy; about the history of student protest; about ballooning tuitions and debts; and about the contradictory status of the most elite schools as emblems of American identity. However, we also need to be more precise about what we are talking about when we talk about "the campus." For campus panic is, specifically, campus panic. It is the campus which we have collectively cathected—not the university, not higher education. For instance, the trope that circulates in the media today is not "university antisemitism," but "campus antisemitism," and this rhetorical pattern holds across the history of campus panic....

Thesis: The campus is a fantasy and a media trope. The camera produces the campus. The camera is at once a security camera—like the one installed in my department's hallway—and the camera of the mass media. Each camera, the police and the media, feeds back into the other, in the paranoid spiral characteristic of panic: acceleration, escalation, inflation....

When Liz Magill was forced to resign from her position as president of the University of Pennsylvania after testifying in a congressional hearing which turned out to be a trap, something happened to Liz Magill and to the University of Pennsylvania. But the purpose of the trap was not to implicate her or that university; it was to implicate the campus as such....

The campus is the fantasy of an inside. There is the campus, and then there is the outside. On campus/off campus. But the boundary between the campus and its outside is a permeable membrane. The quadrangle, with its gated walls, is, after all, not really where the space of the university ends. The empirically existing campus is integrated into its environs, so that it is difficult to say just when one is off campus....

The essential components of the campus, therefore, are not the classroom, the library, the laboratory, or even the dormitory, but rather the security camera and the cruising police SUV. The aesthetics of the quadrangle launders these paraphernalia: the ID card with the magnetized strip is allegorized as the ivy-adorned brick edifice. The coherence of the campus as a fantasy depends upon the aestheticization of its security apparatus....

When “these individuals” were students, their actions were technically permissible; now that they are non-affiliates, they are “in violation,” “raise safety concerns,” and finally “pose a clear and present danger.”...

When we see that the campus is a fantasy, we can begin to resist the pull of panic. The Gaza Solidarity Encampment itself demonstrates this lesson. The students involved in the protest refused to be cast as the Child in a national fantasy. Camped out on the campus, they instead occupied that fantasy. Offered a panicked, irrationally terrified future of security for some, they courageously demanded a future of freedom for all.

Sam Sabin, “Surveillance Looms Over Pro-Palestinian Campus Protests,” *Axios* (May 4, 2024):

<https://www.axios.com/2024/05/03/student-pro-palestine-encampments-campus-surveillance>

As college students reckon with weeks of pro-Palestinian [protests](#) and [police activity](#) on their campuses, experts warn they might spend their summer breaks feeling the impacts of ongoing campus surveillance. **Why it matters:** Law enforcement is known to lean on facial recognition and social media monitoring tools when investigating campus protests and arrested protesters.

Police and universities have a long history of cooperation on campus safety issues — and that’s often meant sharing campus video footage, protesters’ geolocation and publicly available social media posts, Albert Fox Cahn, executive director of S.T.O.P., told Axios.

- **University police departments also bought more surveillance tools during the pandemic,** citing a need to monitor campus safety issues like potential shootings.
- Some installed automated **license plate readers** on campus, [according to the Electronic Frontier Foundation](#). Others have [publicly discussed](#) using state law enforcement’s facial recognition **databases** in their own investigations.
- At least 37 colleges have used **Social Sentinel**, a social media monitoring tool that’s reportedly been used to surveil student protesters, since 2015, according to [a 2022 news investigation](#).

Arjit Douglas Sen and Derêka Bennett, “Tracked: How Colleges Use AI to Monitor Student Protests,” *The Dallas Morning News* (September 20, 2022):

<https://pulitzercenter.org/stories/tracked-how-colleges-use-ai-monitor-student-protests>

For a few thousand dollars a year, Social Sentinel offered schools across the country sophisticated technology to **scan social media posts from students at risk of harming themselves or others**. Used correctly, the tool could help save lives, the company said. For some colleges that bought the service, it also served a different purpose — **allowing campus police to surveil student protests**.

documents from Kennesaw State show campus police **tracked demonstrators’ online activity for days with Social Sentinel before a contentious 2017 town hall**. Brandy White, a criminal intelligence analyst in KSU’s police department, was in charge of the monitoring. On instruction from her supervisors, **White entered information about demonstrators and protest groups into Social Sentinel’s monitoring tool and set up**

searches to find posts about the event, emails show. White also received a KSU police intelligence briefing from a colleague about the event. The document, obtained by *The News* in response to a public records request, **singled out one progressive activist group, the liberal grassroots network Indivisible**, and cited conservative conspiracy theories that George Soros funded the protesters.

Frances Madeson, “Crackdowns on Protests Are Exposing Higher Ed’s Complicity in Israel’s Genocide,” *truthout* (April 27, 2024):

<https://truthout.org/articles/crackdowns-on-protests-are-exposing-higher-eds-complicity-in-israels-genocide/>

Rory Mir, Thorin Klosowski, and Christian Romero, “Surveillance Defense for Campus Protests,” *Electronic Frontier Foundation* (June 7, 2024):

<https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2024/06/surveillance-defense-campus-protests>

It’s clear that the changing role of surveillance on college campuses exacerbates the dangers faced by all of the communities colleges are meant to support, and only serves to suppress lawful speech.

Over the past decade, **many campuses have been [building up their surveillance arsenal](#) and inviting a greater police presence on campus**. EFF and fellow privacy and speech advocates have been clear that this is a **dangerous trend that chills free expression and makes students feel less safe, while fostering an adversarial and distrustful relationship with the administration**.

Many tools used on campuses overlap with the [street-level surveillance](#) used by law enforcement, but universities are in a unique position of power over students being monitored. For students, **universities are not just their school, but often their home, employer, healthcare provider, visa sponsor, place of worship, and much more**. This reliance heightens the risks imposed by surveillance, and brings it into potentially every aspect of students’ lives.

This guide is written with those involved in protests in mind. Student journalists covering protests may also face digital threats and can refer to our [previous guide](#) to journalists covering protests.

Campus Security Planning. Putting together a security plan is an essential first step to protect yourself from surveillance. At a protest, a mix of [visible and invisible surveillance](#) may be used to identify protesters. This can include **administrators or law enforcement simply attending and keeping notes of what is said**, but often **digital recordings** can make that same approach less plainly visible. This doesn’t just include video and audio recordings—protesters may also be subject to **tracking methods like face recognition technology and location tracking** from their phone, **school ID usage**, or other sensors. So here, you want to be mindful of anything you say or anything on your person, which can reveal your identity or role in the protest, or those of fellow protestors.

This may also be paired with online surveillance. The **university or police may [monitor activity on social](#)**

[media](#), even joining private or closed groups to gather information. Of course, any **services hosted by the university, such as email or WiFi networks, can also be monitored** for activity. Again, taking care of what information is shared with whom is essential, including carefully separating public information (like the time of a rally) and private information (like *your* location when attending). Also keep in mind how what you say publicly, even in a moment of frustration, may be used to draw negative attention to yourself and undermine the cause.

[Disproportionate disciplinary actions](#) will often coincide with and be preceded by some form of surveillance. **Even schools that are more accommodating of peace protests may engage in some level of monitoring**, particularly schools that have already adopted surveillance tech. **School devices, services, and networks are also easy targets**, so try to use alternatives to these when possible. Stick to **using personal devices and not university-administered ones** for sensitive information, and **adopt tools to limit monitoring**, [like Tor](#). Even banal systems like **campus ID cards, presence monitors, class attendance monitoring, and [wifi access points](#)** can create a record of student locations or tip off schools to people congregating. Online surveillance is also easy to implement by simply joining groups on social media, or even adopting commercial [social media monitoring](#) tools.

One good rule of thumb: **if a device, software, or an online account was provided by the school (like an .edu email address or test-taking monitoring software), then the school may be able to access what you do on it**. Likewise, remember that if you use a corporate or university-controlled tool without **end-to-end encryption** for communication or collaboration, like online documents or email, content may be shared by the corporation or university with law enforcement when compelled with a warrant.

Dave Maass and Hailey Rodis, “Scholars Under Surveillance: How Campus Police Use High Tech to Spy on Students,” Electronic Frontier Foundation (March 9, 2021):

<https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2021/03/scholars-under-surveillance-how-campus-police-use-high-tech-spy-students>

In July 2020, the Electronic Frontier Foundation and the Reynolds School of Journalism at University of Nevada, Reno launched the [Atlas of Surveillance](#), a database of now more than 7,000 surveillance technologies deployed by law enforcement agencies across the United States. In the process of compiling this data we noticed a peculiar trend: **college campuses are acquiring a surprising number of surveillance technologies more common to metropolitan areas that experience high levels of violent crime.**

Body-Worn Cameras: Aside from your run-of-the-mill, closed-circuit surveillance camera networks, BWCs were the **most prevalent technology** we identified in use by campus police departments.... One of the largest rollouts began last summer when Pennsylvania State University announced that [police on all 22 campuses](#) would start wearing the devices.... One of the main ways that universities have purchased BWCs is **through funding from the U.S. Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Assistance**. Since 2015, more than [20 universities](#)

[and community colleges](#) have received funds through the bureau's Body-Worn Camera Grant Program established during the Obama administration.

Drones: The Lehigh University Police Department acquired a drone in 2015, and equipped it with a thermal imaging camera. Police Chief Edward Shupp told a student journalist at [The Brown and Right](#) that the only limits on the drone are Federal Aviation Administration regulations, that there are **no privacy regulations** for officers to follow, and that the department can use the drones "for any purpose" on and off campus.

Automated License Plate Readers: First, for **parking enforcement**; Second, campus police are using ALPRs for **public safety purposes**. The [Towson University Police Department](#) in Maryland, for example, scanned over 3 million license plates using automated license plate readers in 2018 and **sent that data to the Maryland Coordination and Analysis Center, a [fusion center](#)** operated by the Maryland State Police.

Social Media Monitoring: Colleges and universities are also watching their students on social media, and it is not just to retweet or like a cute Instagram post about your summer internship. Campus public safety divisions **employ social media software, such as Social Sentinel, to look for possible threats to the university, such as posts where students indicate suicidal ideation or threats of gun violence....** Social media monitoring technology may also be used to **monitor students' political activities**. Social Sentinel software was used to watch activists on the [University of North Carolina](#) campus who were protesting a Confederate memorial on campus, Silent Sam. As NBC reported, UNC Police and the North Carolina State Bureau of Investigation used a technique called "**geofencing**" **to monitor the social media of people in the vicinity of the protests**.

Biometric Identification: At least four police departments at **universities in Florida**—University of South Florida, University of North Florida, University of Central Florida, and Florida Atlantic University—have access to a **statewide face recognition network called Face Analysis Comparison and Examination System (FACES)**, which is operated by the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office. Through FACES, investigators can upload an image and search a database of Florida driver's license photos and mugshots. // U of GA: **iris scanning** in dining halls

Gunshot Detection: Some universities and colleges **purchase their own** gunshot detection technology, while others have **access to the software through partnerships with other law enforcement agencies**. For example, the Georgia Tech Police Department has access to gunshot detection through the Fūsus Real-Time Crime Center.

Video Analytics: the University of Miami Police Department in Florida and Grand Valley State University Department of Public Safety in Michigan. These universities apply advanced software to the camera footage—sometimes called [video analytics or computer vision](#)—**that use an algorithm to achieve round-the-clock monitoring that many officers viewing cameras could never achieve**. Often employing

artificial intelligence, [video analytics systems](#) can track objects and people from camera to camera, identify patterns and anomalies, and potentially conduct face recognition.... Three university police departments in Maryland also maintain lists of cameras owned by local residents and businesses. With these camera registries, private parties are asked to voluntarily provide information about the location of their security cameras, so that police can access or request footage during investigations.

Maryam Jamshidi, “Securitizing the University,” LPE Project (June 3, 2024):

<https://lpeproject.org/blog/universities-securitization-palestine/>

[public](#) and [private](#) actors have attempted to delegitimize this activism by accusing these students of [supporting terrorism](#) and even [being terrorists](#). Now, after nearly eight months, those smears have been translated into **concrete legislative proposals at both the state and federal level** — efforts that implicitly and, at times, explicitly depict students, faculty, and the university itself as potential enemies of the U.S. national security state that must be disciplined and controlled.

The most concerning proposed federal law takes aim at the tax code. **H.R. 6408**, which has already passed the [House](#) and is currently pending before the [Senate](#), would **terminate the tax-exempt status of “terrorist supporting organizations.”** Intended to [respond](#) to pro-Palestine student organizing, the law gives the Secretary of the Treasury unilateral authority to suspend the 501(c)(3) status of any U.S. organization they determine has **provided “material support”** to certain kinds of groups in the preceding three years. / Thanks to its breadth, the bill **threatens First Amendment protected activities on university campuses nationwide.** It adopts the criminal law definition of [“material support,”](#) which prohibits an expansive set of activities that can **include speech acts “coordinated” with terrorists....** Under H.R. 6408, a university could potentially be stripped of its 501(c)(3) status for providing “material support” to an informal or formal **grouping of two or more persons, like say a chapter of Students for Justice in Palestine (SJP),** where the SJP chapter is found to have provided material support to an Foreign Terrorist Organization, such as Hamas. While the idea that a US-based student organization could be providing “material support” to a designated FTO may seem ludicrous (it is), **pro-Israel [politicians](#) and [groups](#) have been aggressively pushing the baseless narrative that SJP chapters are fronts for Hamas** since October 7 — claims that would create existential concerns for universities if H.R. 6408 becomes law and give them clear incentives to ban SJPs and other pro-Palestine groups from their campuses for First Amendment-protected activities.

Congress is also attempting to turn already-existing laws and programs created during the War on Terror against students and faculty. On [April 19](#), as pro-Palestine [student encampments](#) were beginning to mushroom, **Congress reauthorized an amended and expanded version of one of the most-notorious post-9/11 laws—Section 702.** Originally adopted in 2008, [Section 702](#) **provided retroactive legitimacy to an illegal mass surveillance program created by the Bush administration.** While the law is purportedly [aimed](#) at gathering intelligence on non-Americans located abroad, its design inevitably **sweeps in Americans’ private communications**—as demonstrated by the government’s repeated efforts to use Section 702 intelligence against

individuals inside the United States, including [Black Lives Matter protestors](#) and [journalists](#).

The most hawkish version of Section 702 ultimately became law, with some of its biggest supporters peddling it as necessary to surveil pro-Palestine student protestors. These advocates included members of Congress, as well as a number of pro-Israel groups, like the ADL and the Jewish Federations of North America, which strongly opposed a key reform to Section 702 that would have added a warrant requirement to protect the information of U.S. citizens... Thanks to an amendment made to the law, the new version of Section 702 **could even make it easier for the government to compel universities to participate in state surveillance.** Though the [expansive scope](#) of Section 702 already arguably covered universities, the amended law **dramatically broadens the range of U.S. persons compelled to assist with Section 702 surveillance to include any “service provider who has access to equipment that is being or may be used to transmit or store wire or electronic communications.”**

various congressional proposals specifically target students and faculty for participating in pro-Palestine advocacy or other work. The first, an [amendment](#) introduced in early [May](#) to a pending bill, would **place certain students and faculty on the government’s notorious No Fly List.** Under this legislation, the Director of the FBI is required to place on the list students and faculty who have been subject to university disciplinary efforts relating either to “openly pledg[ing] support for, or espous[ing] allegiance or affiliation to” organizations designated as FTOs by the Secretary of State, or to “solicit[ing], command[ing], induc[ing], or otherwise endeavor[ing] to persuade another person to engage in a crime of violence against a Jewish person or the Jewish people because of their race or religion.” – **HARVARD CORP. ALSO PROHIBITS CONFERRAL OF DEGREES**

The amendment’s implications become even more egregious when considered alongside [the Antisemitism Awareness Act](#), another currently pending bill. This act requires the Department of Education to apply a definition of antisemitism that **equates antisemitism with anti-Zionism and anti-Israel advocacy** to departmental [interpretations](#) of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. If this act passes—notwithstanding its clear [First Amendment infirmities](#)—universities fearful of Title VI claims may start to more vigorously discipline students and faculty engaging in pro-Palestine speech and activities.

Another congressional bill introduced in [early May](#), titled [Hamas Supporters Have No Home Here Act](#), **would require, among other things, the deportation of foreign students who are charged with any criminal violation** (for instance, criminal trespassing) related to their participation in “antisemitism rallies or demonstrations.” On its face, the bill does not endorse or reference a particular definition of antisemitism, though given its [sponsors’](#) intentions its implementation **would likely embrace the Antisemitism Awareness Act’s definition.**

Though universities are hardly the bastions of warmth and openness they often claim to be, their many shortcomings sit alongside many worthwhile values and ideals. These include the **belief that the university is**

a place to challenge student biases and preconceived notions; to foster free and open debate about contentious topics in a respectful and sensitive manner; to support unfettered academic inquiry and the “life of the mind”; to facilitate opportunities for students to meet and learn from one another in formal and informal ways; and to encourage students, faculty, and staff to meaningfully contribute to improving university life. / All these values are **threatened by the legislation discussed above**. These bills are **intended to dictate what can be said and taught at universities, the kinds of extracurricular activities available on campuses, as well as the sort of scholarship that can be pursued**. They ensure that people with certain beliefs—in support of Palestine—will feel even more unwelcome and marginalized on university campuses than they already do. These bills also **undermine any confidence in the campus environment as one where intellectual risks can be taken without punishment; where taboos can be challenged without censure**; and where conversations, within or outside of the classroom, can and will be conducted in good faith without the threat of reprisal.

Ken Klippenstein, “The Intelligence Community Is Spying on Student Protesters,” *Ken Klippenstein / Substack* (May 20, 2024): <https://www.kenklippenstein.com/p/the-intelligence-community-is-spying>

The **National Counterterrorism Center**, created in the wake of 9/11 to combat al Qaeda, is now working overtime to **find evidence of foreign funding of pro-Palestinian student protesters**, I have learned. The effort follows **repeated calls by Congress for the federal government to investigate university protesters’ purported links to Hamas**, and coincides with a push by the FBI and homeland security bureaucracies to link the campus demonstrations to foreign actors. The National Counterterrorism Center’s (NCTC), a part of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, is beefing up its intelligence collection and analysis of “extremist” groups associated with domestic terrorism, particularly a domestic category called “**Anti-government and anti-authority violent extremists**,” according to a source inside the community....

On May 10, the Chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee sent [a letter](#) to FBI Director Christopher Wray **asking “whether the FBI had any related undercover employees, online covert employees, or confidential human sources” among what it called “pro-Hamas protests on college campuses.”** By sending the letter, Congress is in effect **pressuring the FBI to penetrate the protests with both on-the-ground and online informants** (if it hasn’t already). An obvious threat to the freedom of speech and association enshrined in the Constitution, the letter tries to circumvent these concerns by **arguing that it is illegal to “endorse” or “espouse” terrorist groups** — despite there being no evidence the protesters have done that. ...speech isn’t material support, something which is typically only something the Justice Department prosecutes with stronger evidence, like making financial contributions to a terrorist group. Nor is it “violent extremism. Nevertheless, the federal government is hellbent on making that case.

On May 14, the Chairs of the House Oversight and Education Committees sent [a letter](#) to Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen **requesting “Suspicious Activity Reports” (SARs) on organizations participating in the protests**, groups like **Students for Justice in Palestine, Jewish Voice for Peace and IfNotNow**. The SARs

would be based upon banking information. “The Committees are investigating the **sources of funding and financing for groups who are organizing, leading, and participating in pro-Hamas, antisemitic, anti-Israel, and anti-American protests** with illegal encampments on American college campuses,” the letter reads. “This investigation relates both to malign influence on college campuses and to the national security implications of such influence on faculty and student organizations.” Again, this kind of request is a **pressure campaign to get the federal government to link the college protests to Hamas or other foreign bodies**. But unlike the previous letter, **Suspicious Activity Reports are a surveillance tool specifically designed to produce evidence of financing of terrorism**.

- In April, FBI Director Wray, when asked about the college protests, [told NBC](#) that the **Bureau is “keenly focused on working with state and local law enforcement, campus law enforcement” and that “we do share intelligence...with campuses,”**

- White House spokesperson Karine Jean-Pierre, asked about the protests, said earlier this month that “the **DOJ and FBI is going to continue to offer support to universities and colleges** in respect to federal laws,”

- Documents obtained by Bloomberg [show Department of Homeland Security agencies monitoring the protests](#), including the Federal Protective Service and Homeland Security Investigations.

Luke Goldstein, “Pro-Israel Groups Pushed or Warrantless Spying on Protesters,” *The American Prospect* (April 26, 2024):

<https://prospect.org/blogs-and-newsletters/tap/2024-04-26-pro-israel-groups-warrantless-spying-protesters/>

When the **renewal of a key section of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA)** was being debated in this Congress, one of the pieces of evidence from reformers for the abuses in the system was that the law had routinely been employed to spy on protesters in the U.S. Despite the fact that FISA’s Section 702 is **intended to be about collection of intelligence on foreign subjects**, U.S. persons would often get vacuumed up in the dragnet. And the FBI was caught querying FISA databases to get information on protesters, most recently during the Black Lives Matter protests in 2020.

Despite these concerns and after a bitter debate, **Congress passed and President Biden signed a reauthorization of FISA Section 702 with new and expanded powers for surveillance**. Just days before that bill became law, Columbia University president Nemat Shafik testified before a congressional hearing on antisemitism. This set off the encampment protests at Columbia, the ensuing crackdown by the NYPD, and now the spread of demonstrations to college campuses across the country. These two separate strands are coming together to **potentially expand warrantless surveillance onto U.S. campuses**.

A letter from numerous American Jewish and pro-Israel organizations, issued earlier this month and

recently made public, **urged Congress to reauthorize that very spying law, FISA Section 702, for the purposes of spying on “foreign involvement in domestic antisemitic events,” a clear reference to anti-war demonstrations regarding Gaza.** The letter cites rising cases of antisemitism since the October 7 Hamas attacks, and makes unfounded connections to foreign threats inside the U.S., as justifications for warrantless spying on American citizens, to “combat terror at home.” The **Anti-Defamation League** was one of the signatories to the letter. Its president Jonathan Greenblatt, who has advocated for a more severe crackdown by law enforcement against campus encampments, suggested on MSNBC that **students were “Iranian proxies,”** without any clear evidence. That could be the kind of insinuation needed to spy on campus protesters. The letter also strongly **opposed warrant requirements for querying databases about U.S. persons** whose information was collected under Section 702. An amendment to require a warrant to use that information failed by the tiniest of margins in the House, ending in a [212-212 tie](#).

In the lead-up to an earlier vote on Section 702, the chair of the House Intelligence Committee, Rep. Mike Turner, held a briefing that advocated for reauthorization by using the **example of New York City anti-war protests in the fall of last year and claiming links to Hamas.** The implication was that their communications should be tapped. As [reported](#) by Wired, the way in which Turner presented the use of Section 702 in this situation would likely be in violation of FISA.

Through Section 702, the government is not permitted to directly “reverse target” a protester’s communications, only a foreign target. What intelligence agencies and the FBI have routinely done, however, is conduct a **warrantless backdoor search using general terms on protesters**—like “Black Lives Matter”—through a giant database of communications it has gathered legally through Section 702. In this instance, the **FISA Court did [deem](#) these practices to be an overreach of government authority,** though the enforcement against them is extremely limited.

In the context of the current protests, government authorities could conduct these types of backdoor searches on the communications of “anti-Israel protesters” or other search terms. An even **more direct case of government spying would be a college student or faculty member, who may be a citizen or studying on a student visa, who regularly communicates with family and friends back home in another country.** Those communications could be directly obtained through Section 702 and monitored by the government.

Spencer Ackerman, “Warrantless Spying on Pro-Palestinian Protesters Is Easier Than Ever,” *Forever Wars* (May 1, 2024):

<https://www.forever-wars.com/warrantless-spying-on-pro-palestine-protesters-is-easier-than-ever/>

at a moment of accelerating domestic suppression of outrage over U.S. complicity in Israel's destruction of Gaza, what matters is that NSA and CIA use of the so-called “[backdoor search provision](#)”—a search that requires no warrant through troves of ostensibly foreign-focused intelligence that was *collected* warrantlessly—is up. *Way* up....

Expect these authorities to be used against many kinds of people. Among the targets will be U.S. supporters of Palestine. As the **Section 702** renewal neared the finish line, the umbrella Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations, which on Sunday demanded that "[order on our campuses... be restored immediately](#)," [urged its passage](#) in a letter to 702 supporters Rep. Mike Johnson, the GOP House speaker, and Rep. Hakeem Jeffries, the Democratic House leader. As I've [reported for *The Nation*](#), shortly after the Oct. 7 attacks, the ADL began pushing for investigations of campus and other pro-Palestine organizations for material support for terrorism despite lacking any factual predicate beyond rhetoric.

Mayor Eric Adams' baseless and [historically ugly](#) assertion of "[outside agitators](#)" among the students can be manufactured through the powers granted by Section 702. As well, the renewal in April of Section 702 vastly expands, for two years, the surveillance powers granted to U.S. intelligence agencies. "If you have access to any communications, the government can force you to help it spy. That means anyone with access to a server, a wire, a cable box, a wifi router, a phone, or a computer.

"CCTV Locations: University of Pennsylvania Cameras," *Almanac* 70:35 (May 28, 2024):

<https://almanac.upenn.edu/volume-70-number-35/#cctv-locations-university-of-pennsylvania-cameras-v70-n35>

As prescribed by the University Policy "Closed Circuit Television Monitoring and Recording of Public Areas for Safety and Security Purposes" ([Almanac April 29, 2008](#)), the locations of all outside CCTV cameras monitored by Public Safety are to be published semi-annually in *Almanac*. – **Nearly 300**

Chris Morris, "Why Facial Recognition Technology Makes These Campus Protests Different From Those in the Past," *Fast Company* (May 2, 2024):

<https://www.fastcompany.com/91116791/facial-recognition-technology-campus-protests-police-surveillance-ga>

What made those images even more notable, though, are the **lengths to which many of the protesters are going to in order to hide their identities**. Keffiyehs and facemasks are commonplace. Some cover themselves with blankets. It's a vastly different sort of protest than the Black Lives Matter marches of 2020—or anything Americans have seen lately. And artificial intelligence—along with [facial recognition technology](#)—might be to blame.

Video surveillance for security reasons is fairly common on college campuses, but as law enforcement agencies increasingly use [facial recognition](#) technology to identify suspects, that has led to more concerns among protestors that they could be targeted or doxed for expressing their opinion. That could result in everything from **lifelong repercussions for what could be peaceful protesting to threats to the safety of students who are identified** (correctly or incorrectly) as protestors. And given questions of the accuracy ([especially for people of color](#)) of some facial recognition software, it could also result in legal threats to universities.

Student protestors, for years, **have demanded schools refrain from using facial recognition on campus....** But in this round of protests, **it's a lot more than campus cops who are involved.** Columbia [called in the NYPD](#) to clear Hamilton Hall, which had been occupied by protestors. And on Emory's campus, the Atlanta Police Department and [Georgia State Patrol](#) were sent in to clear out a campus common area. The scene is being repeated at other schools. Many of those professional law enforcement organizations [embrace facial recognition software](#), with several striking deals with technology companies to boost their use of it. And, in many cases, that's why protestors are covering up.

Jay Stanley, "States Dust Off Obscure Anti-Mask Laws to Target Pro-Palestine Protesters," ACLU (May 15, 2024):

<https://www.aclu.org/news/privacy-technology/states-dust-off-obscure-anti-mask-laws-to-target-pro-palestine-protesters>

Arcane laws banning people from wearing masks in public are now being used to target people who wear face coverings while peacefully protesting Israel's war in Gaza. That's a big problem. In the 1940s and 50s, many U.S. states passed anti-mask laws as a response to the **Ku Klux Klan**, whose members often hid their identities as they terrorized their victims.... Now these laws are being used across the country to try and clamp down on disfavored groups and movements, raising questions about selective prosecution. Just this month, **Ohio Attorney General Dave Yost** [sent a letter](#) to the state's 14 public universities alerting them **that protestors could be charged with a felony under the state's little-used anti-mask law**, which carries penalties of between six to 18 months in prison.

Administrators at the **University of North Carolina** [have warned](#) protestors that wearing masks violates **the state's anti-mask law** and "runs counter to our campus norms and is a violation of UNC policy." Students arrested during a protest at the University of Florida were [charged with](#), among other things, wearing masks in public. At the **University of Texas at Austin**, Gov. Greg Abbott and university officials called in state troopers to [violently](#) break up pro-Palestinian protests after the school [rescinded permission](#) for a rally on the grounds that protestors had a "declared intent to violate our policies and rules." One of the rules the administrators cited was a university **ban on wearing face masks "to obstruct law enforcement."**

At a time when both **public and private actors are increasingly turning to invasive surveillance technologies to identify protestors, mask-wearing is an important way for us to safeguard our right to speak out on issues of public concern.** While the ACLU has raised concerns about how anti-mask laws have been wielded for decades, we are especially worried about the risk they pose to our constitutional freedoms in the digital age. In particular, **the emergence of face recognition technology has changed what it means to appear in public.** Increasingly omnipresent cameras and corrosive technology products such as [Clearview AI](#) allow police to easily identify people. So, too, can private parties. **The push to normalize face recognition by**

security agencies threatens to turn our faces into the functional equivalent of license plates. Anti-mask laws are in effect a requirement to display those “plates” anytime one is in public. Humans are not cars.

For those speaking out in support of the Palestinian people, being recognized in a crowd can have extreme consequences for their personal and professional security. During the Gaza protests, pro-Israel activists and organizations have posted the faces and personal information of pro-Palestine activists to **intimidate them, get them fired, or otherwise shame them for their views.** These doxing attempts have intensified, with viral videos showing counterprotesters demanding that pro-Palestinian protesters remove their masks at rallies. Professionally, **employers have [terminated workers](#)** for their comments about Israel and Palestine, and **CEOs have [demanded](#) universities give them the names of pro testers** in order to blacklist them from jobs.

Jessie Lauck, Clare O'Connor, Jesse Lieberman, Maya Broadwater, and Patrick, McCaslin, “An Investigation Into the Use of Facial Recognition at the University of Miami”:

<https://www.umfacialrecognition.com/>

UMPD Police Chief David Rivero boasted about using facial recognition in several investigations. Rivero described using the Florida Department of Law Enforcement’s facial recognition technology, while denying it was facial recognition technology. UM has access to the Face Analysis Comparison & Examination System, FACES, a facial recognition technology run by the Pinellas County Sheriff’s Office, according to two official documents.

Theia Chatelle, “How Yale University Surveils Pro-Palestine Students,” *The Nation* (May 20, 2024):

<https://www.thenation.com/article/activism/yale-university-surveils-pro-palestine-student-protests/>

Documents obtained by *The Nation* under Connecticut’s Freedom of Information Act illustrate a **pattern of targeted surveillance by Yale University against students engaged in pro-Palestine activism.** These tactics, as the documents reveal, vary from **administrator presence at rallies to police surveillance of students’ social media accounts, to coordination between campus, local, and state police forces.**

However, in seeking to avoid the fate of its fellow Ivy League institutions, **its goal is to be one step ahead of its students,** conversations between Yale Police Department (YPD) officers and university officials show. Pilar Montalvo, assistant vice president for university life, was one of those tasked with this job, and has become a recurring figure in students’ on-campus activities. “In [Montalvo’s] interactions with students, she tries to shut down whatever we’re doing,” said Patrick Hayes, a Yale student involved in pro-Palestine activism on campus. “It’s kind of obvious that the administrative rules are applied very differently to groups that have missions that the university sees as counter to their own.” ... the administrative bureaucracy at Yale—which [now outnumbers](#) its undergraduate students—has been crucial in shutting down conversations about anti-Palestinian and anti-Muslim hate incidents that have occurred on campus. In the hundred pages of documents obtained by *The*

Nation, Montalvo is copied on nearly every YPD e-mail exchange about pro-Palestine events and rallies. Not only does Montalvo appear to work directly with the YPD, but she collaborates with centers and initiatives housed within the university—especially those that have a stake in pro-Palestine organizing.

One individual who communicated directly with Yale administration and the YPD is Uri Cohen, the executive director of the Slifka Center for Jewish Life at Yale. Cohen runs one of the many student life centers at the university to which Yale has dedicated ample time and resources after it launched its [Belonging at Yale](#) initiative in 2020. Cohen and other staffers at the Slifka Center have been in frequent communication with Montalvo and the YPD with concerns about the activities and speech of pro-Palestine organizers. “I just heard that the language around tomorrow’s SJP day of resistance now includes explicitly that violence against Zionist-identified people and institutions are both justified and politically necessary,” wrote Cohen in one early October email to Duane Lovello, director of public safety & community engagement. This language didn’t appear in any official postings by Yalies4Palestine, and it is unclear exactly which post Cohen was referring to. Despite this, Montalvo used Cohen’s comment as a pretext to call one of Yalies4Palestine’s lead organizers into a meeting to gather more information.

Yale not only contacts students about planned rallies but actively monitors for events before they are made aware of them through official channels. In one case, Vanessa Schenking, YPD’s compliance and crime analyst, sent an e-mail to Steven Citta, lieutenant at the Hartford Police Department, tipping him off about a potential Yalies4Palestine action at a weapons manufacturing plant. On many other exchanges, **YPD officials communicated via e-mail with the New Haven Police Department to plan their responses to pro-Palestine actions** in New Haven. In some cases, that meant organizing potential routes of travel for protests. In others, it meant responding to concerns from community members about the statements or rhetoric of pro-Palestine organizers. Both agencies were intimately involved in the policing of students in the early months of pro-Palestine activism in New Haven through internet monitoring, in-person presence at rallies, and communication with university administrators.

Sally E. Edwards, “Student Protesters Accuse Harvard Administrators of Surveillance at Palestine Vigil,” *The Harvard Crimson* (March 4, 2024):

<https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2024/3/4/protesters-accuse-harvard-surveillance/>

Pro-Palestine student protesters accused Harvard administrators of **attempting to surveil and identify students** participating in a Friday afternoon vigil for more than 100 Palestinians who died after Israeli forces opened fire on a crowd awaiting humanitarian aid.... During speeches at the vigil, student organizers — who did not identify themselves — alleged that Harvard administrators had **attempted to solicit students’ ID cards and names.**

DEFENSIBLE SPACE

Matthew M. Carr, "Urban Hostility: CPTED, Hostile Architecture, and the Erasure of Domestic Public Space," Honors Thesis, Portland State University (2020).

The creation of Oscar Newman's *Defensible Space Theory* in conjunction with criminologist C. Ray. Jeffrey's *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design* resulted in the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design agenda (CPTED), demonstrating the ways in which physical environments play a critical role in crime prevention. CPTED gave birth to a form of urban exclusionism hinging on identifying users and legitimate or illegitimate. A consistent failure to recognize that identifying users in this way is inherently a value based process that can be undermined, has led to the abuse of CPTED guidelines and the creation of Hostile Architecture. Hostile devices are incredibly effective at perpetrating urban exclusionism through rendering public spaces unusable to certain users. By removing unwanted citizens from public spaces, cities can erase images of poverty, social decay and public disorder to attract commerce (2)

To fully dissect hostile architecture, and recognize why it has been a mainstay in urban cores for decades, it is imperative to examine the studies which preceded and generated the current urban climate — none more central to the issue than the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). As a response to what he saw as a 'destruction of social framework through failed urban renewal strategies,' criminologist C. Ray Jeffery, coined CPTED in 1971, calling for "the development of an interdisciplinary behavioral science of crime and prevention."1 In this section, I concisely address Elizabeth Woods' efforts while she was the director of the Chicago Housing Authority and oversaw public housing projects. I document her view of public surveillance techniques and the way in which she influenced early iterations of CPTED. I examine Oscar Newman's defensible space theory and address the four main components he identified as being crucial to creating a defensive space. I review the early iterations of CPTED as constructed by Jeffery and address the six broad characteristics identified by the first generation CPTED; territoriality, surveillance, access control, image/maintenance, activity programming, and target hardening. (3)

Wood believed that by incorporating open spaces to support assorted gatherings, the natural surveillability of the complex would rise, creating an environment where residences are overseen and observable by neighbors or passersby. Surveillability today is understood to include ecological factors such as lighting or vegetation surrounding a residence (4)

Newman's writings are focused on urban housing projects, in particular, Pruitt-Igoe in St. Louis (fig. 1,2). Built in 1954, this housing complex was infamous for its crime, poverty and racial segregation, symbolizing the failure of mid-century urban renewal projects. Newman noted that public spaces were crime ridden, vandalized and dirty while most private spaces were decidedly better maintained.7 Based on these observations, he argued that

it was possible to design public environments in a way which granted greater control to residents, while constructing physical layouts to act as natural deterrents against criminal offenses.

Based on these observations, the term “defensible space” was established; defined as a residential environment whose physical characteristics—building layout and site plan—functioned to allow inhabitants themselves to become key agents in ensuring their security.⁸ He believed that through adopting a model focused on fostering a sense of responsibility over a communal area in which residents can “extend the realm of their homes and the zone of felt responsibility,” criminal acts would decrease, resulting in safer living conditions. (5)

Newman furthermore identified four main concepts: **territoriality, surveillance, image and milieu**, which became the backbone of the defensible space theory and influenced initial iterations of CPTED. He defines territoriality as ‘the capacity of the physical environment to create perceived zones of territorial influences, further explaining that the sub-division of space into zones of influence should result in a clear delineation between public, private and semi-private spaces.⁹ This in turn creates a hierarchy of space ranging from totally private to fully public (fig. 3), suggesting that the capability of a resident to defend (6)

Much like Wood, Newman believed that natural surveillance was essential and should be designed into cities, allowing any citizen to act as a monitor at all times. This creates a state of conscious visibility, while fostering an internalized and self-imposed social control system: as / identified in models such as Foucault’s panopticon.¹⁰ Newman believed that by adding adequate lighting, reducing or eliminating physical barriers to visibility, and promoting clarity in key areas (entrances, lobbies, waiting areas, parking areas), social-behavioral rules were further enforced leading to greater levels of safety and accountability (6-7)

Newman also strongly encouraged the use of electronic surveillance particularly in semi-public spaces or “blindspots” (difficult to surveil spaces). This was one of the most damaging of the defensible space proposals as it pushed for a dramatic increase in uninterrupted monitoring, severely undermining personal privacy for residents in semi-public spaces.¹² However, natural and electronic surveillance were both key aspects in the original CPTED model, and have become pervasive in nearly all facets of modern life (7)

The original findings of CPTED were revised in a 1977 publication, but it wasn’t until 1990, in Jeffery’s book *Criminology: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, that his model evolved into a fleshed-out program. In his own words, the basic assumption of the CPTED is:

*“the response [i.e. behavioral adaptation] of the individual organism to the physical environment is a product of the brain; the brain in turn is a product of genetics and the environment. The environment never influences behavior directly, but only through the brain. Any model of crime prevention must include both the brain and the physical environment.”*¹⁹ Thus, **the six main CPTED considerations were formed: territoriality, natural surveillance, access control, activity support, image, management and target hardening** (9)

CPTED suggests that physical design within the built environment has the ability to provide **natural surveillance** opportunities for residents and the greater community alike. As stated by both Wood and Newman, if offenders perceive that they can be observed, the likelihood of them committing a **criminal act decreases significantly**. Natural Surveillance is further assisted by avoiding low levels of lighting, thick trees or shrubbery, or any similar forms which provide opportunities for concealment. It is important to note that even if the physical environment lends itself to natural surveillance, it does not mean that surveillance is always taking place. This is why Jeffery later pushed for crime prevention models that addressed the brain and physical environments, rather than just adjustments to the built environment like he initially proposed. (10)

Stephanus Coetzee and Karen Puren, "Towards Safe Campus Environments Through Environmental Design: Two Universities as Case Studies," *Challenges of Modern Tomorrow* 7:4 (2016): 28-46.

Environmental psychology

Numerous theories were developed that address safety in the spatial and built environment. These include the works of Wood (1961), Jacobs (1961), Angel (1968), Newman (1972), Jeffery (1971; 1977; 1990), Clark (1980), Wilson and Kelling (1982), Wekerle and Witzman (1995) and Ekblom (1995). (32)

Elizabeth Wood, 1961: Wood (1961) focused on lower income residential areas with the goal to create richer and more fulfilling areas. As Wood (1961) strove towards enhancing quality of life for residents through design changes and increasing the aesthetic quality of residential environments, she developed guidelines for improving these environments' security and safety (Paulsen & Robinson, 2004). Wood's (1961) main design goals are (i) **visibility** and (ii) **the surveillance of pedestrians**. Visibility, according to her, relates to ways to improve residents' visibility, for example using windows to make lobbies clearly visible from the outside and well-lit in the evenings, while **surveillance relates to ways to survey residents and their property by for example redesigning public and semi-public spaces into places of relaxation to attract people and improve informal surveillance**. (32)

Jane Jacobs, 1961: **eyes on the street**

Schlomo Angel, 1968: crime prevention through rational choice theory

Oscan Newman, 1972: defensible space - Newman's (1972) concept of environmental design is based on improving security by (i) developing coordinated design standards for street layout, (ii) street lighting, (iii) architecture; and (iv) land use. The main goal is to create environments that would not only reduce the opportunities for crime, but also to encourage people to use public space to contribute to their safety and to increase their sense of community (33)

C.R. Ray Jeffery, 1971: Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design: CPTED guidelines presented for the creation of safe environments are (i) **to increase surveillance and visibility**, (ii) promoting territoriality and defensible space, (iii) managing access and escape routes, (iv) maintaining the image and aesthetics of areas, and (v) target hardening. (34)

Ronald V. Clark, 1980: Situational Crime Prevention: SCP has two main goals: (i) to understand and predict how the three core elements (motivated offenders, soft targets and the absence of capable guardians) come together and (ii) to reduce crime opportunities in the locations specified (34)

James Q. Wilson and George Kelling, 1982: Broken Windows Theory

Wekerle and Whitzman, 1995: Safe Cities – community responsibility

Paul Ekblom, 1995: The ecological approach

Passive surveillance and visibility, as proposed by Jacobs (1961), were identified as important environmental aspects in creating safer campus environments in this research. Also, a **mixture of land uses (Jacobs, 1961), the creation of territoriality and defensible space (Newman, 1972), well designed public spaces** (Jacobs 1961, Jeffery 1971), the use of accessibility and pedestrian routes (Angel, 1968, Jeffery 1977) are all environmental aspects that increase the number of pedestrians, and thereby increasing the passive surveillance within an area. The importance of visibility is also supported by aspects such as **lighting and landscaping**, which played a role in how participants perceived safety (as suggested by Jeffery, 1997). Furthermore, perceptions of safety were also influenced by **how well areas are maintained, the image and aesthetics of parks and buildings and the degree of minor disorders**, for example alcohol and drug abuse (as suggested by Wilson & Kelling, 1982). However, the findings of this particular study emphasizes the fact that the environment does not determine safety alone. Safety and how people (in this case students on two campuses) perceive safety is attained through the **interplay of the person (e.g. past experience), the spatial environment and its features as well as the social environment**. (42)

Hannah Soule, “Eyes on the Street: Racialized Bodies and Surveillance in Urban Space,” Senior Project, Bard College, 2022.

The segmentation of space for purposes of security in the urban setting is further illustrated through Oscar Newman’s theories and spatial proposals for a Defensible Space published in 1972. In collaboration with psychologist George Rand, Newman set off in Defensible Space a new way of looking at urban design through a criminological approach. This method of design placed crime prevention and surveillance at the forefront of organizing space. Newman: architect, theorist, and planner **first wrote about Defensible Space first in 1964 when doing research on why Pruitt-Igoe, a housing project built in 1951 in St. Louis was being / torn down**. Newman used the example of Pruitt-Igoe among many other “failed” housing projects to support his theory which would take spatial form through **“low-rise, high density housing with defined public space that could be monitored by self-policing”**(Fig 7).²⁵ Newman defended his theory by presenting how

Defensible Space would turn a bad city/neighborhood into a good one. He described the “bad city” as a place where a would-be criminal would notice that no one is watching and proceed in his criminal activities whereas **in a “good city” made possible by applying defensible theory, a potential criminal would feel eyes on him the second he enters the space** and would leave that environment.²⁶ He felt that his proposed designs would stimulate natural human territoriality in the urban setting. (9-10)

Newman wanted to create a new urbanism of naturalized surveillance in which **territoriality would be emphasized as to encourage humans to defend themselves through defending their grounds**.³³ Some of Newman’s strategies provided in Defensible Space which included the implementation of 6-foot fences protecting communities from the public were realized with generous financial support from the New York City Housing Authority and Housing and Urban Development (HUD).³⁴ Newman’s ideologies and strategies in researching for Defensible Space were inherently biased as he **attributed the possession of property to a citizen’s better morality and respectability in society**. Yet the liberty of owning property was not a privilege people living in public housing had. The emphasis of crime reduction through redesigning public infrastructures resulted in / **highly surveilled landscapes where neighbors took on the role of the police officials to defend their environments**. (11-12)

In 2016, the ACLU reported that **law enforcement agencies in Oakland and Baltimore used data from social media sites to track protest activity, employing such surveillance tactics to monitor organizers**.⁵¹ The ability to track and surveil another has become increasingly more accessible due to forms of social media which share one’s location and become tools used by law enforcement to dismantle freedom of speech and movement. (17)

Oscar Newman, *Creating Defensible Space* (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy, Development and Research, April 1996).

All Defensible Space programs have a common purpose: They restructure the physical layout of communities to allow residents to control the areas around their homes. This includes the streets and grounds outside their buildings and the lobbies and corridors within them. The programs help people preserve those areas in which they can realize their commonly held values and lifestyles.

Defensible Space relies on self-help rather than on government intervention, and so it is not vulnerable to government’s withdrawal of support. It depends on resident involvement to reduce crime and remove the presence of criminals. It has the ability to bring people of different incomes and race together in a mutually beneficial union. For low-income people, Defensible Space can provide an introduction to the benefits of main-stream life and an opportunity to see how their own actions can better the world around them and lead to upward mobility.

Over the past 25 years, our institute has been using Defensible Space technology to enable residents to take control of their neighborhoods, to reduce crime, and to stimulate private reinvestment. We have been able to do this while maintaining racial and economic integration. The process has also produced inexpensive ways to create housing for the poor, often without government assistance. (9)

The physical modifications I planned for Clason Point had these goals:

- To increase the proprietary feelings of residents by subdividing and assigning much of the public grounds to the control of individual families and small groupings of families through the use of real and symbolic / fencing
- To reduce the number of pedestrian routes throughout the project so as to limit access and to intensify the use of the remaining walks. Only those walks that passed in front of the units would remain in use, and these would be widened to allow them to be used for play and sitting areas. New lighting would be added to improve visibility and to extend the use of the walks into the evening.
- To improve the image of the project by resurfacing the exterior of the existing cement-block building and by further identifying individual units through the use of varying colors and resurfacing materials.
- To reduce intergenerational conflict among residents within the project by assigning specific areas for each group to use. (68)

The **use of factory-built housing minimized onsite protests and potential vandalism** by opponents of the housing by limiting the onsite construction time. The housing units arrived 95 percent complete from factories approximately 100 miles away and were placed on foundations (that had been prepared earlier) during the course of a day. The ability of the local residents and politicians to complicate construction by **influencing the unions was also minimized** by having most of the work done in communities distant from Yonkers. (92)

Carrie A. Rentschler, "Designing Fear: How Environmental Security Protects Property at the Expense of People" in Jack Bratich, Jeremy Packer and Cameron McCarthy, eds., *Foucault, Cultural Studies and Governmentality* (SUNY Press, 2003): 243-272.

CPTED began as a movement in architecture and urban planning in the early 1970s (National Crime Prevention Institute, 1996b). C. Ray Jeffery's book *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design* introduced the term. Jeffery argued that **security must focus on preventing criminal activity by focusing on "direct controls" that affect criminal behavior, such as perceptions of safety, how visible a site is to outside surveillance, and how many people use the space at any given time** (Jeffery, 1971; National Crime Prevention Institute, 1996a). (248)

CPTED, then, is an architectural-behavioral model of security; it **assumes "crime is located in the environment, not in the individual.** There are no criminals, only environmental circumstances which result in criminal behavior. Given the proper environmental structure, anyone will be a criminal or noncriminal" (Jeffery, 1971, p. 177). CPTED thus enacts a **theory of criminality based upon environmentally induced**

behavior rather than individual pathology (Ekblom, 1995, p. 115). It **seeks to elicit conformist (noncriminal) behavior from authorized users of a space** and to discourage use by unauthorized users, based upon the idea that crime is a result of environmental engineering rather than systemic social inequality (Jeffery, pp. 167-188). Human aggression is understood as a behavioral response to environmental stimuli, so CPTED assumes that altering environmental cues will discourage criminal activities. Crime can be prevented by "decreasing the reinforcement available from criminal acts and increasing the risk involved in" committing them, through environmental engineering (p. 178). (249)

CPTED operates on the principles of **natural surveillance, natural access control, territorial reinforcement, and maintenance**.⁵ Use of the term "natural" signifies three basic principles: the **unobtrusiveness of the security, the visibility of public spaces and access ways, and the unquestioned embodiment of surveillance practices users of the space will ideally inhabit** as a result of environmental security. Its security design **operates on a panoptic principle, making public spaces very visible to surveillance while making security mechanisms invisible** (Foucault, 1979, pp. 195-228). Its naturalness is therefore judged by how the security feels. While CPTED security measures encourage participation by users of the space, they should not feel like they are exerting effects. It is a systemic approach to security that emphasizes control over the physical environment, the behavior of people, the "productive" use of space and loss prevention. It signifies a **mentality of "holistic security" in which all aspects of the environment are • available for • manipulation in the name of crime prevention**.⁶ Since the program was initiated, the **University of Illinois has erected berms and fences along its borders, removed rows of hedges along parking lots and sidewalks, installed additional lighting throughout campus, and instituted "traffic calming" procedures** to deter skateboarders from skating in high traffic areas and to slow traffic by raising pavement around intersections, changing the texture of pavement, and decreasing speed limits. The first official project utilizing CPTED principles fortified the new university president's office, for an estimated \$750,000. **A silent alarm system, security door, a cell phone and bulletproof vest were all provided for University President James Stukel to address his fears of student uprisings** (which he had dealt with at the Chicago campus) (author interview with John Benberg, August 11, 1997). (249)

Secured by Design: <https://www.securedbydesign.com/> (thanks to @hex.ooo on Bluesky)

Founded in 1989 by the Association of Chief Police Officers in response to the increase in burglary and the need to improve security standards, Secured by Design (SBD) is an internationally recognised mark of security excellence. It is a model that is being copied in countries such as The Netherlands, Poland, South Korea, Australia, Chile, The UAE and several states in the USA.

SBD works to improve the security of buildings and their surroundings by working closely with architects, builders, developers, local authorities, registered housing associations and a variety of other

stakeholders to incorporate police crime prevention standards from initial concept and design, through to construction and completion.

SBD also operates an accreditation scheme for products or services that have met a recognised security standard. These products or services – which must be capable of preventing crime, deterring crime, or delaying a criminal attack, thus improving and reducing opportunities for offenders – are known as being of a '[Police Preferred Specification](#)'.

SBD is the only way for companies to obtain police recognition for security-related products in the UK. SBD products are known to prevent major organised crime and counter terrorism.

Phineas Harper, “It’s No Longer Appropriate to Let Untrustworthy Metropolitan Police Have a Say in London’s Design,” *The Standard* (March 13, 2024):

<https://www.standard.co.uk/homesandproperty/property-news/comment-metropolitan-police-urban-planning-secured-by-design-b1144802.html>

Since the 1980s, the Met have been gradually amassing more and more influence over the design of London's architecture from controlling street furniture and plants in parks to whole schools and housing estates. Using a little-known initiative called Secured by Design (SBD) which was launched under Margaret Thatcher's government in 1989, police forces can review proposals for new buildings or public spaces, and demand sweeping changes. Metropolitan Police officers are now routinely advising architects, landscape architects and local authorities across the capital on how to design buildings and neighbourhoods.

Unfortunately, much of Met's design advice is chronically flawed and rooted in systemic prejudices rather than community-centred design principles. Rather than cultivating welcoming neighbourhoods, SBD is contributing to [growing social isolation](#), creating neighbourhoods where many people, particularly marginalised communities, are discouraged from socialising. For example, [SBD](#) promotes dead-end cul-de-sacs rather than permeable streets, suggests the “use of single seats or stools set several metres apart” rather than benches, praises high fences, and warns that certain “communal areas, such as playgrounds, toddler play areas, [and] seating facilities have the potential to generate crime”.

See also

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2022/may/02/police-public-spaces-secured-by-design-uk-cities>

Emily Hays and Derrick McDonald, “Whose Security? Security of Which Values? Security Against What?” *Hacker* (n.d.):

<https://www.hackerarchitects.com/news/design-crime-prevention-and-the-white-imagination>

BIPOC designers, notably the collective [Design as Protest](#), called for strategies to dismantle the privilege and power structures that use architecture and design as tools of oppression, and specifically demanded designers “[Cease the Implementation of Hostile Architecture & Landscapes.](#)”

DAP defines hostile architecture and landscapes as “design tactics that purposefully restrict specific behaviors in public spaces. The tactics can appear as design guidelines such as Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), exclusionary design elements, and acts of surveillance. **Hostile architecture has historically been encouraged under the guise of safety, but its implementation disproportionately excludes marginalized groups** from houseless people to Black, Brown, Indigenous & Asian communities.

The CPTED movement can be traced back to **Jane Jacobs and her critique of contemporary planning practice in [The Life and Death of Great American Cities](#)**. The concepts now called First Generation CPTED were solidified in the early 1970s with the architect **Oscar Newman’s book [Defensible Space](#)** and criminologist **C. Ray Jeffery’s [Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design](#)**

CPTED proponents and practitioners also use these apolitical frames to imply that the process of differentiating between legitimate and illegitimate users of social space is based on objective criteria. However, **assumptions about race, gender, age, and socio-economic status, for example, often become the grounds upon which people are classified as legitimate or illegitimate users** of social space. CPTED legitimizes the spatiality of wealth, hetero- and cis-normativity, able-bodiedness, whiteness, and masculinity while delegitimizing the spatiality of Blackness, Indigeneity, queerness, and disability through criminalization.

Consider surveillance, a critical component of CPTED. The surveillance of Blackness has long been, and continues to be, a social and political norm. Surveillance practices and policies not only produce norms pertaining to race, they actively exercise a power to define what is in or out of place. Where public spaces are shaped for and by whiteness, some acts in public are abnormalized by way of racializing surveillance and then coded for disciplinary measures. [iv] **These enactments of surveillance manifest boundaries along racial lines**, often resulting in discriminatory and violent treatment. The resulting disciplinary action is spectacular and episodic, making everyone aware of the presence of power, represented most frequently by law enforcement. (e.g. Simone Browne)

These mechanisms are bolstered by a process of city building that pushes for the privatization of all non-commodified public spaces, while simultaneously supporting policies that increasingly militarize facets of these spaces.[v] **Zoning, policy, and city code are mechanisms that the owning-class has used effectively to design and build the reality of our society's spatial experience.** We see time and time again that it is the safety and security of businesses, their owners, and their property that is protected at the cost of Black, Indigenous, and unhoused people.

Joy Knoblauch, "Defensible Space and the Open Society," *Aggregate 3* (March 2015):

<https://we-aggregate.org/piece/defensible-space-and-the-open-society>

After racial inequality prompted rioting in Detroit, Newark, New York, Los Angeles, and other cities in the late 1960s, federal concerns over crimes against property and preoccupations with creating a psychopathology of African-American city dwellers eclipsed outrage over the unjust and unequal treatment of black people.¹ This was evident in the reports of three high-profile commissions appointed by President Lyndon B. Johnson: the **Kerner Commission's *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (1967); the Douglas Commission's report, *Building the American City* (1967–1969); and the Kaiser Commission's report, *A Decent Home: The Report of the President's Committee on Urban Housing*.**² The Kerner Commission's report featured a series of vivid photographs by Gordon Parks, which also appeared in *LIFE* magazine. Parks' images put a face to the so-called pathology of the "personality factory" of black families in the "slums," and displaced concern with structural economic issues onto residents themselves. Similarly, the Douglas Commission report cataloged losses to property that resulted from rioting before they addressed the human costs of inequality.

Over the next twenty years, **officials came to see vandalism and property damage as not just an index, but also a cause of social ill.** One outcome was the rise of "**Broken Windows theory**," which suggested that fixing and preventing property damage could repair and preclude unlawfulness and civil disorder. Elaborated in 1982 by social scientists **James Q. Wilson and George L. Kelling**, Broken Windows theory has shaped the policing strategy employed today in New York and many other cities by **encouraging police departments to target even small crimes against property.**³ Combined with a growing emphasis on order maintenance policing, the Broken Windows approach increased the number of enforcement interactions between officers and citizens, setting the stage for pervasive harassment and occasional deadly violence.

Wilson and Kelling's theory was received by a city already acquainted with the work of architect and urbanist Oscar Newman, who had used New York City Housing Authority police data to develop his own theory of defensible space between 1969 and 1972.⁴ Broken Windows and defensible space are linked in popular understanding and in public policy documents.⁵ **Both assume that combating visual signs of blight can improve a neighborhood and prevent crime.** However, a closer look at Newman's 1972 book, *Defensible Space: Crime Prevention Through Urban Design*, which helped launch the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) movement, shows that **the earlier version of Broken Windows theory**

emphasized self-policing over municipal enforcement. **Each rests on the flawed assumption that reducing visual signs of blight (not to mention designing a better urban environment) is an acceptable substitute for solving the structural and social problems facing black Americans.**

Defensible Space included a chapter on “Image and Milieu,” which focused on the damage caused by the stigma of living in a housing project plagued by vandalism. Newman’s conclusions, informed by psychological research, suggested that architects could strengthen civil society and preclude crime by creating “defensible spaces,” clearly outlined territories that would encourage residents to police their own spaces. His criminological model was in fact a biopolitical one, governing through close attention to the available data about crime in public housing and based in a social scientific theory of mind.⁶ Newman promoted the idea that **housing should be redesigned to engender feelings of ownership among residents so that they would police their own turf....** Freedom from violence is clearly an improvement, but in cases where the fear of crime is not in proportion to the actual threat of violence, **Newman’s soft-power model simply introduces “community” self-policing that alienates neighbor from neighbor, creating suspicion rather than safety.**

Newman opened *Defensible Space* by tying social good to architectural forms. Pointing out that the 1968 Federal Housing Act had recommended that families with children should only be housed in high-rise buildings when there is no other option, he **attacked the high-rise multifamily dwelling.** This argument was underscored by the vivid **images of the implosion of the Pruitt-Igoe** housing complex featured on the book’s dust jacket.

Undifferentiated groups were dangerous, according to psychologists, as each bystander could evade civic obligation in anonymous unclaimed spaces. But with a clear sense of responsibility and ownership, a bystander would become a defender. **The architect’s role was to understand the findings of social psychology and redesign the urban environment to reinforce the bystander effect.**

Newman’s alternative to high-rise, high-crime public housing was a form of **low-rise housing that would clearly delineate spaces for each unit, creating security by establishing clear boundaries and thresholds.**

Though it was challenged by social science experts and those who studied the new field of environmental psychology, the book was a success.¹⁵ It was widely reviewed in the popular media and sold well.... Newman’s way of thinking **supported the demise of the high-rise housing project** typology and the **rise of New Urbanist planning** and design strategies, and his ideas remain the basis for an ongoing CPTED industry.

current interpretations of his theories, such as Broken Windows policing, have abandoned the architectural and biopolitical dimensions of his work.

Newman hoped that defined territories would make cities safer, and less violent, and would hence preserve the urban, open society that was very much under threat in the late 1960s. Like Jeremy Bentham, he proposed a soft-power solution to policing, imagining that prisons would be made more humane and the abuses by guards

reduced by the self-surveillance that panoptic architecture promotes. **Translated to the urban environment, the model of self-policing has yielded a private, gated world that has not reduced fear or increased trust.**

Newman's intentions—to preserve community and to develop an open society, rather than elucidate a theory that has led to incarceration on a nearly unprecedented scale—**seem lost today.**

Bryan Lee, Jr., “America’s Cities Were Designed to Oppress,” *CityLab* (June 3, 2020):

<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-06-03/how-to-design-justice-into-america-s-cities>

For nearly every injustice in the world, there is an architecture that has been planned and designed to perpetuate it. That's a key principle of the Design Justice movement, upon which I base my practice. Design Justice seeks to dismantle the privilege and power structures that use architecture as a tool of oppression and sees it as an opportunity to envision radically just spaces centered on the liberation of disinherited communities.

That built-in oppression takes many forms. It's in the planning decisions that target non-white communities for highway projects and “urban renewal” schemes conceived to steer economic benefits away from existing residents. It's in a design philosophy that turned neighborhoods into mazes of “defensible space” that often criminalize blackness under the guise of safety. And it's in the **proliferation of public spaces that often fail to let certain cultural communities congregate without fear of harassment.**

The script has shown us that the violence inherent in the economic and cultural deconstruction of black neighborhoods, usually under the pretense of economic development, precipitates the displacement of living communities, accelerates inequities, amplifies the fears of white society, and makes acceptable the use of force by police to protect even the slightest inconvenience of land and property.... white America has found it all too easy to transpose its capital and beliefs into physical space, allowing the architecture to covertly project power in the name of white supremacy without the burden of having to sustain the unpleasant acts of overt racism themselves.

With this simple deed, we've restricted the freedom of movement to those deemed unworthy by the declaration of the built environment — and thus authorized countless acts of violence in the name of protecting land, property and the public realm. For example: **In 2019, Minneapolis [approved the extension of CPTED \(crime prevention through environmental design\) practices for all new developments.](#)** While CPTED principles are **said to help discourage crime by orienting building windows and entrances to aid in providing “eyes on the street” that monitor activity, in practice this strategy can [end up serving the same suppressive purpose as stop-and-frisk policing](#) — to assure that anyone considered suspicious is made to feel uncomfortable.** The problem is when you are black in this country, you live daily with the heavy weight of the world's distrust on your shoulders.

- **Cease all efforts to implement defensible space and CPTED crime prevention through environmental design tactics that often promote unwarranted interaction with the police.**
- **Architects should stop supporting the carceral state through the design of prisons, jails, and police stations.** All of these spaces inflict harm and extraction on black bodies far beyond that of other communities.
- Stop using area mean income, or AMI, [to determine “affordability” in our communities](#). Instead root the distribution of state and federal resources in a measure that reflects the extraction of generational wealth from black communities.
- Advocate for policies and procedures that **support a genuinely accessible public realm, free from embedded oppression.**
- **Ensure communities’ self-determination through an established procedure that incorporates community voice in process and community benefits agreements** in action for all publicly accountable projects.
- **Detangle our contractual relationships with power and capital** to better serve neighborhoods and communities from a position of service and not from a place of extraction, freeing ourselves from the fee-for-service model and building power through black and brown development of the built environment.
- Invest in and secure the place-keeping of black cultural spaces.
- Redesign our design training and licensing efforts to reflect the history of spatial injustice and build new measures to ground our work in service of liberating spaces.

DEFENSIBLE CIVIC SPACES + SCHOOLS

David Monteyne, *Fallout Shelter: Designing for Civil Defense in the Cold War* (University of Minnesota Press, 2011).

college students often expressed dissident opinions on the fallout shelter program. Guerrilla interventions resisted materially the resignification of the built environment, while organized protests called on the academy to oppose the irrationalities of civil defense. Fallout shelter signs were vandalized and stolen when posted on campus buildings. Confronted with at least eighteen fallout shelter signs having been “removed or mutilated by students” during the spring semester of 1963, the administration at the University of Minnesota somewhat condescendingly acknowledged the students’ outlook toward open debate. (68)

Writing to appease the colonel in charge of the fallout shelter program at the district office of the COE, the university’s vice president explained that among things that characterize a college or university student body is

the fact that there will always be a segment of activists on almost any subject . . . There have been lively discussions in some of our student groups about the fallout shelter signs and, to some students—who at this stage in their life like / to think of themselves as active pacifists—the signs in themselves are a war-like act. The University, of course, in no way shares this feeling . . . We do feel it to be completely our responsibility to cooperate with you in the fallout shelter sign program. And yet, **the way in which we handle our problem on a campus I expect is probably more sensitive than it might be in any other type public building. In some cases the sign removal may not be an act of vandalism. It may reflect a misguided, but nonetheless sincere attitude.** (68-9)

...critics believed that architects ought to solve national and international problems of mass housing rather than mass shelter or dispersal. In this, they harked back to the idealism of the earlier modernists, who believed in architecture as social reform. **By 1961, a group of architects arose to protest the AIA's new, close involvement in civil defense.** Focusing on the institute's promotion of fallout shelter surveys and competitions, the **group attacked AIA's unilateral decision on behalf of the members to assist the government in "planning for destruction."** No longer questioning the technical possibilities of architecture for civil defense—indeed, dismissing them entirely—this protest group stated bluntly that fallout shelters were “anti-architecture.” **The AIA was forced to prove that this was indeed “architecture,” even “good design,”** and the ongoing competitions, charrettes, and award programs described in chapters 5 and 6 were to provide the evidence. (109)

Critics believed that any shelter program at all put the United States on a constant war footing, thus inviting attack. For their part, **architects revisited earlier debates over the ethics, efficacy, and even the possibility of designing for civil defense. In 1969–70, a militant architecture student body, politicized by protests against the war in Vietnam and other “Establishment” practices and institutional oppressions, crashed AIA conventions and chapter meetings. As a result, the AIA reluctantly was forced to reformulate its relationship with the OCD,** and to rethink its responsibilities to a democratic society. (190)

Although EOCs were publicized as institutions for the preservation of social welfare, it soon became apparent that they also were bastions of social control. Built in response to Cold War geopolitics, EOCs quickly became headquarters for the forces of containment on the home front. Civil rights marches, protests against the U.S. war in Vietnam, and other mass demonstrations were increasingly frequent in the second half of the 1960s. So were episodes of urban rebellion, as inner-city residents reacted angrily to living conditions, police oppression, or national events like the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr. Municipal authorities and police, often reinforced by the National Guard, scrambled to maintain order in their cities. Their actions often resulted in violent clashes with citizens. News coverage of these urban conflicts in visual media often fanned the flames, leading to more strife and damaging the reputation of the city and its government.³⁹ **Emergency Operating Centers were promoted as a solution to urban chaos and confrontations, places where cool heads would prevail, allowing civic authorities to defuse troubling situations.** Events could be tracked on the wall maps of EOCs, and emergency services dispatched from the centralized communications hub. (222)

For the most part, **students and others critical of civil defense in the late 1960s protested the profession's participation in the program, and the broad implications for world peace, rather than the design and construction of fallout shelters per se.** Despite all the OCD publications, purpose-built shelters were not prevalent enough to justify picketing. There were perhaps a few hundred buildings across the United States designed to incorporate fallout shelter, compared to more than one hundred thousand that were surveyed and marked to indicate their inherent accommodation of fallout shelter. Finding more of this inherent shelter in new buildings, especially in deficit districts, was the key aspect of shelter survey updates, now conducted by teams of architecture and engineering students. (229)

Functionally, in the communication room, a bank of radios was dedicated to city departments concerned with postattack welfare: police, fire, radiological monitoring, and the Department of Public Works. **"Intelligence" got its own small office,** but the mayor did not. In the largest room, twenty desks and chairs faced the **operations map wall** where threats and responses could be plotted across the city. For the more immediate vicinity of Government Center, **closed-circuit television cameras trained on the plaza piped images to the EOC of any postattack (or protest) environment.** Located two floors below the plaza level, and shielded by the walls of the parking garage, the EOC in Boston City Hall essentially was a bunker. (265)

Commentators clearly understood the **desire to control the environments of Boston City Hall as a response to the rise, in the late 1960s, of mass protest movements and various forms of urban unrest associated with them.** Concerns about the containment of social disorder became increasingly prominent among civil defense planners and building professionals. For instance, Boston City Hall's building manager at the time noted that **the "openness of the plaza was designed to get demonstrators off the narrow streets where they would smash windows."**⁷³ **Time magazine also reported on these strategies: though "a bastion, it abounds in entrances, ramps, staircases, and a huge central courtyard—all suitable, as Kallmann points out, for sit-ins."**⁷⁴ On the other hand, concrete bollards that served as plaza lighting, plus broad stairs and other grade changes, complicated vehicular access to the base of the brick ramparts that meet the ground at most points around the building's perimeter. The plaza's open expanse served to emphasize City Hall's bunker architecture, the building rising as a midspace mass symbolically commanding a cleared field of fire. The ambivalence between the openness and the authority of a public building is here understood as a configuration in which **the openness itself ensures effective relations of authority** (266)

Alexandra Louise Bevan, "Designed for Threat: Surveillance, Mass Shootings, and Pre-Emptive Design in School Architecture," *Surveillance & Society* 17:3/4 (2019):

<https://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/surveillance-and-society/article/view/7077>.

While the nascence of surveillance studies owes much to **Foucault's** connections between **institutional architecture and modern discourses on discipline, and surveillance literature routinely covers the role of architecture in security regimes,** security and surveillance studies rarely discuss architecture and the

structures of power from a designerly perspective (Foucault 1995). This article prioritizes this approach through the case study of educational architecture in the era of mass shootings. Its intervention is mostly conceptual in nature; thus, approaching educational architecture as an expression of the way surveillance and control are exercised in the Western postwar security state. Specifically, this article explores the discursive negotiations of safety, risk, information, surveillance, and citizenship by looking at how primary, secondary, and tertiary educational architectures respond to the threat of mass shootings.... Contemporary educational architecture inscribes the pre-emptive threat into its design, marking a shift from a postwar modernism that saw itself as treating the aftermath of a nuclear war. (550)

there are two articulations of this pre-emptive-threat environment in school architecture: the **“fortress school”** is a term this study repurposes from Bewley-Taylor (2006) to refer to a **reactionary style of school architecture that is modelled on older understandings of security and surveillance; the second articulation is the “surveilled flow” and operates on the concepts of threat established in the newer negotiations over information, privacy, and security that are unique to the digital era.** (551)

Surveillance studies offers several theoretical contributions that are relevant to this article’s case study of educational architecture in the era of mass shootings. These include the **idea of lateral surveillance (Andrejevic 2006); the ideas of soft surveillance and diffused surveillance, which allow for the illusions of freedom and personal privacy while monitoring is ongoing and ubiquitous (Marx 2006);** theories on risk culture; and the social control of children’s bodies as a testing ground for the increasingly popular toleration of surveillance intrusions into personal privacy. From its earliest days surveillance studies has been concerned with the intersections among privacy, individualism, and various ideas of personal space.... Focused attention is paid to personal details that are monitored, recorded, checked, stored, retrieved, and compared—in short processed in many different ways” (2). These activities are carried out using a variety of tools, **including CCTVs, metal detectors, biometrics, motion sensors, and the tracking and collection of people’s online behavior.** This study’s contention is that architecture should be included among these tools as it often works in concert with them.” (551)

It is impossible for surveilling powers to remain ever alert and watching; consequently, surveillance is largely devoted to sorting people, spaces, and events into abstract categories that may then be flagged for further monitoring (Lyon 2002: 3). This tension between mobile agents and keeping select targets under observation, between keeping the illusion of freedom and transparency while also surveilling people and places of interest, is very much present in school architecture in the age of mass shootings. **Schools want to create illusions of community and freedom of information and knowledge. These often translate, in physical terms, to communal spaces that allow for freedom of movement and circulation.** However, there is an increasing pressure that these spaces and the **people occupying them must be monitored for risky or errant behavior.** (551)

the idea of the **panopticon** has been so abstracted in scholarship (Murakami Wood 2012) that it is / easy to forget it originated with an **architectural manifestation** of an emerging conception of modern power and control over populations. Foucault reminds us that architecture and power and, in particular, the **politics of watching and being watched**, are always overdetermined (551-2)

The fortress school strongly delineates between inside and outside space through few and highly controlled entrances and exits. Their façades are often confrontational towards their surrounding contexts. For example, the façade of the architects de Rijke Marsh Morgan's extension to a primary school in South London has a white-and-orange curtain wall of interlocking rectangular panels that simulate laid bricks. Despite the bright colors, the **façade is bunker-like**. Within the school's walls, however, a sense of community is created through open space that situates multiple discrete entities (offices and classrooms) around an agora, a center courtyard, or a corridor for flow. (552)

Urban renewal was a coordinated response on the part of city planners and tertiary educators to oust residents of slum areas that had resulted from the postwar emigration of white residents out of cities. Urban renewal also accommodated the sharp increase in college enrolments affected by the GI bill, a postwar piece of US legislation that subsidized returning veterans' tertiary education and home mortgages (Bewley-Taylor 2006: 237-238). The worst trappings of modernism, including its context insensitivity and presumptions of universality, were mobilized in campus buildings constructed in the 1960s and 1970s. This architecture **reinforced a culture of urban surveillance that conveniently coincided with the war on drugs and the dislocation of low-income residents of color** (Bewley-Taylor 2006: 239). Allen makes the case that the urban-renewal projects of the 1960s and 1970s and the student radicalism of the same period have overdetermined histories. **Incidents of large student protests in the People's Park at Berkeley and student riots in Paris and at Columbia University in 1968 were part of a global response to the political climate of the time, which included the rapidly expanding university campus** (Allen 2007: 5). In the context of **growing political conservatism, bellicose Cold War regimes, escalating police brutality, aggressive campus expansion projects, and student and community protests in developed postwar nations tried to reclaim the urban spaces that urban-renewal projects had forcibly annexed. Campus planners subscribed to an ethos of "utmost rationality"** that divided academic departments into "planning modules" and designed dormitories as "towers in the park" in order to conserve space (Allen 2007: 8-11; Riker 1961). A hunger for more space forced universities to turn to surrounding residential areas, which they bought and from which they evicted these residences' tenants under the guise of "cleaning up" the neighborhood (Allen 2007: 12). (553)

Educational contexts traditionally position modernism as rationalizing, disciplining, and organizing ornery student and residential populations. By the 1980s, student populations and university-town residents were understandably bitter about the modernist eyesores that peppered campuses. (553)

Williams "writes about the hypocrisy of a tertiary modernism that strove to express aspirations of interdisciplinarity and departmental collaboration by inserting sky bridges and walkways between

buildings (ibid.: 20). More concerned with fostering connectivity inside its walls, **urban renewal articulates an institutional insularity by turning away from the surrounding community**. For Williams, hallways and courtyards are little more than empty and privileged expressions of the tertiary penchant for reflecting upon the outside world in the absence of interacting with it” (554)

Malls, university campuses, neighborhoods, and schools are rebranded as **closed, private, and fortified spaces** in the surveillance era. (554)

Much like the modernist university campus, open spaces within the fortress school are exclusive to insiders. However, in this newer iteration, insiders are encouraged to patrol and surveil each other through a system of internal security mechanisms, such as CCTVs, classroom doors that lock from the inside, transparent lockers, and spaces that foster ideas of transparency through such features as atriums with adjacent offices that have bullet-proof glass walls. Kupchik and Monahan (2006) write on the encroachment of surveillance systems in British and US schools through police presence, security cameras, and metal detectors (624). Hope (2009) writes about the **proliferation of CCTVs in UK primary and secondary schools. Like their US equivalents, UK schools justify their public-surveillance tactics by citing instances of school shootings** (most notably the Dunblane primary school shooting of 1996 in which a gunman shot 16 children and one teacher before killing himself) (899). Hope notes that the “severest risk narratives tend to be reserved for those perceived to be dangerous outsiders, ‘undesirables’ who should remain beyond the school boundaries,” thus, the need to fortify schools to protect them from the outsider (ibid.: 893). However, Hope notes the contradiction that it is oftentimes someone attached to the institution who conducts a terrorist attack. CCTV, as an internal surveillance tactic, enables us to label insiders as either others or potential risks (ibid.: 899). The bunkered, protective outward-looking of the fortress school is coupled, therefore, with a practice of internal monitoring and inward-looking that patrols citizenship from within (554)

Lateral surveillance is a term borrowed from Andrejevic (2006) who uses it to describe the peer-to-peer surveillance that is encouraged in an increasingly mediatized society. From one point of view, this heightened lateral surveillance was inevitable; Thompson (2003) argues that surveillance is bound up with the development of capitalism. However, in the era of late capitalism the exact forms lateral surveillance take are very much related to digitization and dominant neoliberal free-market ideologies. Thompson adopts Sewell’s distinction between vertical and horizontal control, according to which late capitalism develops fewer direct forms of social coercion or a kind of **“chimerical control” over workers** (Sewell 1998: 422; Thompson 2002: 139). Zuboff also notes that **softer forms of surveillance** characterize late capitalism and are manifested in the high value placed on teamwork and collaborative learning (Zuboff 1998: 308). Thompson similarly observes that these softer, more chimerical forms of surveillance are exercised when workplaces **collect performance data and encourage teamwork** (Thompson 2003: 140-1). (554)

Finn and McCahill (2010) conducted fieldwork on how teenagers living in low-income areas of Northern City, UK, experience surveillance at school and in urban areas. It is troubling that students assume that forms of

classroom surveillance and security (like staff-card swipes at doors) are integrated with city CCTV cameras so as to track their movements (ibid.: 276). They also assume that teachers track what they do on school computers (ibid.: 281). Finn and McCahill show that **surveillance culture is fully integrated into the lived experiences of youth and the expectations they have of public and private spaces (ibid.: 286). It also suggests that students do not feel they have any negotiating power or agency in these systems (ibid.: 287).** This study shows that the students in these school buildings are already primed for highly securitized regimes. Secondary-level students in low-income groups see educational spaces as part of a larger fabric of their surveilled profiles. Recent mass student protests for gun control in America point to this group's increasing frustration and dissatisfaction with what they see as limited degrees of agency and sovereignty in the present school system and political climate in their country (Blinder and Yee 2018). (555) – **PANOPTO, COP SHIT**

If students feel current systems of education and government constrain their rights as citizens, they have good reason. The recalibration of the fortress school has historically been in steady conversation with incarceration systems. This is particularly true in the post-industrial state that disciplines a potentially disobedient population of young citizens who face decreasing job security within the context of the decline of the welfare state (Kupchik and Monahan 2006: 618). **School architecture borrows heavily from early systems of incarceration. Indeed, the architectures of schools, prisons, and asylums are inextricably bound together with Enlightenment-era notions of discipline, reason, and governance** (Foucault 1995: 73-4). However, the surveillance tactics of the modern security state are continually tailored to the particular historical disgruntlements of the students of the moment. (555)

Kupchik and Monahan (2006: 620-1, 624) cite the multiple signs of increasing internal surveillance in schools since the 1990s, such as **metal detectors, CCTVs, and police presence on campuses**. They associate these with the parallel trends of imprisonment rates that began to soar with the increasing privatization of the incarceration system (ibid.: 621).... Surveillance programs like “classmate informants” who are paid in neighborhoods, rise in poor neighborhoods. “Students’ experiences are thus framed within a **climate of distrust** under the watchful eye of the state” (ibid.: 622). Kupchik and Monahan’s depressing image of increasing surveillance in public schools describes the internal ocular regime of the fortress school. **The fortress school encourages self-surveillance and co-surveillance among its citizens; it encourages them to yield information on themselves and each other under the auspices of safety and transparency. Citizens are also encouraged to constantly scrutinize the internal population for possible dissidents**, such as those who appear unhappy or depressed, or exhibit anti-social behaviors that might pre-empt potential acts of terrorism. (556)

Newman’s pioneering work in security and public housing introduced the idea of the “defensible space” to urban planning (Newman 1996). Newman argues that high crime rates are exacerbated by high-rise buildings and, instead, advocated for limited private dwelling units with individual yards (ibid.: 13-14). In place of a large shared courtyard, each handful of dwelling units would face a smaller courtyard offset from the street, Newman’s way of “bringing the streets into the control of the residents” (ibid.: 22).

Newman therefore **reinforces the idea of self-policing through architectural design**, providing a strong historical precedent for similar notions of the mutual surveillance inscribed in educational spaces today. In addition, his recommendation for fewer and spaced-out entrances echoes the high-security architectural façades of current educational architecture that provide finite and controlled points of penetration for the next potential mass shooter (ibid.: 28). (556)

The development of security architecture in public housing historically coincided with what surveillance scholars describe as the intensification of a risk culture. Vaz and Bruno (2003) write about cultures of self-surveillance that aim to pre-empt mental and physical illness (i.e., rating and recording your daily mood). These cultures fit into popular ideologies of self-care and lifestyle management. Individuals who do not subscribe to regimens of self-care are therefore at risk. (556)

In Deleuze and Guattari's words, "Technologies of control can be characterized by their potential for the 'molecularization' of surveillance that **re-configures the target of surveillance as a member of a risk population rather than as a (molar) individual**" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 334-337; Osmond 2010: 328). In effect, people are treated differently based on a risk assessment and not on criminal behavior (ibid.: 335). While such programs are thought to be preventative, they come dangerously close to **stigmatizing individuals before they have even committed a crime**. (557)

Pre-emptive inward-looking also includes a Russian nesting-doll-type hierarchy of personal privacy. There is inside the city walls and then there is deeper inside the city walls, where the classroom is located. One example of how this manifests in material design is the lockdown key, a quick, easy mechanism that allows the user to lock the classroom door from the inside with the push of a button. Only people who have the master key can unlock it from the outside. (557)

In the postwar era, the threat of a nuclear holocaust was met with large-scale infrastructural apocalypse-greeting projects, like the highway system, duck-and-cover drills, and bunker. However, these are mostly reactive: they are measures that are put into play once the danger has occurred. A culture of threat and pre-emption is different in that it inscribes and anticipates potential pathways danger may take into the present-day lived realities of people and places. **Threat and its anticipation are omniscient**. Architecture does not wait for threat so it can then respond; it is primed for threat so it may shape the chaos that ensues. (558)

The nervous inward-looking is coupled with a corresponding outward-looking, which takes the form of a sniper, or drone view of the outside world. Two years after the **Sandy Hook** shooting of 2012, in the US, in which a twenty-year old man killed twenty six-year-olds and six staff, the school demolished the original building and erected a new one next to the footprint of the original. The final design by Svigals and Partners features a **rain garden between the parking lot and the school building, or what amounts to a moat as a first line of defense** (Urist 2014). Entrances are limited to three points in the façade, with the back of the building facing a thick wood. Administrative offices are placed at the front of the building, looking outward, and the main

entrance has a double-entry port akin to those we would encounter at banks. This type of design **makes sure the inhabitants have the higher ground, from which they can keep a watchful eye on the exterior world.** The styles of façades that are attached to architecture built for threat tend to be gruff, homogeneous, and illegible. Architectures of pre-emption draw sharp distinctions between insider and outsider, with liminal passage points whereby visitors undergo a security induction by passing through gatehouses, metal detectors, or administrative offices (i.e., the 2014 guard house Jonathan Tuckey designed for Wilberforce Primary School, in London, England [Frearson: 2014]). The irony of these structures is that terrorism is rarely the result of a truly outsider threat because most mass shooters are affiliated, in some way, with the communities they terrorize. (559)

Inward-looking in preemptive school architecture engenders the process of monitoring each other and acclimates us to intrusions into personal privacy on the part of institutions of power. This is less the panoptic environment that Foucault theorizes than it is a visibility and a culture of surveillance focused on one-on-one interrelationships that are determined by access to information and the control of its flow. (559)

Pre-emptive school architecture scripts practices of outward- and inward-looking that reflect the desire to sharply delineate the outsider and the insider, to acclimate young citizens to incorporate invasions of privacy as well as to create the illusion of transparency and freedom of movement within a building that, at any moment, is subject to a complete lock down. Pre-emptive architecture encourages mutual surveillance among its citizens and is designed around predicting how attacks unfold rather than responding to or preventing them. (559)

Another model is what is termed surveilled flow. The Royal Dutch Military Police Complex designed by Zvi Hecker Architects (Figure 2) powerfully illustrates this iteration of pre-emptive educational architecture that aims to **make the whole school porous and flowing** rather than shutting it down as the fortress does. (560)... Segal writes of the Royal Dutch Military Police Complex, “The campus’ horizontal, dynamic and dispersed nature counters the concentric, symmetric, hierarchical and enclosed buildings commonly associated with state power, control, and supervision. A main element of enclosure – the peripheral wall – becomes here the building itself, which does not enclose a thing but meanders around open spaces. Furthermore, this peripheral ‘wall is permeable; by its mere shape and configuration, it creates a form that interweaves and connects open and closed, building and landscape, collective and private spaces, allowing the campus to remain ‘exposed,’ open and porous. (ibid.: 87) (560)

One response to these pressures is the school fortress: an architectural inscription of pre-emptive threat that is as literal as President Donald Trump’s isolationist promise to build a wall that would encase the United States from the outside world. Another response is the surveilled flow, which is shaped by the **neoliberal claim that “opening up” provides the best chances for digitally and visually detecting internal aberrations or organizational deviances. This is also an architecture that dangerously conflates suicide bombers and**

mass shooters with civil protesters, citizens with mental health conditions, and the quiet outcast, or loner—all of whom are branded as unruly occupants and potential hostiles. (562)

Allen, Peter. 2007. Violent Design: People's Park, Architectural Modernism and Urban Renewal. The Institute for the Study of Society Issues Fellows' Working Papers at UC Berkeley, May 11.
<http://escholarship.org/uc/item/6vz4s7jj> [accessed May 8, 2018].

PROTESTS + DEFENSIBLE DESIGNS

Shannon Mattern, "Speaking Stones: Voicing the City" in *Code + Clay, Data + Dirt: 5000 Years of Urban Media* (University of Minnesota Press, 2017)

Joanna Merwood Salisbury, *Design for the Crowd; Patriotism and Protest in Union Square* (University of Chicago Press, 2019).

Oliver Elser, Anna-Maria Mayerhofer, Sebastian Hackenschmidt, Jennifer Dyck, Lilli Hollein, and Peter Cachola Schmal, eds., *Protest Architecture* (Park Books, 2003).

Patrick Rafail, "Protest in the City: Urban Spatial Restructuring and Dissent in New York, 1960-2006," *Urban Studies* 55:1 (January 2018): 244-60.

Protests become increasingly spatially concentrated, with a disproportionate amount of activism taking place on or in close proximity to privately owned public spaces. Spaces in close proximity to powerful organisational or institutional targets also experience heightened protest activity. Overall, I show that the built environment, and the social relationships creating it, powerfully influence where dissent occurs. This is consistent with the advent of neoliberal policies directing urban spatial restructuring, which have brought about a process of structural funnelling for protest, ultimately making events more likely to occur in spaces that are hostile to mobilisation. (244)

a disproportionate amount of protest activity consistently **occurs in areas with powerful institutional targets, but these targets are located in increasingly privatised public spaces**. A consequence of this process is that public parks, a traditional assembly point for collective action, have declined in importance over time as sites of contestation. (245)

College campuses have been historic hubs of activism and social movement activity... College or university campuses, and their close proximity may attract atypical high levels of protest activity, particularly institutions with historical cultures of political activism (Van Dyke, 1998). It is important to note, however, that spatial

access to university property became heavily restricted in the USA following the 1960s. **Many colleges and universities came to adopt 'free speech zones', referring to policies that explicitly prohibited or reduced access to certain spaces on campus while simultaneously imposing restrictions on how and why spaces could be used.** This process has occurred not only at private institutions (Sarabyn, 2010), but public institutions as well (Calvert and Richards, 2005; Davis, 2004). Examples abound of students being arrested, detained or otherwise facing penalties for ignoring university policies that set parameters around appropriate speech (see e.g. Zeiner, 2005: 1–2). (248)

Hans Nicholas Sagan, "Specters of '68: Protest, Policing, and Urban Space," Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 2015.

Central to protest policing is the concept of territorial control; means to achieve this control vary by mode of protest policing, which varies according to dominant socioeconomic model. Protesters used a variety of spatial strategies at varying degrees of organization. **Both protesters and police developed innovations in spatial practice in order to make their activities more effective.** This has significant consequences for professionalized urban design. Both protester and policing spatial innovation involves the tactical reorganization and occupation of urban space. As urban space plays a constituent role in protest and policing, environmental designers must be aware of the political consequences of their designs (1)

The Australian Capital Territory Planning Authority further explores urban design for security in its publication *Role of Urban Design in Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, prepared by urban planners Wendy Bell, Ben Woodroffe and Graham Gaston.... The Australian authors base their work on *Environmental Crime Prevention* by architect and social researcher Barry Poyner from 1983. This work proposes the following urban design moves intended to reduce the incidence of crime: the privatization of residential streets, limiting pedestrian access, separating residential and commercial uses, arranging apartment doors and windows carefully, making sure schools are visible from other buildings, limiting access to the rear of houses, and so on. The book also **cites Felson 1987 on doing away with 'open-campus' designs, in favor of using more controlled access master plans.** The following basic CPTED practices will lead to higher incidences of inclusion and less likelihood of crime: **police patrol cars able to easily reach all sides of a building, streets are wide and straight enough to give patrolling police an unobstructed view, buildings set far enough back from the street to produce a sense of semi-private space, defensible spaces:** clusters of houses, clear use of spaces, etc. (73)

Xueying Wu, Yi Lu, Jingjing Wang, and Bin Jiang, "Built Environment and Urban Space Affect Protests: A Cross-Sectional Study in Hong Kong," *Sustainability* 15 (2023):
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su151713096>

we investigated the relationship between built environment characteristics and the spatial distribution of 348 protests that occurred in Hong Kong from June 2019 to January 2020. We innovatively distinguished between

peaceful and violent protests as well as legal and illegal (authorized vs. unauthorized) protests. Our study revealed several significant patterns. First, in general, **areas with a higher level of building density, government and commerce point-of-interest (POI) density, metro accessibility, park density, and street greenery experienced more protesting activities.** Second, illegal and violent protests, those which are less constrained by authorities and thus more likely to reflect the autonomous choices of the protestors, are **more likely to occur in regions with more government and commercial buildings, high metro accessibility, and a high level of street greenery** (1)

First, in the protesting process, protestors need to gather in a space before starting. Parks, city squares, or other open spaces in an **urban space that act as “containers”** are more likely to be chosen by protestors. Second, protestors need to effectively convey messages and their opinions. In most cases, protestors use peaceful means, such as shouting slogans in streets, public speech, banners, or sit-down demonstrations, to voice their opinions and put forward demands. **Government buildings or places with a large volume of pedestrians (e.g., commercial buildings, metro stations, vibrant streets) are usually identified as strategic locations or a “stage” for protestors.** Third, the movement of protestors or protesting goods in urban spaces is another crucial part of protesting. The **transportation system in an urban space, especially the metro system, works as a “feeder” for protestors**, supporting the massive gathering and movement of demonstrators in the space. Fourth, vandalism may erupt when the protestors’ demands do not receive a positive and timely response from government departments. Government buildings, crucial public facilities (e.g., metro stations), and major streets become their “target”. Fifth, the protestors may have to confront the police if vandalism occurs. The urban space will become the protestors’ natural “shelter” to avoid law enforcement. A space with dense buildings or dense trees may be the preferred choice. (15)

We found that **protests are spatially concentrated in areas with a high building density, high government and commerce POI density, high park density and metro accessibility, and an abundance of street greenery.** Further, our results also reveal that illegal violent protests, not peaceful ones, are more likely to occur in areas with high government and commerce POI density, high metro accessibility, and an abundance of greenery. (16)

Tali Hatuka, *The Design of Protest: Choreographing Political Demonstrations in Public Space* (University of Texas Press, 2018).

Chapter 1, “Challenging Distance,” introduces the book’s key premises and the lens through which protests are explored. Chapter 2, “Choosing a Place,” focuses on **how distance is manifested in space and its role in event planning.** Because no ideal space exists for political action, the dialogue between the people and those in power might take place anywhere. Thus, the key question is not only where a particular action occurs but also **what types of opportunities does a particular place offer to communicate an ideology? How does setting influence the development of temporary relationships on a mass level?** In exploring these questions, “Choosing a Place” provides a set of abstract, temporary categorizations for public spaces and offers a

general overview of the dynamics between political events and places. Chapter 3, “Enhancing the Impact,” is about distance and distanciation and about the **ability of activists to project their message beyond the event’s geographical boundaries**. More specifically, it examines the ways in which actors employ various spatial spheres and organizing principles to enhance their messages and claims. Tracking the ways in which actors operate reveals a sophisticated and multifaceted configuration of dissent, which extends beyond the boundaries of the nation-state and questions of national identity, thereby pressing us to abandon notions of resistance that assume that a subject stands vis-à-vis the established state’s structure of power. Part I closes / with chapter 4, “Bargaining Power,” which discusses protests as bargaining processes regarding the appropriation of city spaces. Over the long history of civil protest, organizers have frequently struck bargains with authorities and police in advance. (viii-ix)

Part II, “Spatial Choreographies,” is about the specific spatial and temporal dimensions of protests. It investigates specific events’ detailed designs, not only as aesthetic manifestations but also as tactics. Tactics, argues de Certeau in *The Practice of Everyday Life* (xix), depend on timing and opportunities that must be seized. However, tactics are not the “victories of the ‘weak’ over the ‘strong’ (whether the strength be that of the powerful people or the violence of things or of an imposed order, etc.).” Instead, they concern the clever implementation of the protest’s planning strategy. Clearly, tactics cannot be exactly replicated (even by the same activists), but they can definitely inspire other protesters. The unfixed nature of a protest’s design is its strength, allowing activists to contextualize their ideas and actions. “Spatial Choreographies” addresses the dynamics between temporalities and their spatial attributes. They are microanalyses of events that focus on the dynamics between the body and physical settings, between the protest’s social dynamics and ritual components (e.g., marching, gathering, and singing), dress code, and schedule (i.e., the timing and duration of the event). Chapter 5, “Staging the Action,” provides an introduction to these features, presenting the **dramaturgical attributes of three key spatial protest prototypes: the spectacle, the procession, and the place-making**. Under each prototype, one can find extremely diverse spatial choreographies. In addition, although all protests are time-space specific and embedded in a concrete political, historical, and spatial context, some protests can also be viewed as offering a sociopolitical choreography in space that can be found, with alterations, in other contexts. Chapters 6, 7, and 8 present examples of these spatial choreographies. Chapter 6, “Spectacles,” analyzes events, whether large- or small-scale performances, that tend to be well-planned gatherings with particular sensitivity to the physical order or architectural attributes of a space. Chapter 7, “Processions,” examines events in which walking or marching figure prominently, placing the protest in the mundane and economic space of the city. Chapter 8, “Place-Making,” investigates events that use object(s) in a given setting as the heart of the event. The body in this type of action is secondary to the object, though they are closely linked. All the events analyzed in these chapters are major political actions and key events on a national or international scale from the 1960s to the present day. (ix)

Michael H. Carriere, "Between Being and Becoming: On Architecture, Student Protest, and the Aesthetics of Liberalism in Postwar America," Dissertation, University of Chicago, 2010.

As David Harvey and others have pointed out, both modernism and liberalism were coming under great attack by the end of the 1960s. It is my contention that a close attention to matters of space – so vital in understanding the rise of postwar liberalism and the university's place in such a system – can also allow us to see why such institutions were under assault by the 1960s. **Such well-known episodes of the era – including the impetus for Berkeley's Free Speech Movement and the struggle against the construction of a gymnasium on the Columbia campus – revolved primarily around who controlled such spaces, and how they were to be used. Even more broadly, it is my contention that the alienation and unauthentic nature of American society often seen as crucial factors in the rise of the student movement can be attributed, at least in part, to issues surrounding the built environment of the college community. The stifling atmosphere of the "multiversity," for example, was more than metaphorical; it was a planned, concrete reality. And the search for "authenticity" – so important to many on the New Left - could take on spatial dimensions as well, as seen in the People's Park campaign in 1969. At the same time, the relationship between such institutions and their urban neighbors also undoubtedly played a role in the evolution of the movement** (11)

The debate over free speech at Berkeley, as John Searle astutely pointed out, was in large part a boundary dispute. More specifically, how were spaces associated with the university to be used, and who decided such uses? Going back into at least the early 1930s, students at Berkeley had embraced the "Sather Gate tradition," a university-sanctioned policy that created a "freedom of expression" zone just outside of university grounds, where this southern entrance opened up onto Telegraph Avenue. Since this space was **technically off-campus and legally owned by the city of Berkeley, it was seen as a place where students could exercise their right to free speech as citizens of the city.** Not surprisingly, this area near Sather Gate became **a hotbed of political organizing.** Students supporting all sorts of causes – from across the political spectrum – used this space to orate, set up tables, and pass out literature.

Yet as the university went through **rapid physical growth** in the postwar period, the **boundaries of the campus began to shift.** Most importantly, the university had helped the Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC) acquire the land needed for the construction of a **new student union facility** over a number of years, often holding such property in the name of the Regents. This extended the boundaries of the university, **pushing the school into property previously owned by the city and private owners.** When the Student Union building opened in 1961 (near Sather Gate, at the intersection of Bancroft and Telegraph), **the space previously associated with free speech and political activism was now gone:** to keep the tradition / alive, **students designated a 26x40 foot space directly in front of the new Student Union as the new "freedom of expression" zone.** This space was thought to still be owned by the city. It was, however, **property now owed by the university.** (311)

The question of political organizing on or near the Berkeley campus had become a vital issue by the fall of 1964. That previous summer the Republican National Convention had been held at nearby Cow Palace, and students from both the left and the right had come out to attend and protest the event. **That fall, students used the strip of land at Bancroft and Telegraph to recruit students for a variety of causes, particularly the now burgeoning civil rights movement. Such activity was allowed as it was believed that this piece of land belonged to the city of Berkeley,** rather than to the university. Kerr, however, knew this was the case and he asked the treasurer of the university to transfer the land to the city as soon as possible. For reasons unknown, Kerr's instructions were never carried out.

On September 14, 1964, **the university announced that organizing and soliciting funds for off-campus political activity would be banned from taking place in this space. To Kerr and other university administrators and their allies, the use of university grounds for political organizing violated the neutrality and objectivity that the school took great pains to maintain.** To such individuals, the "University and the name of the University must not be used to involve the University as an institution in the political, religious, and other controversial issues of the day." This position was codified through what became known as the Kerr Directives, issued throughout the early 1960s. At the same time, **a number of Berkeley officials were concerned that the tables and crowds that gathered at Sather Gate could constitute a safety hazard,** and in / fact served to somewhat **blight the campus environment.**⁹ Yet to many Berkeley students, such a policy only served to highlight the spatial imperialism of the university: it took the space it needed. According to one contemporary critique of such policies, **"the multiversity has never been sure where it ends and the world begins," so it has simply crafted a strategy that allows it to take whatever it wants – and then use such space however it wants.**¹⁰ (312-13)

those that called for the continuation of the Sather Gate tradition also had a very urban, urbane understanding of the university: they, like Kerr, saw the campus as a city. But their view of the urban was much different than the vision that Kerr championed in such works as *The Uses of the University*. **To many that would come to participate in – or sympathize with – the FSM, the fight became a question of who controlled the city, and how such city spaces should be used.** Or, put another way, who "owns" the city? Kerr and other university officials had a very liberal understanding of private property and property rights. According to noted FSM leader Mario Savio, "the Regents have taken a position that they have virtually unlimited control over the private property which is the University of California." (313)

Interestingly, the way that Berkeley evolved spatially in the postwar era may have helped to create the space necessary for the rise of individuals like Mario Savio and movements such as FSM. In an overlooked work on Berkeley in the 1960s, **sociologist Max Heirich has noted how the "Spatial rearrangements of the campus" may have set the stage for the Free Speech Movement. "As the Berkeley enrollment grew, additional buildings and facilities resulted in a rearrangement of student traffic patterns and the location of informal meeting centers."** Such processes dramatically affected where students were apt to cluster on the campus. (314)

The construction of Dwinelle Hall in 1952, a building that Heirich describes as “a mammoth labyrinth of classrooms, large lecture halls, a theater, and offices,” created a space where large amounts of students of the humanities now gathered (as the building was primarily dedicated to the disciplines of the humanities). And in 1960 and 1961 the cafeteria, book store, Student Union, and a general common leisure area were moved to what had been a block of stores adjoining the university just south and west of Sather Gate. To Heirich, **such a move “shifted the gathering point for coffee and conversation downhill to the natural territory of the humanities and social science students, adjacent to an area traditional set aside for political recruiting.”** The final piece of development came in the summer of 1964 with the construction of Barrows Halls, “a starkly modern, eightstory social sciences building.” Barrows Hall was built due east of the new Student Union, and on the same general level: the commitment to modern design was now plainly on display for many to see on a daily basis. **Perhaps most importantly, now those students studying the social sciences were brought into close proximity of the Sather Gate entrance.** (315)

Yet it was the architecture and urban planning associated with the Student Union that created the space – and perhaps, in a sense, the inspiration – needed for the FSM. In an October 1961 review of the Berkeley Student Center, noted architectural critic Allan Temko had commented on the particularly urban feel of this space: **“The great university of modern times is a civitas – a city not merely in essence but in physical activity.” To Temko, the design of this space, by Vernon DeMars and Donald Hardison, had a “deliberately citylike concept,”** one that clearly kept “urban considerations in mind.” At the same time, Temko saw the center itself as incredibly historically aware, with an affinity for such structures as the Piazza of San Marco in Venice. Moreover, the **buildings themselves seemed to embrace adornment:** they were “adorned with the university’s escutcheons, banners, and heraldic devices,” all of which were **“meant to contribute, structurally as well as decoratively, to the vivacity of the scene.”** To Temko, DeMars had embraced a style best described as **“planned chaos,”** a “veritable architectural ‘stream of consciousness.’” (316)

As someone still sympathetic to many of the goals of modernism, Temko simply saw too much going on in the space. “In view of all this,” he wrote, **“it seems fair to call the center a schizoid creation, torn between rational planning premises and their irrational architectural expression.”** To Temko, the space was **“a clutter of forms,”** one marked by “anarchic detailing,” even “carelessness tinged with sentimentality.” There was no firm commitment to order or simplicity of design here, **and Temko feared that the space would literally overpower and confuse the Berkeley students** (316)

Yet to DeMars, such a space was meant to evoke a strong response among such young people: it was meant to excite and inspire them, even purposefully confuse them. Perhaps distressed by the anti-urban aesthetic present in Berkeley (and perhaps struggling with his role in the planning of Wurster Hall, a structure whose final design DeMars would find great fault in), DeMars had gone out of his way to **create a truly urban space.** Responding to Temko’s critique, DeMars fired back: It is all a fragment of an urban situation **with purposeful changes of pace and vista (yes, and building materials) at the scale and tempo necessary to**

evoked the experience of an urban situation: a synthesis of streetscape and plazascape, great building and small, shop and pub, terrace and mall. This implies complexity, and cannot be achieved with the doctrine of 'less is more.' (317)

The planning for this new student center also called for the creation of Sproul Plaza. For this open space a portion of Telegraph Avenue, the main street of business near the university, was converted to a mall for **the block between the new Student Union and the campus' main administrative building, Sproul Hall.** Renamed Sproul Plaza, this mall provided a large space for people to congregate and talk. Perhaps more importantly, Sproul Plaza seemed to make little distinction between gown and town, as the space met a street where numerous coffee shops and large low-rent apartment houses frequented by students could be found. To Heirich, **"This architectural treatment made the border between campus and community less marked and encouraged nonstudents to use the area as well."** To journalist Art Seidenbaum and others, **Sproul Plaza quickly became a key area of congregation for Berkeley students** (317)

Larger numbers of students reached the central campus via Sather Gate instead of through North Gate or through the east end of Bancroft Way at Piedmont Avenue. Even Berkeley leaders such as Clark Kerr **saw the potential for the space – particularly its potential as a staging ground for mass protest. According to Kerr himself, Cecil B. DeMille could hardly have invented a more attractive setting for one of his extravaganzas than the university had unintentionally created for the events of fall 1964....The wide steps of Sproul Hall seemed a ready-made platform for speeches and demonstrations....It was a Hollywood stage set for mob scenes.** (318)

Reinhold Martin, *Knowledge Worlds: Media, Materiality, and the Making of the Modern University* (Columbia University Press, 2021).

These scars still mark the ground just south of **Sather Gate** where the architect Arthur Brown Jr., in an expansion plan for the campus, had earlier identified a number of possible building sites, including the blocks that adjoined the gate on either side of the Telegraph Avenue, in the area of the old homestead association. On one side of this zone, Brown's plan showed the building that would become Sproul Hall, on the other, its axially mirrored, nonidentical twin. A **student union** was later proposed for this second site and completed in 1961 to designs by Vernon De Mars, Donald Hardison, and Lawrence Halprin. During this time, University of California president Clark Kerr had **considered designating the one-block extension of Telegraph Avenue between the two buildings as a "free speech island,"** and the city transferred the land to the university for this purpose. But after **Kerr issued new rules that loosened restrictions on students regarding intramural political speech, the "free speech island" was abandoned.** / By then the Berkeley campus had become the central node in what Kerr called, in an influential series of lectures published in 1963 as *The Uses of the University*, a **"multiversity."** (217)

In mid-September 1964, as that year's bitter presidential contest neared its end, Berkeley administrators decided to enforce a **ban on political advocacy on university property**, principally in the **area that would have been the "free speech island": the half-in, half-out zone between Sproul Hall and the student union**, just outside Sather Gate at Bancroft Way. **Student organizations objected, and the administration issued rules that allowed limited activity by permit only.** In response, several groups, including **Students for a Democratic Society and the Congress of Racial Equality, defied the ban and set up unauthorized tables in front of the gate, outside the old campus but on university property, using the boundary marked by the gate to assert performatively their rights as citizens to political speech, but within the formal bounds of the symbolically boundless multiversity.** Eight violators were summoned to the dean of students office. There, they presented a petition signed by five hundred others demanding that any punishment be extended to all signatories. When the administration refused, about one hundred and fifty students commenced a three-day sit-in in Sproul Hall (219)

That night, Berkeley chancellor Edward W. Strong issued a statement: "Some students demand on-campus solicitation of funds and planning and recruitment of off-campus social and political action. **The University cannot allow its facilities to be so used without endangering its future as an independent educational institution.**"⁸⁷ The paradoxical implication being that, in the long shadow of McCarthyism, the price of academic freedom was political isolation. At the sit-in, **Mario Savio**, a twenty-one-year old philosophy student from New York and **spokesperson for what became known as the Free Speech Movement (FSM), who had spent that summer organizing for civil rights in Mississippi**, responded by referring to Kerr's "multiversity" as a "machine" producing human capital for industry that had been jammed by the students' actions.⁸⁸ Positionally, Savio and his colleagues enacted the contested right to speak politically inside that machine. But, insofar as they **exploited the inside-outside zone between gate and sidewalk, their speech was also positioned, and conditioned, by the symbolic form defined by the misalignment of gates, axes, property lines, and frontiers, and the media complex of maps, laws, and campus plans** that we have been following. **On campus, the protesting bodies corporate were / students; off campus, they were citizens; in the threshold zone between gate and sidewalk, they were split** (219-20)

In late 1964, after another impasse, Savio inaugurated a mass occupation / of Sproul Hall with a speech on the steps that drew on Kerr's reference to a "knowledge industry." As Savio put it, 'There's a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can't take part; you can't even passively take part. And you've got to **put your bodies upon the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon all the apparatus, and you've got to make it stop.**'" (220-1)

"Another sit-in commenced; some eight hundred students were arrested, jailed overnight, and then released on bail. A few days later, Kerr led a university- wide meeting in John Galen Howard's (and William Randolph Hearst's) out-door Greek Theater. Excluded from the program, Savio mounted the stage, was escorted off, and then was allowed to speak. Negotiations and demonstrations continued, teaching assistants went on strike, and the faculty voted to oppose the administration's position. Finally, in early 1965, the Berkeley administration

issued new guidelines permitting political speech and advocacy in the con-tested zone and elsewhere. (221)

Two conflicting accounts of the relation between political speech and aca-demic freedom emerged from Berkeley faculty in the aftermath of the Free Speech Movement. **One emphasized the educational function of the university / as a space apart and argued that in politicizing that space the student protestors had violated its special trust and its special freedoms. The other emphasized continuities between campus and city and the permeability of boundaries, arguing that academic freedom and the freedom to speak politically were effectively the same.**⁹² In urging his fellow students to “put [their] bodies upon the gears” and bring the multiversity to a halt, Savio distinguished between machine-like bodies and human bodies, declaring that “this machine, this factory, this multiversity here, its parts are human beings.”⁹³ But this very same human machine embodied a boundary problem of a different kind, one that, again, functioned as a symbolic form. The multiversity had two bodies, the “body corporate” of the universitas and the material body of the “machine,” each of which now doubled-up in turn. Symbolically and practically, **these bodies split along two axes, one that passed through the Golden Gate, another that passed through Sather Gate. The first axis linked libraries and laboratories with mines, quarries, and land claims, and later, cyclotrons with bombs; the second axis linked the academic body with the civic body.** (221-2)

COLUMBIA

Michael H. Carriere, “Between Being and Becoming: On Architecture, Student Protest, and the Aesthetics of Liberalism in Postwar America,” Dissertation, University of Chicago, 2010.

After close to a decade of fund-raising efforts, Columbia began clearing the gymnasium construction site on February 19, 1968, cutting down trees, uprooting park benches, removing parts of a stone parapet, and digging a large hole. Just two days later, on February 21, 1968, the West Harlem Morningside Park Committee – itself a successor to a community-based group called the Ad Hoc Committee for Morningside Park – organized a 25-person demonstration, calling for a halt to the construction of the gymnasium. Twelve individuals were arrested for trespassing and disorderly conduct. On February 28, 1968 a protest organized by Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the Graduate Student Council, and the College Citizenship Council drew 150 demonstrators. A number of these demonstrators tore down a section of fencing surrounding the construction site, attempted to stop a truck entering the site, and sat in front of a bulldozer. (361)

Most of the students arrested did not belong to SDS, but rather to the College Citizenship Council, a group that, according to one historical account, “had its roots firmly in the civil rights movement and sent its members to Harlem to tutor and organize workers.” The gym would go on to become a powerful symbol in the uprisings that gripped Columbia during the spring of 1968, as the student protestors who took over the campus drew from a critique of Columbia’s architecture and urban

planning that had been evolving within the community for years before the gymnasium episode. Here the protesters scored a somewhat rare victory, as Columbia officials shelved plans to build the gymnasium in Morningside Park. The project was never completed in that location (362)

As in previous episodes, the struggle over the gymnasium centered upon how urban space was to be used, and how decisions on this subject were reached. To student protesters and community members alike, the debate over the gymnasium project dealt explicitly with issues of autonomy, democracy, and participation – and how these issues related to the future of the built environment of Morningside Heights. The gymnasium did become a symbol for all of this, but a symbol with a very real and known history behind it. And the reason this issue exploded in 1968 may rest in the volatility of this history. Yet there may be another reason behind this timing: the student protesters' ability to link this local concern with broader, international events. The student protesters were able to turn the university's belief in its privileged position within postwar liberalism – along with their / concurrent employment of the language of the Cold War in discussing university policies and missions – on its head. **By linking Columbia's modern urban planning practices to the university's complicity in events in Vietnam, the protesters were able to connect the university once again to the dark sides of modernity and American liberalism.** (387-8)

As the above document continued: the Columbia administration everyday holds violent demonstrations disruptive of people's lives – in Morningside Park, in the Institute for Defense Analysis headquarters in Washington...in every building on Morningside Heights (except, of course, Riverside Drive), and many buildings in Harlem and the Westside (389)

there was a surprising sense of continuity between protests against US foreign policy, Columbia's involvement in the creation of such policy, and issues of university "imperialism" in Morningside Heights (390)

A closer look at the issue of IDA's presence on Columbia's campus shows how **critiques against both university involvement in such conflicts as the Vietnam War and the school's policies toward urban renewal came together within the student protest movement at Columbia.** Though thousands of miles apart, **student protesters cast both conflicts in terms of institutional oppression, individual autonomy, and the need to create an environment based upon participation and self-determination.** (391)

To many protesters, Columbia's participation in the **IDA** illustrated the university's complicity in the war effort. Yet protesters also began to make a connection between IDA and events on the domestic scene. Movement sympathizer Michael Klare, in an article on the IDA, noted that the Johnson administration had asked the group to modify Vietnam-oriented warfare tactics for domestic use. One strike document found that the group, apart from its **research work on deadly weapons such as napalm and tactical nuclear weapons for use in Southeast Asia, also does research on 'counterinsurgency in the ghetto'** – in other words, it investigates means of preventing oppressed people in their own cities from rebelling against a system which is set up to keep them down.⁸ **"IDA invented Mace,"** found one document, **"the newest form of non-violent chemical**

warfare for use in ghettos.” To many student protesters, such a development perfectly illustrated that the **cold war had come home**.⁹ Such a reality made it possible for protesters to make an **explicit connection between events in Vietnam and Columbia’s urban environment, as they were both “battles against policies which oppress the community.”** (392)

Columbia students deeply involved in the protests – **looked to Team 10 architects – esp van Eyck and Hertzberger // Team 10 was also the Smithsons + Brutalism**

· Interests in the vernacular, democratic planning

Brian Goldstein, *The Roots of Urban Renaissance: Gentrification and the Struggle Over Harlem*, Expanded Ed. (Princeton University Press, 2017 / 2022).

Sharon Egretta Sutton, *When Ivory Towers Were Black: A Story About Race in America’s Cities and Universities* (Fordham University Press, 2017).

It asks you to trace an evolutionary arc that begins with an unsettling effort to eliminate the exercise of authoritarian power on campus and in the community, and ends with an equally unsettling return to the status quo. This turbulent encounter with the forces of social change takes you to New York City to Columbia University’s School of Architecture; it occurs between 1965 and 1976, mirroring the emergence and denouement of the black power movement. You will begin your journey as deadly race rebellions boil over nationwide, sparking frantic efforts to remedy the crisis; your journey will surge ahead during a university- wide student rebellion on Columbia’s campus in 1968 (1)

Your journey will also follow **two university units that steered the School of Architecture toward an emancipatory approach to education** early along its evolutionary arc. One was the **Division of Planning, a unit within the school whose legendary chair, Professor Charles Abrams, had worked as an antidiscrimination lawyer**; the other was the **university- wide Urban Center, established with Ford Foundation monies to carry out “new work by Columbia in the field of urban and minority affairs.”**² Buoyed by the era’s civil rights and black power activism, these two units **used Ford’s deep pockets to open the ivory tower to a cadre of ethnic minority recruits**, involving them and their revolutionary white peers in learning to improve Harlem’s slum conditions. (2)

You continue your journey in Chapter 2 by reading about mounting racial tensions in the nation’s metropolises during a period bracketed by the **1965 Watts rebellion and the 1967 Newark, Detroit, and Harlem rebellions. You read about responses by professional organizations in architecture and planning—responses so conservative that a radical group called Planners for Equal Opportunity formed, drawing the FBI’s attention.** (12)

In Chapter 4, you read about a counterforce of incredible creativity that the display of brute police force ignited, including faculty support at the School of Architecture for a university- wide boycott. **You learn about the faculty's adoption of the "May 17th Resolution," which contained illegal interim rules that set in motion the school's experimental operation. You also learn that, during the following summer, student- led groups began meeting to hammer out a completely transformed curriculum that established new modes of learning and a new relationship to the surrounding community.** Finally, you learn about the all- out search for ethnic minority students that began with just three ethnic minority students and faculty and then snowballed as news of the effort spread. (13) – **RADICAL PEDAGOGIES**

unparalleled crop of ethnic minority recruits walked through Avery's oak doors. You see that the recruits have fearlessly transgressed institutional norms so that what is outside in the community has come inside into the school, and vice versa. You also see that they have gained access to Avery's inner sanctum, the design studio, where revolutionary students have disrupted the off- putting traditions of studio instruction. You read how a **growing body of recruits helped open up the studios to the community through for- credit courses and paid internships sponsored by the Division of Planning.** (13)

In Chapter 6, you learn about the recruits' brief sojourn at the apex of the arc of insurgency as the school sprinted ahead of national affirmative action efforts. Then you read about the descent that ensued as **widespread conservatism unraveled the school's experimental operation.** You read about battles between the school and university that attracted an external administrator's scrutiny as the planning division took the lead in the downward trajectory. You see how the university stripped the Urban Center of its funds, eliminating the planning division's major source of support for its recruits and their community- based work. You see how the descent sped up when the architecture program **received a conditional accreditation**, prompting Dean Smith's resignation and the external administrator's threat of receivership should a replacement not be found immediately. You see how BPRFSAO and the assistant dean for minority affairs went on the offensive when ethnic minority enrollment plummeted. Finally, you learn that the faculty adopted new rules in May 1971, ending the school's experimental operation. (14)

In Chapter 7, you learn that, when James Stewart Polshek became dean in July 1972, he undertook a slew of changes, some of which had devastating consequences for the recruits. You learn that, in addition to securing full accreditation and funds for Avery's expansion, Polshek eliminated architecture's undergraduate degree and planning's community engagement programs. You learn that BPRFSAO fought declining recruitment efforts, with Polshek's evenhandedness calming the battle and the recruits' plummeting numbers bringing finality to it. You also learn **that university administrators eliminated the division of planning's social justice mission and rejected its choice for a well- known senior faculty member as a nationwide fiscal crisis devastated poor communities** (14)

The summer's intense spirit of experimentation resulted in a completely transformed curriculum at the School of Architecture in terms of content as well as instructional methods. For sure, its framework had been set in

place long before the liberation, beginning with Dean Colbert's interdisciplinary real- life learning initiatives. The framework was further advanced by divisional chairmen who **undertook a more open- ended, community- centered curriculum during the preceding year.**²⁹ That is when Abrams launched UAEP and began securing funding to undertake community work,³⁰ but the chutzpah of the student- led councils upped the level of ingenuity and commitment to revolutionary change. Though the **transformed curriculum involved lectures, seminars, and studios**, you will primarily explore the studios because it was through this part of the curriculum that students engaged with the surrounding community, which is the primary focus of this story. The councils adopted two overlapping approaches to studio instruction: **the Architecture Division adopted student- centered learning (for- credit hypothetical and community service studios offered in Avery Hall), while the Planning Division adopted community- service learning (for- credit studios offered in Avery Hall as well as paid internships offered in “storefront studios” in Harlem/East Harlem community).** (86)

Sarah Williams, “The Architecture of the Academy,” *Change* 17:2 (March-April 1985)

As schools are places of learning, it is hardly rash to suggest that they have an additional responsibility to build well. **“If we’re going to set high educational standards,” comments James Stewart Polshek, dean of the architecture school at Columbia, “then our architecture should reflect those standards.** If we teach culture we must be purveyors of culture as well.” “Developers don’t build on campuses,” says Jon Hlafter of Princeton. “Buildings here last longer and mean more. So a college has a responsibility to consider its plant a kind of teaching aid: a textbook of times, of places, of educational and cultural trends, and also of architecture.”” (55)

YALE

Michael H. Carriere, “Between Being and Becoming: On Architecture, Student Protest, and the Aesthetics of Liberalism in Postwar America,” Dissertation, University of Chicago, 2010.

As at Berkeley, Yale students took issue not only with the form of buildings that went up in the postwar era, but also with the planning associated with such structures. In April 1968, for example, several hundred Yale students blocked bulldozers hired by Yale University to remove two small trees from a grassy campus corner known as Cross Campus. According to *Progressive Architecture*, “It was the first time in anyone’s memory that Yale’s traditional spring riots had had an architectural focus, and as such they shared a cause with the more spectacular riots at Columbia,” where students were protesting the construction of a gymnasium in Morningside Park (a development that will be covered in detail in the next chapter of this dissertation). The students at Yale were attempting to halt the construction of an underground library designed by Edward Larrabee Barnes, a structure that with its “16 large skylights protruding from below, like rows of rectangular eyes, would effectively destroy

green open space, which students had used for years.” To the journal, such protests at institutions like Yale “could lead to speculation that students are becoming more aware of the environment.” (337)

Paul Rudolph’s Art and Architecture Building (1964) also illustrates the power of modern architecture on the postwar Yale campus, of doing things in a new way, free of restrictions and without regard for tradition. In fact, architect Paul Rudolph saw the building as evidence of “the new freedom” that he saw his designs as embracing by the early 1960s, when the Art and Architecture Building was on the drafting board.³⁰ To many observers, the artistic statement that this building made was inspirational. Writing on the structure for Architectural Forum, architectural critic Sibyl Moholy Nagy found that “The Yale school is Paul Rudolph’s confessional proof that architecture is not a commodity but an infinite potential of art, and therefore free and imperishable.”³¹ This concept of the building as a work of art – or something more than just a structure meant to house students and academic departments – gave the building a sense of importance, of durability. A writer for Progressive Architecture, commenting on such a phenomenon, concluded that, with Rudolph’s creation, “There is a decided feeling of permanence; the observer cannot imagine the building never having been just there. (63)

Yet it was Paul Rudolph’s Art and Architecture Building that was most often referred to as some sort of academic, manly citadel. Progressive Architecture deemed the building “this massive concrete fortress,”⁴⁵ while architectural historian Tom McDonough has referred to the / structure as “an unmistakably virile building.”⁴⁶ In a contemporary review of the building, Vincent Scully noted that the building’s column clusters “rise forcefully,” and that the concrete exterior of the mammoth structure was “tactilely dangerous,” a reality that, notwithstanding his later critique of the building, seemed to genuinely interest and excite Scully.⁴⁷ The idea that the building’s exterior was in fact physically dangerous became the defining characteristic of the structure. Rudolph had formed the structure’s rough concrete walls into corrugated surfaces which construction crews then smashed with hammers, breaking them into splintered projections like shards of broken glass. One critic was impressed with this “feeling of masculine textures” created in these “inaccessible walls,” but cautioned those admiring the building to not get too close to the structure, for fear of these walls actually harming the passer-by.⁴⁸ “You could,” concluded Scully years after his initial praise of the building, “literally hurt yourself if you bumped into them. (67-8)

To a number of scholars, this architectural depiction of manliness, strength, and even outright violence spoke directly to Cold War-era concerns. Commenting directly upon such a development, Scully has found that such an aesthetic was the logical, and in its own way frenzied, climax of the physical aggression and primitive vainglory of the late modern era. I have often felt that it reflected a kind of cold war mentality as well; **it was brute force glorified.**⁵⁰ Given President Griswold’s stated **commitment to a “strong” response to global communism, such a brand of architecture makes perfect sense on the postwar Yale campus** (68)

it may make sense to view their displays of strength with regards to their relationship with the cityscape of New Haven. Here, a form of “brute force” was also needed: one to tame the perceived disorder of the postwar American city. As John Hersey, Master of Pierson College at Yale noted of the university in the 1960s: **“Yale lives in a city. Two blocks from Yale on one side, five or six blocks from Yale on another, lies ghetto, bursting at the seams....A university in a city is hard pressed from two sides.”**⁵² A strong version of modern architecture could bring both order and efficiency to the campus and the community, while at the same time putting on display the clear distinction between the benefits of modernism and the pitfalls of previous design strategies. Perhaps most importantly, **such tough structures as the Art and Architecture Building could serve as bulwarks against the adjacent ghettos, making sure that the pathologies of such an urban environment did not make their way on to Yale’s campus.** (69) – DAVARIAN
BALDWIN’S BOOK

On perhaps the most basic level, the Art and Architecture Building put on display a sense of efficiency and order. While all of Yale’s arts programs had once been spread all over campus, Rudolph’s mammoth structure provided a new home for the majority of these departments (70)

At Yale, architecture students quickly came to find Rudolph’s Art and Architecture building as counter to such concepts as artistic freedom. In fact, such young people began to rebel against Rudolph’s mammoth structure soon after it was dedicated. Revisiting the structure in 1967, Architectural Forum found that, **from the perspective of the young people that had to live with the building, the structure’s 4-year history “might be something of a disaster in practical terms.”** (444)

Daniel Roche, “Yale Students Design a Temporary Library for Protesters at Beinecke Plaza, a Longtime Hub for Activists,” *The Architect’s Newspaper* (April 23 2024):
<https://www.archpaper.com/2024/04/yale-students-temporary-library-protesters-beinecke-plaza/>

Gordon Bunshaft’s Beinecke Library at [Yale University](#) is well known to architects—the 1963 building’s translucent granite facade appears in coffee table books around the world. But the iconic building’s exterior, Beinecke Plaza, has a special place in the hearts of social justice activists that many architects may be less familiar with.

In 1969, [Claes Oldenburg](#) famously installed [Lipstick](#) there to protest the Vietnam War and, ever since, numerous activists have held court in Beinecke Plaza to raise awareness about issues from South Africa to Palestine.

Last week, Yalies installed a [pop-up library](#) in Beinecke Plaza, otherwise known as Hewitt Quadrangle, for a [protest](#) called “Books Not Bombs.” The pop-up featured multiple bookshelves stocked with anti-colonial literature arranged in a manner that followed the plaza’s curvature. Handwritten banners adorned the shelves

with messages like “ALL WALLS WILL FALL.” The intervention was designed to support students and [faculty](#) on strike for [Palestine](#).

Beinecke Plaza has a long history of student activism. In 1990, then [Yale professor Dr. Cornel West](#) took his megaphone and gave myriad impassioned calls there for the Ivy League university to boycott apartheid South Africa. At the time, Yale officials condemned the apartheid regime, but [refused to divest](#) from South African businesses. In return, Dr. West and his comrades took to Beinecke Plaza calling for total divestment.

Four years earlier, in 1986, anti-apartheid activists occupied Beinecke Plaza, and renamed it Winnie Mandela City, after Nelson Mandela’s wife. That outpost was designed to mimic “shanties” in Soweto (the source of its nickname, *Shantytown*) and consisted of a few tents clad with signs that had messages like “HONOR THE VICTIMS” and “ACT AGAINST APARTHEID.” Construction workers from Local 35 were ordered to dismantle Winnie Mandela City after it was first built in 1986 but they refused. Non-union campus staffers demolished it shortly after.

Winnie Mandela City was torn down after just a few days, but students quickly returned to the site, much like the events this past week. Winnie Mandela City was subsequently rebuilt and stayed at Beinecke Plaza for the next two years until 1988, when a disgruntled Yale alumnus at his 30th reunion, Dr. Elwood D. Bracey, [set the encampment on fire](#). One Yale sympathized with Dr. Bracey’s actions, calling Winnie Mandela City “[an architectural outrage on a beautiful campus](#).” Not long after, Yale divested its holdings in South Africa in the 1990s.

These past few months, students have held peace vigils at Beinecke Plaza for Gaza, but those have been [regularly disrupted](#) by campus police. The idea for a pop-up library emerged from this activity, when campus protest groups began ideating a pavilion in the same vein as anti-apartheid occupations that were built there in the 1980s. In total, about 20 students were involved in the library’s design and planning, and over 40 participated in its assembly at Beinecke Plaza.

The temporary installation was placed on site Monday, April 15. But to the dismay of organizers, it was [removed from Beinecke Plaza](#) a few hours later. Despite its removal, books remained on the ground in what organizers called a “shelfless library,” along with dozens of students participating in a hunger strike. On April 17, Columbia University students also [built a pop-up encampment](#) in solidarity with Palestine in Morningside Heights known today as the [Gaza Solidarity Encampment](#).

“Settler-colonialism has always been distinctly architectural. The occupation of [Palestine](#), the apartheid, these are enacted and maintained through architecture as much as through armaments,” said Ada Newman-Plotnick, an M.Arch candidate and organizer for The Architecture Lobby. “The Beinecke Plaza installation created space for a community library in the brief time it stood, until the university dismantled it just like they did to the first incarnation of the Yale shantytown that protested ties to apartheid South Africa,” Newman-Plotnick told *AN*.

BUFFALO

“University at Buffalo’s north campus is also a good case. Where the historic south campus is in the city with an expansive central green space, the north campus is all brutalist construction without any public space plopped in the suburbs where you need a car to get anywhere.” - Kellen Hoxworth

Jack Ding, “A Rat in a Maze’: Student Attitudes Toward the Design of UB’s Amherst Campus, 1968-1985,” Senior Honors Thesis, State University of New York at Buffalo, 2015

administrative plan to move several student organizations from Main Street to Amherst. The scheme involved the transition of the undergraduate and graduate Student Associations as well as the Student Corporation known as Sub-Board I, to name a few, to Talbert Hall. As Jay Rosen, the *Spectrum*’s special features editor, exclaimed, “what was once a “closely knit network of student organizations is [now] in danger of being split by the unsettling move of five groups to the Amherst Campus. Logistically, a wide-scale move of every organization to Amherst was impossible at the time; three of the six buildings reserved for student organizations remained on the drawing board. Therefore, dozens of organizations would have to stay put on Main Street. Such a scheme prompted one of Rosen’s interviewees, the treasurer of Sub-Board, to remark that “they couldn’t / have planned it any better if they wanted to **split student organizations**.” The president of the Graduate Student Association raised a more sinister point concluding that the administration was trying to give “a particular character to the nature of student organizations at [the] University,” one which would “**minimize the role students play in the policies of the University**.” (27-28)

Jay Rosen: *Spectrum*’s special features editor

But to Jay Rosen, the problem ran deeper than policy decisions made then and there. To him, the campus at Amherst was the **epitome of the university’s attempts to separate its students**. In the summer of 1977, he penned in the *Spectrum* an article exposing Amherst’s design as one that seemingly **intended to corral and control students**. “It appears that the new campus was, in part, **designed to prevent student disturbances from reoccurring, and failing that, to limit their size and effectiveness**,” Rosen announced. Of the University Plaza, a main activity space of the university, Rosen argued: “the plaza is set at an elevation fifteen feet below the surrounding academic spine area. Hence, activities on the terrace...would not be visible to ground level occupants of the spine.” He further questioned the utility of the plaza, noting that **the six “centralized” buildings which were set aside for students were located a quarter of a mile from the University Plaza**. But even more jarring was the **absence of a student union** from any of the proposed plans. “No student union. Let it sink in...The campus without a heart will never have a beat,” Rosen lamented (28)

Yet another student conceded that “**decentralization is working because if it were not, there would be much more student protest about what is being done to us**...We are being divided and conquered.” (30)

A recent conversation with Jay “Ellicott Berater” Rosen reveals that **most students never took to heart issues of the campus** save for a few politically minded students. Amherst Campus might be shrouded in myth, but in the end, its students walked its plazas and buildings, **never giving a second thought to the idea that its design was used to repress students.**⁵ (44)

The historian Michael Frisch hotly contests the myth of the campus as having been designed to stop protest. “Think of the major protests throughout history... with one or two / exceptions, revolts against the state have seen more success if the perpetrators took advantage of narrow winding alleyways,” Frisch argues. **“Put a bunch of protesters into the middle of a plaza and they’ll get hosed down by a couple of firehoses, but if student radicals wanted to revolt, they could barricade themselves into Ellicott,** block some entrances, open the windows to its towers and throw stones at advancing police, and the press will be able to capture the situation before the police could ever penetrate into the complex.” The **Ellicott Complex had been designed to foster small student communities, to scale down the enormity of the multiversity into more intimate colleges.** The student radicals would certainly be united into an intimate community sharing a similar interest at that one moment (44-5)

SIMON FRASER

Hugh Johnson, *Radical Campus: Making Simon Fraser University* (Douglas & McIntyre, 2004).

Jerry Zaslove, “Foggy Portrait of a ‘Radical’ Campus,” *CAUT Bulletin Archives* (February 2007):
<https://bulletin-archives.caut.ca/bulletin/articles/2007/02/foggy-portrait-of-a-radical-campus>

Businessmen claiming to be enlightened, capitalist modernists, social democrats, corporate philistines, utopian visionaries and young, internationally-educated academics joined with first-time university goers inside an architectural monument that internalized conflicting expectations and externalized anxieties about the emergent mass education.

The dismissal hearings of eight political science, sociology and anthropology faculty (PSA) and the aftermath dominate the core of the book — 216 pages, well over half of its 338 pages. Six of 11 chapters lead us from “Berkeley North” through the firing of five teaching assistants who joined a high school protest (they were later reinstated), to the arrest of 114 students at a sit-in, lengthy assemblies and rallies, inner politics of the SDS-style Students for a Democratic University (SDU), and finally the trusteeship of the PSA department and dismissal hearings and censures.²

Eventually the thralldom of faculty power, perhaps the most “radical” moment, ended the appointment of the vulnerable first president, Patrick McTaggart-Cowan. The nonviolent sit-in ended with “unprecedented” police occupation. This “defined” the presidency of Kenneth Strand (the words are Johnston’s). The many competing

groups stimulated by the instant beginnings point to more surreal than radical formation of either pedagogy or disciplines.

Johnston points to the openness that attracted many to the readiness to create new interdisciplinary subjects. The excitement was high about democratization of almost everything, including gas stations and elevators, although soon “rival conceptions” of what a university might mean settled into a pattern of Weberian bureaucracies as solutions for any notion of participatory democracy, which swept in and out....

Even the prized architecture is not as radical as often featured. Its geometrical, disorienting impersonality, its lack of intimate spaces atop 370-meter Burnaby Mountain becomes a citadel remote from the congested suburbs below. Never a sociable communal space, the design presaged a monument suitable for the symbol of advanced power the founders intended. Vistas did not pacify a university nor make a university radical or original....

President Strand’s legacy prevailed. The administration building is named after him. Many faculty did not even vote to approve bringing in police to evacuate the administration building. “The public,” Johnston writes, always “wanted a crackdown against campus agitators.” Legitimacy was the issue of the day, the decade, the future. In 1990 Shrum saw the future as golden. He talked of a happy ending.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS @ CHICAGO

uci campus important case in point, designed after panther’s occupation of **bunche hall at ucla**, no quad, central green space ringed by paved road to ease kettling; inoperable windows in most buildings (as also the metal anti-banner exterior permascreens on windows on policy building built at ucla) — Via Anna Kornbluh

UT AUSTIN

Ed Gordon’s Racial Geography of UT Austin - <https://racialgeographytour.org/> (via Alhelí (@casadefauxdobe.bskly.social))

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Jacob W. Torkelson, “The ‘Embattled University’: Student Protest and Architecture at the University of Minnesota in the 1960s and 1970s,” Honors Thesis, University of Minnesota, 2017).

Using the University of Minnesota as a microcosm of national trends, this thesis aims to find out **why specific spaces on campus are chosen as nodes of protest, in order to understand the role of architecture in**

shaping activism. These locations—the **Armory, student union, administration building, and auditorium**—contain controls and affordances for protests that influenced why these spaces were repeatedly chosen for student activism. The **design, association, and program of these buildings and the spaces around them**, principally elements of massing, scale, ornamentation, and association, created a stage in which protests gained legitimacy and visibility for their causes. (2)

This study contends the designed environment of the university embodies the cultural and social values of the institution. Therefore, **these buildings and spaces become places of protest against values associated with architecture.** The existing campus architecture on the Mall—the large rectangular green space in the heart of campus—is composed of visually similar buildings that are **representative of a specific value set and institutional identity** that is made manifest through their architectural composition (e.g. massing, façade, materiality, etc.). In each case, the identity of the building is linked by activists with an idea, person, or entity seen in opposition to their cause. This metonymy associates a campus building with a higher power like the president, board of regents, or even national government. Here, the students are protesting in opposition to the symbolism and values represented by the architecture, and warrants further analysis to understand what makes these buildings and spaces politically and socially charged. (5)

As Mark Macek argues, **campuses are designed as controlling environments, “contrived spaces” “meticulously controlled” by designers to be apathetic to the “social, cultural, and political activities of its users.”**³³ In the case of **UT Austin, administrators adapted and remodeled campus buildings and open spaces to make student congregation nearly impossible.** What the university did by **removing existing grassy areas and replacing them with planter boxes**, was to take away the power students experienced by exercising control of their environments; students were no longer able to subvert the authority of the university by congregating en-mass.³ (18; Mark Macek, “The Politics of Campus Planning: How UT Architecture Restricts Activism”, *Polemicist* 1, no. 6 (1990))

In many cases across the country, university administrations made changes to campus to control and even inhibit protests. While there is **no official documented evidence of this occurring** at the University of Minnesota, it is widely believed that this was indeed the case.⁶⁵ Changes made to Coffman Memorial Union following the events of 1972 widely **limited the ways in which students could congregate within the building.** Study spaces were **divided up into smaller spaces** so that **large crowds of students could not occupy, plan, or execute a protest** within the space. The main entrance was eliminated, making the two side entrances primary spaces, with long interior hallways to reach the main sitting area. In this way, there was no easy access for large groups to enter and occupy the building.⁶⁶ However, not all changes were necessarily combative. Architects, in their initial redesign, which was not realized, **called for a small stage or amphitheater to serve as a location for protests to take place within.** While the architects’ intention was not to stifle protests, had their vision been realized, that may have well been the case. **Setting aside a space for protests is inherently opposite the nature of protests / that are meant to be disruptive, organic, and freeform.** More recently, renovations to both the plaza and Coffman Union have left its potential for protests diminished (44-5)

Similar changes were made to Northrop Plaza, although here it is important to note that this was not a result of protest activity. Rather, the **changes to the plaza themselves directly impacted the ways in which students were able to protest**. Whereas before the redesign of the plaza students could gather in massive quantities and flow into the Mall, this was no longer possible. **New zigzag ramps and granite planter boxes** created a plaza that was both physically detached and visually removed from the collective Mall. (45)

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE DUBLIN

Conor Caplis, “Is Belfield a ‘Riot-Proof’ Campus?” *College Tribune* (March 20, 2021):

<https://www.collegetribune.ie/is-belfield-a-riot-proof-campus-ucd-mythbusters/>

The suburban site was seen as a place for the institution to expand and become a beacon of Ireland’s new Higher Education reforms and investments.

By 1964, the first building at Belfield was constructed. The Science Building allowed the institution to expand south, as student numbers were touching on 5,000. The student population would double over the next 20 years and plans were afoot to design a campus for the 20th Century. A young Polish architect, Andrzej Wejchert, won an international competition to design the masterplan for Ireland’s first purpose-built campus at Belfield – deciding to defect from his home country to complete the project. At the beginning of his career, Wejchert sought to design a campus that subverted architectural norms and trialed new city-planning ideas on this small scale.

As the roof slabs were being laid on the Newman Building in October 1968, students entered a period of unrest. This “Gentle Revolution” saw students protesting over the potential merger of the Protestant Trinity College Dublin and the Catholic UCD, and a dramatic shift in social attitudes influenced by student activism across the world.

Students for Democratic Action were a driving force behind a 10,000 strong protest and occupation of Earlsfort Terrace at the time. But importantly, this radical action didn’t precede or influence design of Belfield – but came *after* it.

Speaking to *The College Tribune*, Dr Ellen Rowley of UCD’s School of Architecture, Planning and Environmental Policy said the riot-proof myth can be “debunked immediately”. “There’s no doubt that the whole climate that really came to the fore in the 1960’s was alive in the Belfield campus plan,” Rowley explained. “You couldn’t have been immune from this sense of the need to radicalise the university as an institution, which went hand in hand with civil rights movements around the world.” **According to Rowley, the designs for the Belfield campus were almost entirely finished by early 1966, which predates the student protests at the**

end of the decade. The construction of the campus happened in parallel to the student movements, bringing doubt to any suggestion that these protests around the world had an influence on the design of Belfield.

During this period there was a shift away from pre-war city design, towards new styles of architecture. “Rather than having grid streets, with cranks and bends,” Rowley says, architects strived to “humanise” modernist designs. Belfield was also designed to encourage “chance encounters” with others. So, whenever you’re annoyed because you keep bumping into your ex on campus, just remember that it’s pretty much designed for that. “There’s no doubt that Belfield is part of this radicalisation and revolution about what a university can be, but it’s designed from the student perspective rather than the governing body perspective.”

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

MJ Jewkes and Rachel Kloepper, “U Origins: How Landscaping Projects in the 1970s Ended On-Campus Protestes,” *The Daily Utah Chronicle* (July 8, 2023):

<https://dailyutahchronicle.com/2023/07/08/student-union-landscaping-protests/>

“We set out to visually express the character and dignity of the U in an atmosphere which is cheerful, peaceful and ecologically sound,” said Bruce Jensen, former director of campus planning at the University of Utah.

This statement came in 1971, following the completion of an enormous landscaping project that marked the origin of the current wooded, hill-covered landscape that surrounds the Union building today. The origins of this project are believed to be rooted in student protests of the Vietnam War on the Union lawn in the late 1960s and early ‘70s, according to campus legend.

Landscaping projects had been well underway at the time of these protests. Records show project plans began as far back as 1967, however, documents show that in the years following intense protests in May 1970, significant changes were made to existing plans.

By early May 1970, the news of the invasion had radiated through universities across the country. Protests later broke out, including [a demonstration at the U](#) that centered in the open, flat and highly visible lawn of the Student Union.

According to library [archives](#), “After the deaths of four students at Kent State University in Ohio on May 4, 1970, students rioted at the University of Utah. Classes were disrupted, the Daily Utah Chronicle offices were occupied, and the ROTC building was fire-bombed.” The next morning, the National Guard headquarters building was bombed.

Additionally, [newspaper records indicate](#) that a student protest on May 11, 1970 was the origin of a fire that ignited in the neighboring Intercultural Center, which had been abandoned and was [set to be demolished](#) the following week.

It was [after these protests](#) that the U first created its campus police force.

Prior to the summer of 1970, [the lawn between the Union building and the Marriott Library](#) was very open and visible with little to no trees. The ground was also relatively flat, making it a common place for student protests during the 1960s.

Marriott Library [archives](#) reveal a campus legend that states that “the hilly landscaping around the Union building was put in place to deny rioting students a place to assemble, and that the sidewalks on campus were purposely made wide enough to [accommodate] an army truck.”

Prior to the protests of 1970, Campus Planning Department memos indicate that the landscaping projects during the late 1960s were originally intended to provide a place for students to congregate.

“We ... recognize the need for one single large gathering place on campus for students,” said Arden Larson of the Campus Planning Department in a memo from February 1970, just months before the protests. “The practical and sensible location is near the Student Union building where the largest share of student activity is this area could be designed as an area where student rallies could be held.”

The lawn outside of the Union building does not fit this description. In its present form, the Union lawn contains a large mass of tall trees and five-foot-mounds of grass. It lacks its previous expanse of flat ground, limiting visibility in the landscape and making it a less convenient spot for students to gather, despite still being a central location for student traffic.

The once open-style area of the Union lawn that was so attractive to students to host rallies and demonstrations was not always supposed to be morphed into the tree-covered lot, according to U archives. In Larson’s memo, he outlined recommendations to maintain this open style. “The designer should make certain not to plant grass on slopes with more grade than a 4:1,” Larson said, meaning no more than one foot of rise per four feet of distance in the landscape.

The hills on the Union lawn in its present form indicate that this guideline was disregarded. Larson continued by recommending laying gravel or stones rather than the trees we see today. When asked about the “mound concept” by the Society for College and University Planning, Jensen said the mounds would create “visual screens” to serve as sound barriers. On top of blocking out visibility and sound, the mounds would channel the foot traffic, according to the SCUP.

Even before the trees had grown to the heights they currently have, the SCUP noted that there was a heavy emphasis placed on tree planting. In total, the project planted over 2,000 trees. The project also included three [25-ton granite stones](#) set to fill the area once used for protesting. **The reasons for this change from an “area where student rallies” could be held to a place of “visual screens” and “sound barriers”** are spelled out in several archived memos sent to the then-director Jensen.

One such memo comes from campus planning department member B. Blain Bradford, who expressed concern about rocks as a potential riot “hazard,” alluding to the danger of students using them as weapons. “I received a memo ... posing the hazard that the rocks to the east of the Union building ... could be if we were to have a riot on campus,” Bradford said, alluding to a previous discussion on student demonstrations. “I agree with your recommendation that something needs to be done to alter that situation.”

Additionally, interview records from prior student journalists show budget discrepancies between initial price allotments from the University Institutional Council and final project expenditures, indicating that significant expenses were added by numerous alterations to the original plans

OTHERS

More “riot-proof” rumors: [dorms at Kenyon College](#), [Brown Grad Center](#), [Humanities Building @ Madison](#), [Butterfield dorms at Wesleyan](#), [Harris-Millis dorm @ U of VT](#), [Canaday Hall @ Harvard](#), [Lovett dorms @ Rice](#), [Mission Park @ Williams](#),...

CAMPUS PLANNING + BRUTALISM

Michael H. Carriere, “Between Being and Becoming: On Architecture, Student Protest, and the Aesthetics of Liberalism in Postwar America,” Dissertation, University of Chicago, 2010.

This dissertation focuses upon the built environment at four urban universities in the United States, Yale University, Columbia University, Illinois Institute of Technology (IIT), and the University of California-Berkeley⁹, and documents this relationship between modernism and the postwar American college campus (4)

First and foremost, these schools had internationally renowned architecture and urban planning programs, and the administration and faculty of these schools played leading roles as the postwar university began to embrace modernism. At the same time, these universities worked – often in conjunction with their host cities – to

actively remake the urban landscape that surrounded them. I am also convinced that the fact that students at each of these schools participated (4, note 9)

Paul Venable Turner, in his work *Campus: An American Planning Tradition*, briefly notes the rise of such structures during the postwar era, but seems to attribute their popularity solely to their pragmatic design. As he writes: “Modern architecture, with its rejection of historical tradition and its frequent emphasis on functionalism and flexibility of planning, was well qualified to tackle many of these new problems of campus planning.” More recently, Princeton Architectural Press has issued a series of campus architectural guidebooks that dutifully note the presence of modern structures on universities across the country – often to highlight their shortcomings in comparison to the Beaux-Arts-inspired buildings which serve as their campus neighbors. Such a focus on architectural aesthetics – on the structures themselves – is useful, though I wish to approach this subject from a different angle. I am not primarily interested in critiquing the architectural merits of such structures; the subject of this dissertation is more ideology than functionalism. I wish to document how such design was seen to correspond with the university’s place in postwar American culture. At the same time, I also wish to pay close attention not only to the structures that took up space on college campuses, but how that space was acquired and how the decisions were made on how it was best to be used (5)

To many liberal leaders – within the university and without – the development of universities and their surrounding communities offered a place for the employment of a new visual and spatial language for America’s postwar democracy, and the architecture and urban planning associated with a number of elite / universities provided an arena where modernism – which, like postwar liberalism, valued rationality, technology, a mistrust of ideology, and an orientation towards the future – could flourish. Government agencies showered such campuses with increased federal funding, and welcomed a turn in architectural style that highlighted the new values of the immediate postwar era. In terms of urban planning, **urban universities and their allies even adopted the language of Cold War anti-communism, arguing that university expansion and other forms of urban renewal were valuable instruments not only of domestic “containment” in the war against blight and inner-city decay (not surprisingly, such rhetoric, and the designs this language inspired – as in the discourse surrounding communism – took an incredibly masculine turn), but also in “liberating” such cityscapes from the horrors of urban blight.** Within the world of university planning – as in the realm of American liberalism – the city came to be seen as something of a laboratory, a place where the greatest problems confronting American society could not only be viewed, but also conceivably solved. Along similar lines, the architecture and planning behind such universities highlighted the perceived strengths of postwar liberalism, and their robust modernist design, much like that of many of the US embassies scattered around the world, served as a visual reminder of American potency in the postwar struggle against global communism. (5-6)

I wish to show how community groups and student activists both interacted and learned from one other throughout the postwar period. Instead, the key may be to see how students interacted with such urban environments, and how the citizens of these areas responded in kind.... While students activists of this decade

undoubtedly paid close attention to local concerns, they also saw themselves as part of a national, and even international, movement. A study of such individuals is best served by adopting, in a similar manner, a perspective that effectively integrates the local, national, and transnational (12)

In order to fully explore the role of space in the student protest movement, this dissertation will focus primarily on the built environment of the postwar university and on the experiences of architecture and urban planning students during this era. **This will not only bring new actors into the standard narrative of the 1960s - who themselves will illustrate how the above grievances regarding space were often articulated and acted upon (and, in fact, architecture and urban planning students often played crucial roles in the student protest / movement) - but will also lead this narrative into previously unexplored territory.** (12-13)

Others, such as Marshall Berman, convincingly make the case that the activists of the 1960s attempted to revive a brand of modernism that took seriously issues of social justice. This dissertation takes seriously this sticky relationship between the 1960s, modernism, and postmodernism, and sees a discussion on such a relationship as critical in gaining a better understanding of both the protest movement of that decade as well as the more general histories of architecture and urban planning in the United States (14)

By paying attention to the ways in which students began to challenge the prevailing philosophy of modernism on these college campuses, both in terms of curriculum and in the built environment of the university and its surrounding community, I hope to bring a sense of much-needed historical specificity to a number of rather ambiguous moments, terms, and concepts. **These architects-in-training felt increasingly disconnected from the large, impersonal buildings that surrounded them, and that they were being taught to design. At the same time, they also began to question the alleged neutrality of such designs, as the functions that these buildings took on showed anything but an impartial use of design technology. Urban planning students also began to see the dark side of development, one that involved the destruction of historic sites and the removal of people from nearby neighborhoods.** The idea of architecture as symbolism, let out / the bag by liberal university leaders and designers, was picked up on by protesters to highlight the shortcomings of the system. All of this led to forms of collective action among both architecture and urban planning, as well as for a call for a new understanding of urban space. (14-15)

In their search for a useable brand of architecture and urban planning, many of these students did embrace ideas that would become central aspects of the postmodern canon. **A number of the activists dismissed large-scale planning efforts and the rationality and belief in technology seen as inherent in modern design. In their place, they embraced ornamentation, chaos and fragmentation, and an appreciation of vernacular traditions and local histories.** Yet, contrary to the belief of David Harvey, not all of these students can best be classified as “antimodern.” Like Berman, these young activists wanted to salvage the best of modernism – most specifically, its commitment to social justice – and reinvigorate it with a new set of aesthetic ideals. (15)

Part One, “The Landscape of Liberalism,” begins with a series of chapters that explore how the aesthetics of architectural modernism came to be so closely associated with the political philosophy of postwar American liberalism on college campuses and their neighboring communities. The modern aesthetic provided a medium in which to address both the promises and potential troubles that many liberals saw marking postwar American culture. The disorder and uncertainty that many saw as crucial components of the immediate postwar era could be addressed – and perhaps even contained – in buildings that, in their commitment to rationality, order, and technological advancement, put on display the best components of American liberalism. (15)

A second series of chapters will then show that, going hand-in-hand with this brand of architectural modernism (and often coexisting under the same departmental roof) was a university commitment to a modern form of urban planning, one that stressed many of the abovementioned values while professing a desire for centralized, large-scale projects thought out by elite, well-educated parishioners in a top-down manner. University officials and employees saw the need for their design strategies to go beyond the gates of their campuses, and these individuals sought to spread the good word of modernism throughout adjacent communities. Mirroring the language of anti-communist liberalism, such administrators and their allies saw this endeavor as a “battle for the hearts and minds” of the communities surrounding these universities. And this is not the only similarity between the anti-communist struggle and the rhetoric behind university-sponsored urban development. The language of such development among university officials and their allies was often marked by repeated references to / coordinated “attacks” on urban decay and the need to “contain” the spread of blight before it took over an entire area. **Universities saw themselves as bulwarks in this war against blight, and they sought to bring the sense of order that modernism had brought to their own campuses to shore up conditions in the neighborhoods around them.** (16-17)

Yet all was not doom and gloom for those concerned with the planning of such urban universities. **Universities bought up and developed land for their own use, but also had a large role in broader urban renewal plans, as cities often welcomed the resources that such institutions could bring to the table.** This was particularly the case in terms of architects and urban planners, as many leaders turned to such faculty members to design their larger urban renewal schemes. As they did on their own campuses, these designers brought a distinctive strategy to these communities, one that once again highlighted the liberal vision of the ideal cityscape. While the sense of needing to “contain” the spread of blight was still there, such practitioners of urban renewal also saw a tremendously liberating potential in their work. Going hand-in-hand with the positive values of American liberalism (freedom, racial equality, the end of class distinctions, and a commitment to social welfare, to name but a few), such strategies stressed the life-altering possibilities of such planning: they could remake the city and, in the process, free its inhabitants from poverty, decrepit housing, and other urban ills. **Modernist urban planning would allow capitalism to flourish, provide adequate housing for such minority groups as African-Americans, and create accessible educational as well as recreational spaces for all city dwellers.** Such an optimistic view of postwar redevelopment has become sorely overlooked, particularly in light of the longer trajectory of urban renewal efforts in the United States (17)

Part Two of the dissertation, “The Radical Response” begins to lay out the student and community response to this world. The first chapter of this section, “‘Each morning it gets bigger and uglier’: Modernism, Liberalism, and Alienation on the College Campus,” highlights not only aesthetic dissatisfaction with postwar construction at such universities, but also illustrates how many young people began to make the more overtly political connection between modernism and liberalism. Whether it be students questioning new construction at Columbia in the early 1960s, young activists calling into question the relationship between I.I.T and the surrounding black community, or the influence of spatial concerns on the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley, **many young people at this moment drew attention to the university’s use, or misuse, of urban space, and the shortcomings of both modernism and the liberalism it was seen as representing.** The proceeding chapter, “From Renewal to Removal: Community Response to the Logic of ‘Gym Crow,’” will illustrate that **these critiques were often made by those other than students. In fact, in many cases it was community members and groups that first drew attention to the architectural and urban planning efforts of urban universities.** This chapter will pay great / attention to these movements, along with the relationship between student and community activists – a relationship overlooked or underplayed by many historians of the 1960s. (18-9)

Chapter Twelve of this dissertation will pay close attention to the ideas, individuals, and forces that helped bring about the creation of such critiques: **the arrival of new faculty members, the presence of emerging counter-ideas (the spread of the humanist Team 10 philosophy at Columbia and other universities, for example), the rise of other elements of the New Left (including the burgeoning civil rights movement), and the students’ own experiments with design and use of space.** All of these allowed such young people and community members alike to begin to see how they could possibly altar their built environment and use urban space more efficiently and creatively. (19)

The succeeding chapter, “The Vox Populi as Client: Students, the 1960s, and New Understandings of Space,” illustrates what happened **when these students began to truly see themselves as members of the student movement. By the late 1960s, these students were calling for changes in curriculum and a new understanding of university design and urban space. They launched a full-scale attack on both political liberalism and architectural modernism,** knowing too well the ways in which they had become increasingly intertwined throughout the postwar era. Students at I.I.T., for example, attacked the alleged “neutrality” of Mies’ campus design by highlighting how such technologically superior and efficient buildings could easily be used for efforts designed to support the US presence in Vietnam. At Yale, young activists, along with the local African-American community, condemned liberal urban renewal plans and instead offered their own version of urban redevelopment. To these students, such facts made it clear that a new / order – along with a new aesthetic – were needed and such experiments as **People’s Park** (the subject of Chapter 14 of this dissertation), along with alternative student-led designs for the gymnasium project at Columbia, begins to show what such an effort might look like. While (19-20) – **TODD GITLIN**

There is little doubt that such efforts helped bring about the death of both a particular brand of modernism that had reigned supreme in postwar America, as well as the system of liberalism that it had come to represent so well. **Among those that participated in the events of the 1960s from the fields of architecture and urban planning, the demise of these systems created the space for the birth of such things as advocacy architecture/planning (which called for a new relationship between architect and client), a commitment to humane, affordable housing, the growth of the ecology movement, and the impetus for the American preservation movement....** To many activists, as noted above, such developments helped them renew the promise of modernism that they felt had been lost in the immediate postwar era. They / saw this moment as helping to reinvigorate the positive attributes of modernism – its commitment to social justice and political activism, most explicitly – with a new attention to issues of scope and context. But this evolution also created the space necessary for the rise of the postmodern, as many of the values associated with the rise of this philosophy can be traced to this moment. (20-1)

J. Bryan Lowder, “Were Brutalist Building son College Campuses Really Designed to Thwart Student Riots?” *Slate* (October 18, 2013):

<https://slate.com/human-interest/2013/10/campus-brutalism-were-the-buildings-designed-to-thwart-student-riots.html>

During its heyday, Brutalism was both big and *big*, especially at universities eager to demonstrate their modernity *bona fides*. The 1960s and early 1970s saw venerable institutions across the country building these hulking structures to house performing arts centers, libraries, or other departments; in some cases, [entire campuses](#) were conceived in the style. Yet the Brutalism boom started to crumble even as it approached critical mass—very quickly, students, faculty, and community members came to a widely shared (and rare) consensus that the new buildings were, in a word, *ugly*.

Assuming that your campus did have a Brutalist building, you’ve probably been told a lie about it that goes something like, “Hideous, right? The administration chose that design because it was good at preventing student riots and occupations.” The notion, apparently, is that the style’s typically complex floor plans, dazzling edifices, and oddly placed entrances would discourage those kinds of activities. I’ve heard versions of this tall tale used to explain both the International Affairs Building at my alma mater, Columbia, as well as the North Academic Center at City College, looming as it does a few blocks from my home in Harlem. Colleagues have heard similar apologies in reference to structures at schools all over the place. For years, we’ve all passively accepted this story; however, a little research shows that it is exactly that—a myth.

Though the riot-prevention narrative is widely known, every architectural historian or critical source that I consulted viewed it as extremely dubious. For one thing, the claim is somewhat anachronistic. **Many campus Brutalist projects were planned (if not totally completed) before the student movements of the late ‘60s and early ‘70s really took off**, so crafty administrators would have to have been very prescient to foresee the countercultural-quashing usefulness of any particular style. Plus, as one practical-minded source put it, “not

only was [Brutalism] in vogue, architecturally speaking, but building in concrete was way, way cheap. Hence its widespread use in institutional building” during the period.

But more to the point, **the philosophy behind Brutalism—which was developed in the ‘50s and early ‘60s, again well before the student rebellions began—was directly opposed to repression and control, a detail which makes the style’s later association with totalitarianism all the more ironic.** Mark Pasnik, a professor and practicing architect, explains that the proponents of Brutalism had “collective aspirations” in mind when designing their awe-striking monuments: “These buildings were considered to be strong and robust, but those were attributes about permanence, not about controlling populations. In fact, many of the architects involved were purists about architecture and used architecture to reflect positive human aspirations. Figures like Paul Rudolph and the Smithsons were utopian, not dystopian, in their outlook. It would be wrong to brandish them as control agents.”

...Rohan convincingly points out that Rudolph’s buildings and the many lesser copies inspired by them **“would become scenes of political protest where the feeling of estrangement between the generations would become most apparent ... This new generation would view Rudolph’s monumental theatrics ... as part of the Establishment’s attempts to create an illusionary facade of seamless power and authority.”** From there, it’s not hard to see how the myth of riot-policing became unfairly inscribed on Brutalism’s concrete slabs.

Kriston Capps, “College Protests and ‘Riot-Proof Brutalist Architecture, Explained,” *Bloomberg* (May 5, 2024):

<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/newsletters/2024-05-05/did-college-protests-lead-to-brutalist-campus-architecture>

The [University of Buffalo] campus, they said, was famously designed to thwart protests....

That piece of apocryphal lore long predates the current crisis of student unrest that’s gripped dozens of colleges across the US, and it goes far beyond Buffalo. The story goes that the campus planners of the late 1960s and 1970s responded to the widespread student protests of the era by replacing bucolic quadrangles and learning commons with maze-like modernist compounds in order to stymie the efforts of any would-be agitators....

Writing for Slate more than a decade back, J. Bryan Lowder demolished the argument that university Brutalism was a response to student riots. For starters, it’s anachronistic: The style predates the major Vietnam-era protests...

More to the point, **Brutalist architects were free thinkers, not authoritarian goons. The entire project was an experimental effort to buck the paradigm.** Architects such as Rudolph or Alison and Peter Smithson

rejected the glass-and-steel International Style, which had become linked to corporate ambition, embracing the anti-ornamental, class-leveling power of poured concrete....

And some of those city and state leaders were visionaries themselves. As former UB student Jack Ding explains in his 2015 thesis, the North Campus story begins with New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller, who hoped to build out the State University of New York as a system to compete with the University of California. In 1963, Rockefeller invited prominent modernist architects to his mansion to tour his art collection and hear his pitch — among them I.M. Pei, Gordon Bunshaft of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, and the firm Hellmuth, Obata and Kassabaum (HOK).

Those architects shaped Buffalo's SUNY campus (and many others). Bunshaft designed the original master plan, envisioning the campus as a single building — a megastructure a mile long and 1,000 feet wide (!). That was scrapped for a slightly softer vision by Sasaki, Dawson and DeMay: a complex of interconnected buildings, with no central green, surrounded by parking lots. HOK's design for Cooke-Hochstetter wasn't Brutalist, exactly, but it has the heavy footprint and unmistakable massing of major public housing projects....

Some students (and faculty, and administrators) called the campus grim and totalitarian — but an equally vocal subset saw UB's sweeping, futurist facilities as optimistic....

Sixty-plus years later, of course, the radical practice of 1960s civic designers has cemented into the institutional language of existing power structures. Architects who tried to lay claim to a utopian vision of civic space could not frame forever how those civic structures would read to people. Modernist campuses weren't designed to frustrate student activists, but frustrated students are nevertheless taking note....

Yesteryear's visionary architecture can be a striking stage for mass protest. In January 2023, when supporters of Brazil's former president stormed the capital of **Brasília**, rioters found themselves dwarfed by architect Oscar Niemeyer's sleek concrete buildings and empty plazas. **“So vast are its voids that the sheer scale of the space may have helped temper the energies of the crowds,”** Adrian Anagnost wrote in CityLab....

Such juxtapositions can also be a reason why **the tent** has emerged as such a potent symbol for activists. The mass demonstrations in Cairo's Tahrir Square in 2011 took place under the shadow of the Mogamma, a modernist 1940s civic building (not unlike Buffalo's City Hall). **A flimsy fabric shelter is an inversion of the power invested in a Neoclassical city hall, an Art Deco Wall Street skyscraper or a Brutalist administration building....**

“The way the occupiers of 2011–13 inhabited spaces as isolated individuals presented a departure from the spatial practices of earlier labor and civil rights activists who marched by closing ranks,” architecture historian Can Bilsel writes in an essay for Architecture Against Democracy. “Resistance in public space is now often depicted as the stoicism and vulnerability of an individual body.”

There's a longstanding relationship between campus protests and campus architecture. At times it's been direct: In 1968, students at Columbia University occupied Avery Hall — home to the Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation — as a demonstration against the school's attitudes toward Black students and its treatment of Harlem residents, as my colleague Brentin Mock has written.

That dynamic isn't unidirectional, with college chancellors commissioning architects to kettle student protests. It's more likely that civic architecture has shaped modern activism. **Setting up tents on campus is a pretty abstract way to protest a war happening thousands of miles away, after all. But it makes more sense as a physical response to a building or plaza that activists see as imposing — whatever the original intent.**

CAMPS / TENTS

Maryam Jamshidi, "Securitizing the University," LPE Project (June 3, 2024):

<https://lpeproject.org/blog/universities-securitization-palestine/>

Rise of Faculty for Justice in Palestine, faculty support for encampments, "people's graduations" // understand the forces that these efforts are responding to. They are responding to a **mobilized faculty, staff, and student body—more mobilized than they have been in decades—that have a clear-eyed understanding of what they are fighting for.** In responding to this mobilization with the blunt and repressive techniques of national security, proponents of these legislative tactics implicitly recognize that victory will not come on the plane of ideas, discussion, and debate. Force is the only way they can win

Steven W. Thrasher, "You Are Being Lied to About Gaza Solidarity Camps by University Presidents, Mainstream Media, and Politicians," *LitHub* (May 10, 2024):

<https://lithub.com/you-are-being-lied-to-about-gaza-solidarity-camps-by-university-presidents-mainstream-media-and-politicians/>

What I witnessed at Columbia is what I have seen at all the encampments (and, similarly, in years prior, at Occupy Wall Street at Black Lives Matter encampments): **students experimenting with making a society better than the shit one they're expected to accept, enter and recreate. They were experimenting with self governance and horizontal organizing. They were experimenting with educating, entertaining, feeding, defending and (quite unusual at elite universities) praying for and with one another. They were figuring out their values, and putting real effort into trying to do what's right.** *How beautiful is that?*

University administrators want to control every single aspect of students' social lives, such that they can only produce a limited, finite set of outcomes: one where **students will not question the ruling class, but will only socialize in ways that reproduce the social order, and only socialize in ways which maximize profits for the ruling class and uphold the aims of American empire.** *Stray from that and you will be destroyed.* And *that's* why you are being lied to about these encampments....

A lie from journalists is that these protesters' demands aren't clear, and that the camps are impossible to report on. On Tuesday, media critic Brian Stelter [tweeted](#) this quote from an article by Jill Filipovic: "Despite all the coverage of the protests over Israel's war in Gaza, it can be remarkably difficult to understand what the players are actually saying." ... its faulty premise: that where protesters stand is confusing... / It is *extremely* easy to see what the students want: **the [website Students 4 Gaza](#) lists a map of every school encampment (183 as of this writing) and links to each one's demands.** What exactly they want is **very articulate, well reasoned**, and is as easy to comprehend as signs or chants that say *Disclose! Divest! We will not stop, we will not rest!*

On Tuesday, my good friend Prof. Eman Abdelhadi, a professor at the University of Chicago, traveled to her students' camp... Sharing an email about her university's "cleanup" of the quad (which terrorized sleeping students and violently destroyed their property), she [wrote](#): "By cleanup they mean destroying the only real community space that's existed on this campus."... "For many of us," she [continued](#), "these past 8 days were a **glimpse into a different kind of life. One where we are truly connected to each other, where we share space as human beings not just as positions** (student, professor, etc). **That feeling is bigger than a tent, and it will guide us forward.**"...

I've also met more caring, compassionate colleagues at their camps than in any other venue over my years in Chicago. The shared **goals of these encampments—to divest from an apartheid state and end the genocide in Gaza—are not anything to be ashamed about.** They are **moral and righteous desires. Nor are these fringe positions**; they are desired by the majority of the people on this planet.

In the four encampments I have visited, it has **felt so good to not have to pretend**—as so many universities, publications and politicians seem to want us to—**that everything is fine and we must just get back to normal by pretending what is happening isn't happening.** Everyone knows **police could come in at any second** and beat the shit out of them; but **they know what's happening in Gaza is far worse, and so they're willing to take the risk.**

Like the the **Poor People's Campaign** Martin Luther King was planning when he was killed in 1968 (which was supposed to be a shanty town *encampment* of white, Black and Chicano poor people on the National Mall) the Gaza solidarity encampments have been a **taste of what might be possible when everyone freely gets what they need—and when people unite across divisions to share shabbat, salah, and a demand to end**

war.

Robin Givhan, “America’s Tents Are Pitched on Shameful Truths,” *The Washington Post* (April 30, 2024): <https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2024/04/30/americas-tents-are-pitched-shameful-truths/>

The tents are unseemly. They need to be. They’re **flimsy structures staked on uneven ground surrounded by the stately architecture of the academy, capitalism and power**. Their flapping scrim of nylon and plastic clutter up the landscape and serve as a rebuke to the grandiosities of polite society. **The tents shame countries, cities and individuals for their failures** even when the voices of the activists fall silent, when the chanting stops and the sun sets. The tents are still there...

But it’s the tents that take up the space. **Their presence is a constant, ringing reminder of unrest and anger** even when the student activists type quietly on their laptops or softly sing that “Palestine needs our love” or listen in silence as the evening’s schedule is ticked off over a bullhorn....

For some college presidents, there seems to be a belief that by ripping away the tents and clearing the courtyards, they are also expunging any hate and hurt from their campus — as if antisemitism lives in these makeshift shelters and not in the heart. They demand that the protests be polite, convenient and perfect, or in the words of Princeton University’s president, that the protests adhere to “time, place and manner” regulations....

The tents are always telling us something that we don’t want to hear.

The tents of the homeless fill parks, clutter walkways and sprout in the shadow of freeway overpasses. So leaders of western states across the political divide have gone to the Supreme Court to have those tents declared illegal....

The tents house the people we don’t want to see. These humble structures that sit low in the valleys between skyscrapers and monuments, remind us of inequality, of the unpredictability of unfairness, of the ways in which capitalism and the American Dream don’t work. They represent one immoral truth out of many.

And whether leaders criminalize them, bulldoze them or ridicule them doesn’t matter. **The problems endure because the problem is never the tent.**

Jonathan M. Katz, Bluesky (May 4, 2024):

<https://bsky.app/profile/katzonearth.bsky.social/post/3krojla2dk323>

UVA and Virginia state police are raiding the Gaza solidarity encampment next to the Rotunda. They literally changed the bylaws, which previously permitted tents, a few hours ago. The encampment had been going quietly for several days.

Megan Humburg, Bluesky (April 24, 2024):

<https://bsky.app/profile/bahhumburg.bsky.social/post/3kqykeit46k2x>

IU shadily passed a new tent pitching policy YESTERDAY specifically to trample on students' rights & create a fake reason to call the cops on anti-genocide protestors. **The previous policy did not require tents to be related to a university event and only banned tents being left out past 11pm.**

Official communication from IU Bloomington: "Pursuant to ACA-BL-118 2(C), the Ad Hoc 1Committee approved the following regulation on April 24, 2024: The temporary or permanent installation of structures (including, but not limited to, signage, tents, etc.) at any time must be **approved in advance**, by the Office of the Vice Provost for Student Life in conjunction with University Events, and if approved, must adhere to guidelines provided by the University. The Office of the Vice Provost for Student Life, in conjunction with University Events, may approve overnight use of University property for camping in connection with approved University events or registered University organizations. Such use must be consistent with the University's mission and will not be detrimental to the health, safety, or welfare of event participants or the campus community or in violation of any federal, state, or local laws or municipal ordinances. In extraordinary circumstances, such as times of natural disaster, camping may be permitted when approved by the President or their designee."

Gaza Academics and Administrators, "Open Letter by Gaza Academics and University Administrators to the World," *Al Jazeera* (May 29, 2024):

<https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2024/5/29/open-letter-by-gaza-academics-and-university-administrators-to-the-world>

Our civic infrastructure – universities, schools, hospitals, libraries, museums and cultural centres – built by generations of our people, lies in ruins from this deliberate continuous Nakba. The **deliberate targeting of our educational infrastructure is a blatant attempt to render Gaza uninhabitable and erode the intellectual and cultural fabric of our society**. However, we refuse to allow such acts to extinguish the flame of knowledge and resilience that burns within us.

We call upon our colleagues in the homeland and internationally to support our steadfast attempts to defend and preserve our universities for the sake of the future of our people, and our ability to remain on our Palestinian land in Gaza. **We built these universities from tents. And from tents, with the support of our friends, we will rebuild them once again.**

Peter Mörtenböck and Helge Mooshammer, “Tent Cities, People’s Kitchens, Free Universities: The Global Villages of Occupation Movements” in Doina Petrescu and Kim Trogal, eds., *The Social (Re)Production of Architecture* (Routledge, 2017): 257-70.

The right to political participation such uprisings call upon is made manifest through occupying central nodes in the visual and spatial domains of the social world. Rather than merely passing through space and leaving its surfaces untouched, **these protests employ an array of tactics to demonstrate the potential permanence of resistance**. Key to their political currency is their attachment to urban life and their insistence on non-defiance until some change has been achieved. **These endeavours entail not only an encroachment on symbolic space – the use of banners, placards, performances or mock statues to propose alternative significations – but also the (re)production of a whole set of infrastructures that help to sustain the presence of protest:** from the provision of food, sanitation and medical care for the bodies that occupy these squares to a range of social and cultural means to further the political milieu of the protest – **libraries, theatres, ad-hoc exhibitions, pop-up galleries, assembly spaces as well as communication and media platforms, ranging from on-site radio and press corners to social media and outreach tools.** (258)

Camps, whether those of the protest movements of our time or other camps that have been established for purposes of protest, resistance or autonomous organization, are thus not only sites of discussion and deliberation but also non-stop **experiments in a form of cohabitation based on community and trust.** (260)

In order to distinguish themselves from existing forms of association, **camps also need to mark an ‘elsewhere’ in a spatial respect**, whether as the historical other of the town and its citizens in the form of the military camp and soldiers located outside the town walls, or in political-legal terms as a space outside the prevailing legal order in which other forms of sovereignty are practised, for instance, through the exercise of military, police, foreign or autonomous power. Camps thus **displace and locate, intertwining these two moments such that their occupants become included in their exclusion**. In this way, they intensify their difference from dominant logics of order, while also inspiring, as illustrated by particular historical sites, the encroachment of one organizing principle on another. (260)

This military origin of the camp, its ambivalent nature and the comprehensive influence of principles of spatial order had conspicuous consequences for the development of protest camps in the twentieth century, for their territorial and strategic organization of protest, for the forms of resistance they offered, and for the security and extension of controls over self-organized structures. At all important locations of the Occupy Movement, camps were set up that included the infrastructure, tents and kitchens typical of an occupation in order to provide for a lasting engagement. However, whereas in modern warfare camps are usually established in secure locations behind the front line and provide battlefield support from a distance by supplying ordnance, holding new material for the front in readiness, and providing food and quarters for soldiers, in the case of the recent occupation movements, **the tents themselves formed the front line in the occupiers’ struggle to stay**

where they were. The most vehement challenges coming from police and local authorities were not directed at the protest as such or at protests taking place on the street in front of banks, town halls and company headquarters, but at the tents, tarpaulins and other materials ensuring that the movement could stay put. (261)

Zuccotti Park was selected and provided a point from which the movement's protest marches repeatedly streamed in the direction of Wall Street. On the other hand, the movement's gatherings in public space were also informed by the idea of the formation of a new social constitution, the development of economic principles and the **exploration of mechanisms of direct democracy.** (261)

They provided a testing ground for the emergence of a new community from a collection of fundamentally different individuals outside the influence of established social institutions. The fact that in this context trust was established between disparate people and groups, and collective decisions were shaped by the sense of a **newly formed community** meant that the camps were more than merely bases of operations. At the same time, they constituted **educational sites, forms of political theatre and incubators of an unfolding organizational culture** (Snyder, 2011). The framework for this evolution was provided by the interplay of political forums, working groups and actions with an **improvised infrastructure of signs and banners, laptops and generators, kitchens and libraries, medical facilities and tents.** (262)

the **adversarial camp that the police had erected** on the edge of the park occupation became equally readable. Its core was the **SkyWatch operations platform**, a mobile watchtower equipped with reflective glass, spotlights and cameras that could be extended to a height of 8 metres (Sheets, 2011). The panoptic design of these surveillance machines inevitably leads to associations with Foucault's concept of the disciplinary society (262)

In effect, Occupy Wall Street positioned itself within a camp formed and monitored by the police. Internally oriented activities pertaining to welfare, intermediation and discipline within the camp were largely left to the occupiers, who also diligently **decorated the boundary fence with ornamental objects and placards...** Step by step, it **internalized forms of supervision originating from outside the camp**, which were ultimately able to enclose, destabilize and capture it. (264)

Gitlin, The Whole World is Watching

The covert concern of many institutional operations directed at the Occupy Movement was not the territorial control of parks or squares but rather the **maintenance of the state of emergency as an organizing principle of a seemingly ubiquitous social crisis**, whether in the micro-urban structure of the Occupy camp or the structure of urban development as a whole. (264)

The mainspring of spatial diversification in the Occupy camps focused on here was the desire for a common search for answers in an egalitarian environment. These arenas show how in oscillating movements between

ideas and spatial praxis **a political commons** was generated – not as a thing or asset and not as a quantifiable process, but **as a mouldable social relationship between an assembled group and the environment it has claimed** (Harvey, 2012: 73). **Intellectual and physical nourishment, specially invented recipes, well-networked preparation and alternative forms of enjoyment**, served as catalysts of a globally dispersed, experimental sociality (265)

The **People's Kitchens** established in the camps usually occupied a central location, from where they could supply food for the activities encircling them while also constituting an informal meeting point for everyone in the camp.... Providing support for the occupied parks and squares with all kinds of homemade food constituted an important point of contact for many people, above all in the early weeks of the occupation – a declaration of solidarity with the concerns of the Occupy camps. (265)

Communicating and 'representing' the movement to the outside world also took place at other points in the camps of the Occupy Movement. In the larger camps, media and public relations work was usually conducted in **special information areas**, near to which **legal advice** was often offered and entire libraries emerged. The most comprehensive collection of **books and journals** associated with Occupy was located in the northeast corner of Zuccotti Park, where in November 2011 up to 9000 publications were available, supervised for the most part by **professional librarians**. In a time when libraries are disappearing from urban public life, the libraries of the Occupy Movement signalled the vital importance of this form of public space. The motive driving the spontaneous emergence of these '**People's Libraries**' has less to do with the propagation of a targeted corpus of literature than with the formation of a community of readers, a social bond forged by reading, reflection, discussion and conversation. The communicative focus of the Occupy libraries thus emphasizes the role of the **library as a building block of the community**. (266)

Apart from the open programme offered by such people's libraries, the Occupy Movement's **concern with education** was manifested above all in the numerous **courses, workshops and seminars** held in various self-founded, free universities. In the run-up to Occupy's emergence, student protests around the world sparked by opposition to tuition fees in 2009 and 2010 had already led to a broader discussion on the connection between education, privatization, speculation and indebtedness (266)

The result was a rapid emergence of blogs, e-zines, meeting points and networks in which information was disseminated and discussions started. Initiatives such as New York's Occupy University, Boston's **Free School University**, London's Tent City University and The Art School in the Art School took this discussion a step further, in that they, as the education arm of the Occupy Movement, developed alternative formats entailing free education for all... This approach inspired the foundation of a '**Bank of Ideas**' in an occupied building owned by the Swiss bank UBS not far from the second London Occupy camp on Finsbury Square ([Figures 17.2](#) and [17.3](#)), and subsequently a 'School of Ideas' in an empty school building a few hundred metres away, where courses in alternative citizenship were held for neighbourhood children. (267)

The unfolding of social and cultural relations in protest camps creates a space that supports, focuses and expresses spontaneous utterance and assembly. The emphasis here is not first and foremost on the territorial dimension of the occupied space but on the **spatial praxis of the camp**, which helps repeatedly to generate new and useful tools for the movements. From this perspective, the many **specialized spheres of protest camps, such as kitchens, libraries, medical service and media points, can be described as collectively structured fields of action that constitute a networked form of cultural praxis** and for whose activities self-elected working groups can feel responsible. (267)

The Campus in Camps initiative by Decolonizing Architecture (DAAR) in occupied territories in the West Bank, Palestine, is a different case of searching for an affective pedagogy. Decolonization methodologies in architectural pedagogy have been specifically situated and developed in disputed territories and cities... **Campus in Camps** run by youth in the Dheisheh refugee camp is an alternative pedagogical platform. This platform is based on several activities that take into consideration the refugee experience and the urbanization of camp practices, as well as wider concerns of education and methods of decolonization. Using social media tools as an expanding archive of sources for their activities, Campus in Camps enabled the creation of a new vision of education, by means of critical spatial practices (82)

Gavin Brown, Anna Feigenbaum, Fabian Frenzel, and Patrick McCurdy, "Introduction: Past Tents, Present Tents: On the Importance of Studying Protest Camps," in *Protest Camps in International Context: Spaces, Infrastructures and Media of Resistance* (Bristol University Press, 2017).

The different interdependent operational functions that make up the protest camp can be clearly categorised and distinguished as infrastructures. By common definition, infrastructures refer to the organised services and facilities necessary for supporting a society or community. We therefore use the term 'infrastructure' in its basic meaning to capture **how camps build interrelated, operational structures for daily living**. These structures function together to **disseminate information, distribute goods and provide services**. In order to conduct our analysis and work to code the recurring sets of structured objects, practices and behaviours that make up protest camps, we build on the typology of four sets of infrastructures, conceptualised in Feigenbaum et al (2013). The first of these infrastructures are the **communication and media infrastructures** within protest camps which are concerned with **media strategies, distribution networks and production techniques**. Second, there are **action infrastructures** comprised of **direct action tactics, education, police negotiations, legal aid, medical support and transportation** networks. Third, camps operate through **governance and organisation infrastructures** (formal and informal **decision-making processes, rules and procedures**, but also their spatial organisation). Finally, and sometimes, forgotten, there are **re-creation infrastructures** which provide **food, shelter and sanitation** to camps and campers, the maintenance of communal and private spaces, as well as providing care and safety for those living in and visiting protest camps. (10)

As these set of infrastructures dynamically interact, they sometimes enable and sometimes hinder each other. In these processes conflicts arise which produce a dynamic in which protest camps change, take locally specific forms, succeed or fail.... **Infrastructure should also be read as emergent...** Protest camps, in all their many forms, also have very specific geographies... it is important to **pay attention to the spatialities through which they operate**. Protest camps have a physical form that is located in a particular place.... The **sites of protest camps are chosen because they are strategic** – they **draw attention to an injustice** (or those with power who have perpetrated it); by taking form in that place they have the **potential to prevent or delay / further injustice occurring**; or, they may **occupy a site of symbolic importance** in the popular imagination that helps add credence to their cause through their association with that location. Where a protest camp comes into being can have a very significant impact on how it functions, who can participate in it, and how (and for how long) it can exist. (11-12)

Protest camps have set up a number of ways of **communicating with the outside**; but, just as much, they have considered their **own internal communications**. While protest camps have often created media tents, sometimes outside the actual camp, for external media to address the camp, other specific ways of managing media have also been invented. Protest camps have sometimes ‘embedded’ journalists from outside media in order to control their media images. At the same time camps have developed infrastructures that **enable onsite alternative media production**. (12)

The infrastructures of political action present at protest camps differ widely, starting from those tools directly needed to pursue certain activities. This includes the **organisation of political action; training to prepare people for action; and, sometimes, the provision of care for people after actions** have taken place (see also re-creation infrastructures, below). Action infrastructures also concern the more practical boundary work needed to make protest camps. As barricades rise up, the question of how to relate to the outside is often limited to defence and a (seemingly) clear ‘us- versus-them’ logic. The alternative world created in the camp needs to be protected. The camp provides a number of basic infrastructures to provide such functions. Due to being in place for a number of days, with routines other than action also occurring, the camp lends itself to the training of certain action techniques, including **mass action, legal skills and first aid training**. Such training can occur more formally, in the sense that particular **workshops** are set up and advertised in the camp communications; but, it also **occurs more informally**, when people catch up about experiences around the camp fire, or when they encounter each other after actions. (13) / Protest camps provide **spaces and infrastructures of training and action** where gendered roles in relation to such action can be challenged. Certain perceptions of what constitutes legitimate action can also be challenged. (14)

to utilise a number of innovative new approaches to governance and organisation, driven by the desire to not simply form a political force, but to create alternative political cultures. The **rejection of traditional ways of decision-making**, found in left-wing and counter-cultural movements, has been articulated strongly in many protest camps. By their very spatial and temporal character, they **enable experimentation with self-organisation in more horizontal and anarchist inspired ways** (even if these experiments often fail)....

the shared opposition to the status quo is expressed territorially and this expression **enables the formation of governance based on horizontal and shared decision-making**. A further crucial innovation, visible in the history of South American, British and European camps in particular, is the **development of decentralisation** within the camp. (14)

Social reproduction, or what we have called re-creation infrastructures, is ultimately linked to the **ability of the camp to function as an alternative world in that it provides safety, care, shelter and food for its participants**. Tents and marquees form the basis of this provision, as do kitchens and medical tents. Re-creation infrastructures can emerge spontaneously, and they often do as people gather in protest, bringing together not just **materials to help occupy** a site, but the necessary **equipment and provisions** to allow them to stay there, safely, healthily and relatively comfortably, for a period of time. In more planned camps these infrastructures are often most sophisticated, and sometimes even provided by **specialised teams, such as the Tat Collective** in the UK which overlooks and supplies a stock of material needed to build a camp. There are also a number of **kitchen collectives** in several countries that cater specifically for protest camps, setting up large kitchens to sustain campers. (15) / the tension between the appeal of spontaneous assembly and the creation of protest camps seems to stem significantly from the ability to generate and express a collective antagonistic affect. **The more professional protest camps infrastructures become in their planning and delivery, the less powerful the expression of this collective antagonistic affect may be.** (15)

Taking seriously the material and social infrastructures of camps, we examine the spatial division of labour within protest camps (as well as the ways in which they relate to publics 'outside' their physical boundaries). We also introduce **how the architecture of the public squares and gardens that are occupied by / protesters can shape the ways in which politics is practised within them**. Protest camps are seldom spontaneous, and we need to understand better the processes by which camps are planned, and the **ways in which political practices travel between camps over time**, often entangled with the material histories of specific pieces of camping equipment. This includes the **important role of media and communication infrastructure**. We highlight the need to examine the **relationship between the physical space of occupation and the mediated or virtual space**. Of interest here are the media practices used to maintain and amplify spaces of protest with particular attention given to the **role of media – and social media in particular – in maintaining and amplifying corporeal protest camp sites**. (16-17)

Urban protest camps, in particular, frequently **seek to occupy public space in order to draw attention to the policies of political and economic elites**; frequently, in doing so, they invade spaces that homeless and other vulnerable groups have previously made their own. We need to question **how certain 'publics' are brought into being by protest camps**, while the existence of others might be elided or erased.... This section addresses the constitutive power of the protest camps as a political and communicative space. Here the spatial character of the protest camp as its own sphere of life and communication creates a disposition between the two, something that leads to various relationships **from clear-cut antagonism between 'the camp' and 'the**

outside’ to more heterotopic overlaps, as well as more blurred boundaries in communication and action. (17)

When protest camps become home places, we see the limits of conceptualisations of politics as rationalist speech acts: camps can create a space for participants to engage in deeper identity quests that seek life beyond the capitalist status quo. Precisely because protest camps prefiguratively embody alternative ways of being they can serve as powerful inspirations long after specific camps cease to exist. (18)

Patrick McCurdy, Anna Feigenbaum, and Fabian Frenzel, “Protest Camps and Repertoires of Contention,” *Social Movement Studies* 15:1 (2016): 97-104.

Protest camps **adapt infrastructures and practices from tent cities, festival cultures, squatting communities and land-based autonomous movements.** But protest camps are not simply repertoires on their own. They also form spaces in which a **variety of repertoires of contention** are developed, tried and tested, diffused or sometimes dismissed (98)

The concept of repertoires of contention was first put forward by Tilly (1978) and subsequently developed in his later work (e.g. Tilly, 1979, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2008), can be understood as the collection of strategies and tactics a given contextually-rooted social movement both knows how to do, and chooses to deploy at a moment in time (99)

To facilitate the study protest camps as assemblages of repertoires shaped by place, temporality and material architectures and objects, we suggest a theory and practice of ‘infrastructural analysis’. We use the term ‘infrastructure’ to refer to the organised services and facilities protest campers build for daily living. These structures, along with the practices attached to them, function together, to allow campers to disseminate information, distribute goods and provide services (such as non-violence training, medical care and legal support). We differentiate between four protest camp infrastructures:

- Media & communication infrastructures and practices (media strategies, distribution networks, production techniques);
- Action infrastructures and practices (direct action tactics, police negotiations, legal aid, medical support, transportation networks);
- Governance infrastructures and practices (formal and informal decision-making processes); and
- Re-creation infrastructures and practices (food supply, shelter, sanitation, maintenance of communal and private space). (101)

Anna Feigenbaum, “Resistant Matters: Tents, Tear Gas and the ‘Other Media’ of Occupy,” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 11:1 (2014): 15-24.

Tents communicate political messages in a number of ways. **On their surface, they often act as signboards, affixed with banners and posters, or painted, stencilled, and drawn on.** Slogans about the economy, greed, inequality, and capitalism were scattered across Occupy encampments, while messages drawing attention to issues of race and class, offered both external communication and internal critique faced back at the movement, like Occupy Toronto's Women's Space Yurt that reminded camper's "I am your equal." In some cities, including Occupy Melbourne, protesters responded to legal prohibitions on erecting tents by wearing them instead. Becoming walking tent sign boards, they took to the streets dressed in messages (18)

While US courts have repeatedly upheld the status of tents as a form of protected symbolic communication over the past three decades, when tents move from being "merely symbolic" to being usable infrastructures for sleeping, eating, and other forms of re-creation, prosecutors trot out "reasonable time and place restrictions." For example, in a trial for Occupy Fort Meyers "fake sleeping" was deemed an acceptable mode of communicative protest, whereas real sleeping was not. The court ruled that "The conduct of tenting and sleeping in the park 24 hours a day to simulate an 'occupation' is intended to be communicative and in context is reasonably understood by the viewer to be communicative." (19)

Yangyang Cheng, "Grieving Tiananmen as US Cops Crush Campus Protests," *The Nation* (June 3, 2024): <https://www.thenation.com/article/world/tiananmen-protest-china-campus/>

A placard explained its origin: In the spring of 1989, this tent was among the many pitched in Beijing's Tiananmen Square, where it sheltered student demonstrators from across the country. In the early hours of June 4, as [more than 180,000 troops](#) forced their way through city streets to clear out the square, the owner of the tent stuffed it into a bucket and retreated to safety with his other belongings. The blue tent is now on display at the June 4th Memorial Museum in New York City.

A protest tent from an adversarial state is preserved as a symbol of courage at a US museum; a similar object is criminalized when it challenges establishment power in this country. The contradiction exposes the bounds of American freedom.

HISTORY OF CAMPS + TENTS

Gavin Brown, Anna Feigenbaum, Fabian Frenzel, and Patrick McCurdy, "Introduction: Past Tents, Present Tents: On the Importance of Studying Protest Camps," in *Protest Camps in International Context: Spaces, Infrastructures and Media of Resistance* (Bristol University Press, 2017).

Exodus from a given polity, or political status quo, and the setting up of alternative political space might be considered one of the oldest available strategies for dissenters. It is, thus, of little surprise to find **evidence for camp-like protest already in nomadic cultures and then in the ancient Roman republic** (Cowan, 2002). The setting up of **alternative and utopian communities in medieval and modern Europe** (Hardy, 1979), and in the colonisation of the Americas and the Middle East forms a further historical precedent in which dissenters resorted to exodus and the building of new communities to realise their political aspirations and/ or to escape political persecution (Booth, 1999). (2)

Whether they seek to build alternatives to the status quo voluntarily or are impelled to seek shelter from the status quo, different protest campers bring a variety of diverging experiences into camp communities. Despite this diversity, a **fragile commonality can / be found in a shared antagonism to the status quo**. The production of a common political project also depends significantly on **how campers work on their relationships with each other and enact a politicised notion of mutual care**. **This communitarian conceptualisation of politics challenges social movement theories that prioritise contentious repertoires, like demonstrations, meetings or online campaigns. Protest camps are contentious acts, but they are complex and contradictory spaces that highlight the limitations of politics founded solely in contention**. In line with a view of protest movements as communities of resistance, protest camps prompt the consideration of the material, social and spatial infrastructures of political action. (2-3)

Contrary to much contemporary media reporting, protest camping did not begin in Egypt in early 2011. **Resurrection City, one of the largest protest camps we have found in our research, dates back to the US Civil Rights movement of the late 1960s**. Protest camps were also an important part of the transnational **anti-nuclear movement of the 1980s** (Roseneil, 1995; Feigenbaum, 2008; Leidinger, 2011), and the **anti-roads movement in the UK in the 1990s** (Routledge, 1997; Seel, 1997; Doherty, 1999). The **counter-summit mobilisations of the global justice movement in the early 2000s** were often based around protest camps (Juris, 2008; McCurdy, 2009; Frenzel, 2010). (3)

We suggest to begin the history of the protest camp in **1932, when the shanty town villages of the United States Great Depression, nicknamed ‘Hoovervilles’** after the then president, were mixed with elements of military base sites during the protests of the Bonus Army. Set up in Washington, DC these camps sustained first world war veterans struggling through the recession, while serving as planning bases and sites for the reproduction of daily life during the Bonus Army’s months’-long protests demanding payment of promised benefits for / their time served in the military. It makes sense to start with the **Bonus Army’s camps, because these directly influenced Resurrection City, the Poor People’s Campaign 1968 ‘shanty town’ camp** on Washington Mall. Martin Luther King Jr himself drew attention to the links between Resurrection City and the Bonus Army protests. Shortly before his death he explained to a radio reporter that the marching caravans of city dwellers would be patterned after the Bonus Army back in the 1930s. From May to June of 1968 Civil Rights and anti-poverty activists set up a highly-organised ‘tent city’ that ran along the grassland between the Lincoln

Memorial and Washington Monument in the American capital. The plans for this **protest camp city-in-a-city drew on the model of a base camp, serving as a site for rest, rejuvenation and recreation.** (3-4)

It was a symbolic site that made American poverty visible to the public by bringing the poor to the government's front door. At the same time, **Resurrection City functioned as a base of action as residents went on daily protests inside and outside of government offices.** 'Solidarity Day' brought over 50,000 to Washington, DC with a march that included civil rights campaigners, labour unions, students and radical protest groups like New York's Up Against the Wall. The protest camp also stood as an **experiment in alternative living.** Dozens of volunteers including social workers, **health professionals and educators helped set up and run on-site healthcare centres and kitchens** serving three healthy meals a day, more than many of the city's residents had in their home lives (4)

Transnational protest camps emerged in the form of convergence spaces in the late 1990s and early 2000s around **international summits** of elite government officials, military and corporate leaders, such as **WTO and G8** meetings (Routledge, 2003; Nunes, 2005; Juris, 2008). World Social Forums saw the construction of some of the largest protest camps to date. (7)

Charlie Hailey, *Camps: A Guide to 21st-Century Space* (MIT Press, 2009).

Mabel O. Wilson, "Provisional Demos: The Spatial Agency of Tent Cities," in Sarah A. Lichtman and Jilly Traganou, eds., *Design, Displacement, Migration: Spatial and Material Histories* (Routledge, 2023).

Over the past few years, hundreds of bright red, yellow, blue, and green camping tents have been clustered along train tracks, on the edges of highways below underpasses, and on land adjacent to border fences around the globe. **These tent cities form temporary domiciles erected by the thousands of political and economic refugees in all corners of the world. These improvised settlements are the residue of failed global economic development policies** from the mid-twentieth century onward (although they have deep legacies in colonialism obviously) and these thin membranes of fabric that offer marginal protection against the cold when it rains have been erected, followed by legions of refugees fleeing civic, civil strife in the Middle East and Africa, as bottlenecks at border control stations have produced states of limbo, conditions of neither having arrived nor departed. Across the United States, **Tent Cities not only house those fleeing political turmoil, but also have become semi-permanent homesteads for homeless individuals and families, economic refugees who have borne the brunt of waves of foreclosure and layoffs in recent years.** Even though the economy is clearly buzzing along, tent cities have not disappeared. Tent cities often form outside the oversight of international humanitarian refugee camps or official state detention centers, and against the legal designation of land use defined by local zoning laws. Non-citizens and poor residents residing in them are placed under the supervision of NGOs such as the UN High Commission on Refugees UNHCR, or various religious

organizations. Their status is determined by racial and class differences that disempower them within the various nation states in which they dwell, or through which they pass (21)

These tents, enclosures fabricated from lightweight nylon designed to be portable for activities of leisure and sport, convey the precariousness of the domesticity of these communities, lived out of backpacks and duffle bags. But does itinerance necessarily foreclose political claims to secure more permanent housing, employment and other rights of belonging, belonging to a state, whether short term or long term? **Could a provisional demos, a temporary commons of the people formed within tent / cities, assign agency and leverage collective action for economic and political refugees who are not citizens?** Or is it precisely the tent's lightness, its negligible footprint, that in part contributes to the refusal on the part of the state and cities to commit to long term settlement of the denizens of these tent cities, precisely because of the correlation of race, citizenship, personhood, and land? What can tent cities in the past tell us about how these temporary formations might function as sites of political action and change? (21-2)

Tent cities have a long history as sites of political protest. The Occupy movement—begun when protesters took over Zuccotti Park in lower Manhattan—was a politically motivated temporary settlement of an urban space. Inspired by the Arab Spring movement, this 2011 occupation of a privately owned public space raised collective objections about the hegemony of global finance, financial markets, and the invasive spread of economic inequality aided by government complicity. Occupy Wall Street spawned similar protest encampments in many parts of the world, including San Francisco, London, Frankfurt, Tel Aviv, Hong Kong, Porto Alegre, and elsewhere. The photograph in Figure 2.1 is of Occupy Frankfurt, in front of the European Central Bank at the heart of global capitalism like Lower Manhattan where Occupy Wall Street was established. Earlier formations of tent cities that, like the Occupy movement, promoted specific political agendas, can offer us lessons to understand the most recent waves of temporary settlements, the challenges to rights posed by racial and class differences, and how Tent City denizens might engage in forms of political agency. (22)

In May of 1968, civil rights activists erected a monumental Tent City on the National Mall in Washington DC. Although major victories were won in the mid-1960s, securing voting rights for African Americans and fighting against racial segregation, the problems of housing for the poor, inadequate medical care, hunger, and joblessness did not disappear. This particular protest was launched by African American groups, but was populated by a multiracial coalition, and cast public scrutiny on discrimination exacerbated by economic precariousness and sustained inequality. The widely circulated call for participation in the mass, multi-phased protest focused on fundamental inequalities in America's economic and political processes. This literature explained that << many nations that are poorer than rich America provides decent incomes and services for all poor people. America spends 10 times as much money on military power, as it does on welfare. The government subsidizes big companies and farms, and gives tax favors to rich people, but punishes the poor. America spends more money in one month to kill in Vietnam, than it spends in a year for [the] so called War on Poverty>> (23)

On June 19, Juneteenth, the day that celebrates when enslaved African Americans in Texas learned of their emancipation in 1865, organizers planned the **Poor People's Campaign** to culminate in Solidarity Day. This would be a day long series of militant speeches calling for nonviolent actions around the country. **More than 50,000 people join the residents of Resurrection City to rally for an economic Bill of Rights. The SCLC had initiated the tent city as the first of three phases of demonstrations.** The second phase was intended to consist of nationwide mass protests of civil disobedience. The third phase would involve a boycott of industry and commerce, to force congressional action to alleviate the nation's crippling poverty. However, before the latter two phases could commence, the first phase ended in the violent displacement of the residents of Resurrection City. After forty-two days, and the expiration of the permit of occupation, **over 1,000 police officers descended on the encampment on June 24 to remove residents by force** in response to a few people throwing rocks, along with other acts of protest against intimidation. The police, already fearful of recent urban unrest following King's assassination, **resorted to tear gas and force to clear protesters away from the site.** Those who chose to remain in the camp were arrested (Figure 2.3). (26)

Resurrection City offers a lesson for how a temporary demos, a commons for all including non-citizens can be a place where shared causes can be articulated, demands can be formulated, and actions can be taken. This is a project once again undertaken, most recently with the 50th anniversary of the Poor People's Campaign. (28)