WHAT CAN BLOOM?

AN ABOLITIONIST STUDY OF POLICING AT HAVERFORD COLLEGE

Frances Condon

May 17, 2021

Haverford College Anthropology Department

Advisor and First Reader: Professor Juli Grigsby

Second Reader: Professor Zainab Saleh
# Table of Contents

**Introduction** ........................................................................................................................................... 1

**White Space and the Origins of Campus Safety**  ................................................................................. 7

*From Watchmen to Campus Safety: A Timeline of Institutional Policing at Haverford* .......... 7

*Black Resistance, White Space: The Ardmore Coalition and Black Students’ Organizing* .... 9

*Constructing a Racialized, Spatialized Threat* ......................................................................................... 14

**Carceral Protectionism and Constructing In/Vulnerability** ................................................................. 19

*Policing for the Policeman’s Children* ........................................................................................................ 19

*The Borderlands of In/Vulnerability* .......................................................................................................... 22

*In/Vulnerability, Sanism, and the Wellness Check* ..................................................................................... 28

**Policing Beyond the Police** ................................................................................................................. 34

*Surveillance and Embodied Unsafety: Black and Brown Students’ Experiences of Policing* .. 35

*When “Safety” is Code for White Supremacy: White Notions of Safety as Reliant on Black and Brown Unsafety* .............................................................................................................. 39

**Conclusions: What Can Bloom?** ......................................................................................................... 42

**Bibliography** ......................................................................................................................................... 47

**Appendix A** ............................................................................................................................................. 52

**Appendix B** ............................................................................................................................................. 53
Acknowledgements

Though I wrote these pages, the ideas they contain are largely not my own. This project follows the braided lineages of Black Feminist and Abolitionist scholarship and action—lineages that I do not claim but aspire to be an accomplice to. The list of all those who have informed my understandings of these frameworks and what it means to work towards liberation would fill several books. But near the top of that list would be Professor Juli Grigsby, whose mentorship and teaching has been critical not only to this thesis but to my understandings of the world we live in and what the hell we can do about it. Thank you for your faith in me; for teaching me almost everything I know about Black Feminist Anthropology; for pushing me to be more critical, more reflexive, and more creative; and for always seeing me as a person before a student. It has been an honor to work with you.

I would also like to thank Professor Zainab Saleh, whose advising and teaching is the reason I stuck with Anthropology. Thank you for meeting with me on Skype when I was failing general chemistry my freshman year, and then for introducing me to the power of decolonial anthropology. Thank you for the care you share with your students.

Also critical to this project was the work of Haverford’s incredible librarians who guided me through the process of archival research: Brie Gettleson, Elizabeth Jones-Minsinger, and Margaret Schaus. This project would not have been possible without your patience, curiosity, and expansive knowledge of this college and its histories.

I would also like to thank Reverend Carolyn Cavaness of Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church for her insight and feedback on this project in its early stages. The knowledge you shared about your experiences and understandings of the relationship between the college and communities in Ardmore was deeply instructive.

To all two-hundred-odd people who filled out the survey—especially to those of you who have been harmed, overworked, and underappreciated by this institution—thank you for your time, enthusiasm, and faith. It is my greatest hope that this project can be a tool for those of you seeking to transform this place and world.

Finally, though there are too many to name here¹, this project is dedicated to my friends and peers who are working in so many ways to build networks of care and real safety in this place and beyond. Your passion, creativity, and commitment to the work you do is humbling to witness and be part of. Thank you for your energy, guidance, sustenance, patience, insights, laughter, and honesty.

¹ I was unsure whether you would want to be listed, but this project would be incomplete without at least some of your names. To Valentina Zavala-Arbelaez, Camille Samuels, Sanjeevi Nuhmal, Jessica Lopez, Jason Ngo, and Brittany Robinson: your insights have shaped this project in fundamental ways. Thank you for sharing your time, ideas, and care with me.
**Introduction**

I come to this project in the footprints of student movements across the United States pushing for the abolition of campus police along with abolition of policing and the university as we know it. These movements are, at their best, an extension of generations-long Black- and Indigenous-led revolutionary movements pushing for the abolition of the Prison Industrial Complex, settler-colonialism, capitalism, and all the intertwined realities of violence they engender. Situated within and “under” educational institutions, these campaigns recognize campus policing not as an aberration or exceptional source of harm, but rather a key pillar upholding the university as a place where white, settler logics and modes of being are enforced and reproduced.

What I have written here is, most basically, a study of campus policing at Haverford College—a 1300-student, predominantly white, liberal arts college in the suburbs of Philadelphia where I am currently a student. My focus is loosely the history, impacts, and significance of Haverford’s private security force, known as “Campus Safety”, as well as the broader landscape of policing on the campus. I ask several, large questions, none of which I purport to have “answered” (a project which would take much longer and the work of many more people): What forms does policing take on Haverford’s campus? Who is policed, and by whom, and how does that policing shape experiences of safety, being, and belonging for people on campus? Where did the formal institution of “campus police” come from, and how is it connected to wider structures of racial capitalism (within it, white supremacy, anti-Blackness, ableism, patriarchy, and settler-colonialism)?

To begin answering these questions, I started in the archives, housed in Haverford’s Special Collections on the first floor of the library. I focused on material from the late 1960s to the early
2010s, paging through printouts of emails, annual college reports, meeting minutes, pamphlets, and whatever else I could get my hands on. In order to better draw connections from these materials to the present, I shared an anonymous survey with college staff, faculty, students, and former students, which ultimately received over 250 responses. I also completed two semi-structured interviews with interviewees affiliated with the Campus Safety department. As I am currently a student, this project was also informed by countless conversations with friends and acquaintances, my work with the student abolitionist collective on-campus, and my own experiences of policing on and beyond Haverford’s campus, which though not the center of this project ultimately inform each and every one of my perspectives.

At the most fundamental level, this project is an academic exercise I have to complete in order to complete my major in Anthropology—a parameter that has in some ways limited what this project could be (for example: how it needed to be presented in an academic context and how it needed to be completed in such a short time). However, in an aspirational sense, I hoped and attempted to complete this project as a small contribution to the student activism at this college pushing to make this place one of safety and belonging for people who are not the white men it was constructed for—Black people, Indigenous people, people of color; working-class and poor people; M/mad, neurodivergent, and disabled people; queer/trans, two-spirit, and gender-marginalized people—even if that means the college itself must cease to exist. In this pursuit, I have drawn from Black Feminist anthropologists and Abolitionist thinkers both inside, outside, and against the academy: Savannah Shange, Dylan Rodriguez, Sara Ahmed, Christen Smith, Marisol LeBrón, Fred Moten, Stefano Harney, Johanna Fernandez, Mumia Abu Jamal, Joy James, Viviane Saleh-Hanna, Kim Wilson, and countless others. As a white, upper-middle-class twenty-two-year-old who has been insulated in many ways from the violence of prisons and policing, I
am a student of these frameworks and aspiring accomplice of abolitionist movements overall. To the greatest extent possible I aim to de-center my own experience while remaining critically reflexive about the forms of power I hold and have access to within and beyond Haverford’s campus.

This project has been largely built within the framework of Abolitionist Anthropology proposed by Savannah Shange in *Progressive Dystopia*, a mode of critical engagement that aims to “[apprehend] the necessary conjuncture of antiblackness theory and a critical anthropology of the state” (Shange 2019, 7) and whose “practice is a mode of reparative caring that seeks to be accountable to what is unaccounted for in social reform schemes” (Shange 2019, 10). Shange’s citation of Sharpe, centering the “afterlives of slavery”, brings me to also consider a hauntological framework, thinking through how Saleh-Hannah describes “the modern-day police officer [as] haunted by, developed by, born out of his original self – the slave catcher” (Saleh-Hannah 2015). A hauntological, abolitionist framework centering anti-Blackness also brings me to incorporate Christen Smith’s understanding of the *scenario*, or “violent encounter between the police and black residents” that “make visible the ghosts of racial tension that haunt the nation” (Smith 2015, 11). These frameworks, developed by Black women theorizing within Black Feminism, generally support an understanding of policing as an extension of and fundamental pillar upholding gendered, classed (dis)abled, anti-Black state violence.

Understanding policing in this light, I largely follow the definition of policing offered by abolitionist organization Critical Resistance: that policing is “a social relationship made up of a set of practices that are empowered by the state to enforce law and social control through the use of force” and serves to reinforce “the oppressive social and economic relationships that have been central to the US throughout its history… closely linked to the capture of people escaping slavery,
and the enforcement of Black Codes” (Critical Resistance 2020). As defined by Orisanmi Burton, drawing on Dylan Rodríguez, “policing in North America is always already racialized policing… helping to produce whiteness as a subject of protection and blackness an object of regulation” (Burton 2015). Joining prior literature on campus policing, I understand police not only as the formal apparatus of federal, state, and local governments, but also as the extensions of private institutions (including universities) and practices of individuals beyond the salaried policing apparatus who use their institutionally- and state-backed power to enact social control over others (in ways that themselves reproduce the state and institutions within it)². Through this project I also aim to center the ableist and sanist implications and realities of policing on Haverford’s campus, an axis of structural violence that has been highlighted in its relationship to policing and anti-Blackness by Vilissa Thompson, Liat Ben-Moshe, and other radical disabled thinkers. Policing is critically linked to the raced, gendered, classed, and (dis)abled patterns of incarceration in this country. It is deadly, a reality that I cannot and will not engage fully in this text, but that has informed each and every step of its writing over the past four months—a period in which over 250 people have been murdered by police, many of them Black, mentally ill, disabled, unhoused; many of them children (Sinyangwe et al. 2021).

Understanding policing, prisons, and the “society that could have prisons” (Harney and Moten 2013) as fundamentally violent rather than as solutions to violence is a pillar of the abolitionist frameworks that lie at the center of this text. Abolition is, from my understanding, an expansive horizon that demands we “change everything” (Gilmore 2018; Kaba 2017): destroy these death-making systems and grow new ways of living. It is the process of creating safety—a

---

² To be clear, this definition of policing does not include what people tend to refer to as “thought policing” on campuses like Haverford, a misnomer that configures policing as the product of a disagreement or pressure for accountability rather than of structurally-produced relationships of power.
real safety, one that “comes from our ability to be able to get what we need to live dignified lives” (Kaba 2019), rather than the white supremacist idea of safety that is constituted by the maintenance of order and of white space (Burton 2015; Low 2009). Abolition is expansive—it is something I learn more about every day, and something that I will not try to attempt to “summarize” in this paper. Instead, I encourage anyone new to this vocabulary to engage the countless resources that have been produced by Black and Indigenous revolutionaries and organizers of color inside and outside the walls, some of which I cite here and some of which can be found for free, online, with just a little bit of digging.

I introduce the radical practice of abolition here in part to share a caution that has also shaped this text. Thanks to the tireless work of abolitionist organizers, revolutionaries, and scholars, most of them Black women (Mariame Kaba, Ruth Wilson Gilmore, Angela Davis, Joy James, Safiya Bukhari and so many others) the fight for abolition—or at least, its language—is growing in popularity. As a young white person who undoubtedly would not have been exposed to this work without its mainstreaming, I don’t want to criticize or separate myself from this shift; the growth of the movement has the potential to increase its capacity to topple this system. However, especially writing in an academic context, I am wary of the possibility that this paradigm-shifting framework will be liberalized, co-opted, or watered down. As someone writing in an academic setting, I am particularly cognizant of what Joy James shares about “academic abolitionism”, and how it “[airbrushes] revolutionary demands for power and community-defense into ‘non-reformist reforms’ or ‘revolutionary reforms’ (oxymorons)” (James 2020). In light of this criticism, I want to be explicit that in this project, I am not pushing to diminish or “transform” Haverford’s Department of Campus Safety—I am hoping to highlight that Haverford College as a whole and the state, social, and political contexts it occupies are antithetical to safety. Campus
Safety and campus police more generally are one microcosm of that unsafety. Abolition means no more—it does not mean rethink, reimagine, or reform. It means, to quote Savannah Shange: “quit playing and raze the stadium of settler-slaver society for good” (Shange 2019, 3).

In addition to the language of abolition, throughout this text I also draw on critical race analyses of whiteness and white space that have been developed largely through and alongside Black and woman-of-color feminisms. In particular, I take up Sara Ahmed’s phenomenology of whiteness to understand how whiteness functions and is maintained as a form of power at places like Haverford through the policing of people and space. Ahmed theorizes whiteness as a material, lived mode of being that orients white bodies in space, affecting “how they ‘take up’ space, and what they ‘can do’” (Ahmed 2007, 1). Critically to this project, Ahmed understands white space as an extension of the white body, which I take up alongside Barbara Combs’ theory of “bodies out of place” and George Lipsitz’ understandings of racialized space in my analysis of Haverford’s campus as a white space maintained through policing.

Despite a heavy historical anchor in the afterlives of slavery (Sharpe 2016), the landscape of policing at Haverford is constantly changing, and something that I am only able to scratch the surface of in this paper. When I began thinking through this project in the spring of 2020, one of my guiding questions was why there had not yet been a student movement at Haverford challenging the campus police force or engaging in the kinds of collective action being taken on by students in collectives such as Community Not Cops (at Northwestern University), Care Not Cops (at the University of Chicago), or No UCPD (in the University of California network). However, over the course of the past year, the collective Black Students Refusing Further Inaction and the organizers of the Fall 2020 student strike (including members of Black Students Refusing Further Inaction, Women of Color House, and the Black Students League) have organized around
demands including institutional commitments to police and prison abolition. The systems of policing at Haverford (which are themselves barely-delineated sections of the broader landscape of policing in this country and world) are far more expansive what I can describe here, and they are constantly shifting both through direct disruptions and institutional reforms meant to anticipate or suppress further disruptions. In the following section, I contextualize these shifts in the institutional origins of a formal campus police force at Haverford.

**White Space and the Origins of Campus Safety**

In order to understand the present-day landscape of institutional policing at Haverford, we first need to look at its history. This history is not freestanding, but rather inextricable from social and political developments around race, criminalization, and white space in the United States. In this section, I look to material in the college archives to help illustrate the origins and evolution of the body currently known as “Campus Safety”. In my approach to critical, institutional, archival research, I am indebted to my friend and peer Brittany Robinson and her research tracing the presence and erasure of Black women in Haverford’s archives (Robinson 2020). Like Brittany, I seek to attend to the silences and erasures in Haverford’s archive, particularly around race, gender, and class. In this section, I examine these silences in relation to institutional policing and engage in a reparative practice of rewriting.

*From Watchmen to Campus Safety: A Timeline of Institutional Policing at Haverford*

In the first 116 years of its existence, Haverford College did not have a formal security apparatus, or at least has left no trace of one in its archive. In 1949, for the first time a college bulletin listed a “Security Office” in its list of College Office and Building Telephones—“contact John Sherwin, located in the Infirmary Basement, ex. 1148”—a development which came during
a period of transformation for the college following the Second World War. Available evidence suggests that the office remained small (even as small as a single “watchman”) for the following ten to fifteen years. College bulletins through the 1950s continue to portray the college as occupying an idyllic suburbia, with proximity to Philadelphia offering students “the cultural opportunities of a city” while still insulating them within “a quiet suburban setting” (HC Bulletin, V51, 1952-1953).

In 1965, a security apparatus titled “watchmen” appears as an individual budget line in the college treasurers’ report for the first time (HC Reports of the President and Treasurer 1965-1966), and four years later, the first available charter for Haverford’s “Campus Security” is published (The purpose of Haverford College security department, 1968). Under the section describing Maintenance and Operations, the infant department grows rapidly; in the first five years of its existence, its budget increases by nearly 300% (from $19,880.18 in 1965-66 to $77,510.39 in 1970-71—in 2021 dollars, equivalent to a shift from 168,542.27 to 533,491.23 according to the U.S. Department of Labor Consumer Price Index).³ In this section, I ask: why did Haverford’s security infrastructure come into existence during this period, and how was its rapid expansion justified?

Looking at this early history of the department, in this section I attend to how the expansion of Campus Safety and Security at Haverford occurs alongside an increasing number of Black and lower-income residents in Ardmore and an increasing number of Black students at the college. I trace these developments and their connections to college administrators’ ideas of safety and

³ I have been unable to access detailed, annual budgetary breakdowns for the department in the intervening decades, and for this reason this section does not otherwise focus on financial histories and allocation of resources to the department. However, according to the Comptroller’s office, the allocation for Campus Safety totaled approximately 2% of the college’s overall annual budget (107 million dollars) at the end of fiscal year 2020.
security by tracing explicit and coded language in the college’s descriptions of the Ardmore Coalition and Black students’ political mobilizations. Drawing on material produced by Campus Security between 1969 and 1981, I examine how the college did not respond to but rather constructed a threat of “crime” on-campus in the 1970s and 1980s, portraying itself as a protector while creating a responsibility for individual vigilance by (white) students, staff, and faculty. Far from being a process solely enacted by Campus Safety or at the level of Haverford as an institution, this shift towards racialized criminalization and threat-production is inextricably linked to the shifting landscape of racial capitalism in the late 1960s and 1970s.

Black Resistance, White Space: The Ardmore Coalition and Black Students’ Organizing

Haverford’s Department of Safety and Security emerged during a period of social and political transformation in this country—transformation that was by no means separate from shifts on and around Haverford’s campus itself. The rapid expansion of Campus Safety at Haverford cannot be separated from the expansion of the carceral state in response to Black radical and anti-war political mobilizations during the 1960s and 1970s. Mumia Abu-Jamal and Johanna Fernández describe the expansion of incarceration during this period as an “attempt by the state to restore social control” following uprisings that had disrupted its power (Abu-Jamal and Fernández 2014, 8). Though at a smaller scale, and one more heavily steeped in white liberal rhetoric of “good intentions”, I argue that Haverford College was making the same move—seeking to restore white “social control” over the space of the campus in response to Black-led political mobilizations in Ardmore and on-campus through campus policing. Here, I look at two distinct but interrelated histories of Black resistance to the white space of Haverford during this time: the organizing of the Ardmore Coalition, and the organizing of the Black Students’ League. I discuss how these political mobilizations are inseparable from one another, or from the racialized narratives of fear
and criminalization that the college administration and infant Campus Safety and Security
department deployed against young Black people in Ardmore during this period.

In 1969, Black residents of South Ardmore organized a participatory planning project for
community improvement in South Ardmore. The plan, produced through a grassroots effort
challenging the imposition of community development plans by (white) authorities and seeking an
“appropriate shift in the balance of power” (Ardmore Coalition 1969, 2), detailed several areas of
concern around housing, public services, utilities, open space, and more. In the authors’ words:

“The plan for the South Ardmore community is a plan by and for the black community. It
is concerned with people, homes and community, rather than commercial renewal for
central Ardmore. The uniqueness of the planning effort is that it focuses on the unmet needs
of the black community and is conceived and developed with the full participation of local
citizens.” (The Ardmore Coalition, “Preliminary Plan for Housing and Community
Improvement in the South Ardmore Community, 1969, p. 1)

The organizing of the Ardmore Coalition was far-reaching, and for the most part lies outside the
scope of this thesis. What I speak to here is a small fraction of their work, specifically a proposal
to Haverford College shared in October 1979 asking the college to participate in “a joint housing
development project” with the South Ardmore Community by making land available for “joint
Haverford and community use” through housing for low- and moderate-income families. This
proposal was ultimately rejected by the college, which instead moved in the opposite direction to
purchase and privatize available local rental housing, the Haverford Park Apartments—now
known as the Haverford College Apartments—for student housing in 1975. In demanding the use

4 The history of the Ardmore Coalition and of Black, grassroots political and social mobilization in South Ardmore
more generally is something that I only learned about this year, my fourth year as a student, while doing archival
research for this project (with the help of college archivist Elizabeth Jones-Minsinger). Based on conversations with
my peers as well as Reverend Carolyn Cavaness, this history is not common knowledge within the student-body,
despite its extreme relevance in ongoing conversations around college-sponsored gentrification and displacement of
low-income Black people in the Philadelphia area. More work following the lead and centering the voices of Black
Ardmore residents who participated in or remember this organizing is urgent.
of college land to support and house low- and middle-income Black families in Ardmore, the Ardmore Coalition challenged the college’s existence as a white space and threatened the perception of the campus as a place of white innocence disconnected from a wider political terrain.

The threat to the college’s white space posed by the Ardmore Coalition occurred alongside an internal threat to that hegemonic space which came in the form of increasing numbers of Black students, who through political action challenged the operating dynamics of white supremacy at Haverford. In the college’s Annual Report from 1969, then-college president John Coleman describes these transformations in the student body:

We have more students with more varied backgrounds and more activism in their past and present and more demanding expectations of what a good college should be. They came here to ask more questions in more courses under more faculty. They found time to pull the college deeper into the community, more time to prod the faculty, the administration, and themselves, and, of course, more time to grow more hair… You will note too that more of our students are black. In the class of 1971 less than 1% of the students were black. Last year the freshman class had 10% who were black. The current freshman class has 14%. This college is not committed to any quota at all.” (Coleman, Haverford College Annual Report 1969, p. A1-A5)

Though Coleman does not write of these transformations negatively, throughout the letter he appears to be on the defensive—seeking to minimize the political implications of these social transformations and making clear through that defensiveness that white Haverford is resistant to these changes. In mentioning that the college does not have a quota for Black students, Coleman makes clear to us that at the time, white students, faculty, and/or other administrators within the college were resisting Haverford’s shift away from its long existence as an exclusively white institution. In specifying that students were taking “more time to prod” faculty, administrators, and one-another, he illuminates a sense that the shape of Haverford itself as a white men’s college is literally being upset, poked, and “prodded”, and that these shifts are worthy of a significant amount
of space in his report. White students, administrators, and faculty at Haverford—despite being politically progressive enough to protest the Vietnam War, challenge the compulsory draft, and support the Civil Rights Movement (King 2017)—remained strongly resistant to transformation of the institution they themselves occupied.

Throughout the 1970s, Black students at Haverford mobilized, disrupting systems of white supremacy at Haverford through ongoing resistance and campus-wide mass-protests⁵. One of the earlier records of this mobilization in the college archive is from May 1971, when the Black Students’ League authored a letter to the college’s Board of Managers naming and challenging formations of systematized racism within the college. From the discriminatory treatment of Black staff-members and other staff-members of color by college administrators to Students’ Council labeling of the Black Students League as “black separatists and black racists” (Black Students League Letter to the Board of Managers 1971, 3) in response to their budgetary proposals, the letter illustrates the pervasiveness of anti-Blackness at the college and upsets the common reading of the institution as radically progressive during this period (King 2017). Critically, the students who authored this letter also made a connection between their own marginalization within the college and the marginalization of Black communities in Ardmore, asking readers to “look back towards the east” to find “an overcrowded deteriorating black community strangled between the burgeoning affluence of the main line estates and the open grassy expanses of an academic country club” (Black Students League, Letter to the Board, 1971). This connection is critical because it

---

⁵ Nearly fifty years later, these mobilizations have been honored and uplifted by the collective Black Students Refusing Further Inaction and the Black, Indigenous, and People of Color organizers of the 2020 Student Strike. I do not by any means wish to suggest that resistance by students of color on Haverford’s campus is isolated to the 1970s—however, I focus on this period because of how I argue that these mobilizations were formative to the emergence of a police apparatus at the college.
expresses the foundations of solidarity, or at the very least theoretical connection, between Black students on Haverford’s campus and Black people in Ardmore—both of whom the college saw as a threat to its existence as a white space.

The archives detailing the college’s response to these mobilizations in 1969 and 1970 come through the correspondences of the Community Concerns Committee, a committee of rotating faculty-members convened throughout the Fall 1969 and Spring 1970 semesters. In the meeting minutes, printed copies of emails, and handwritten memos included in the committee’s archive, there are no explicit connections made between Black Students’ organizing and the Ardmore Coalition’s demands, or even overtly negative reactions to them. Instead, faculty and administrators are eager to defend their liberal values and sensibilities in responding to the Coalition’s demands, emphasizing the need for the college to be a “good neighbor” to Black communities in Ardmore, while evading responsibility for the college’s hoarded wealth and denying the possibility of material change. In his letter to then-president John Coleman, sociology professor Paul Hare writes:

“The College wants to be a good neighbor. I personally accept the rationale for trying to improve housing in Ardmore’s black community so that a young, vital community may be kept alive and well… But I don’t want to raise any false hopes—and specifically I don’t want to be a party to creating any belief that this College has the resources, in land, or money, or personnel, to make any big dent in Ardmore’s housing problems.” (Hare to Coleman, August 13, 1969, Community Concerns Committee Archives p. 9)

While seeking to uphold the college as an innocent, humanized “neighbor”, and sharing verbal support for the “young” and “vital” Black community in Ardmore, Hare minimizes the college’s capacity to address Ardmore’s housing problem (even though the proposal offered by the Coalition was explicitly designed to be at no- or limited cost to the college). Using a scarcity narrative that
current students know well, Hare denies responsibility for the college’s hoarded wealth, blaming inaction on a lack of resources rather than a self-serving set of institutional priorities.

However, another thread is woven through the Community Concerns Committee archives that upsets the well-meaning platitudes of committee-members and affiliates: a discussion of the threat posed to campus safety and security by “young vandals [and] mischief-makers” (Report of the Community Relations Committee, January 20, 1969). Though never explicitly racially labeled, these young people are specifically linked to the College Lane Duckpond area—a section of campus labeled “prone to vandalism” and in need of an especially strong security presence. However, in the 1960s, 70s, and 80s, the College Lane Duckpond area, or the East section of the campus, bordered a lower-income Black neighborhood in Ardmore (which has since been partially gentrified). Its deployment as a geography to mask the overtly racist implications of certain “security concerns” is a theme that continues through the 1980s and beyond.

_Constructing a Racialized, Spatialized Threat_

In April 1986, three external consultants invited by Haverford’s administration conducted an evaluation of “Safety and Security” at Haverford College. The consultants interviewed “students, College Administrators, Safety and Security personnel, local neighboring law enforcement officials, and faculty of Haverford College” (MacNutt 1986, 1) to produce a series of recommendations and observations, which to date comprise perhaps the most comprehensive review of Campus Safety and Security practices at Haverford available in the public archive. The report contained only one explicit mention of race: that “the visiting committee noted no problems in the area of inter-racial relations among members of the college community” (MacNutt 1986, 3). Serving to normalize whiteness and framing “inter-racial relations” as something potentially
negative ("no problems"), this sentence was and is consistent with the majority of the public archive around Haverford’s Campus Safety operations, which unilaterally avoid discussions of race in their descriptions of individuals or institutional protocol. However, language around “desirability” or “undesirability” and “respectful” comportment, as well as neighborhood identification, served as a coded signifier of race (non-whiteness) and class status.

Perhaps the most concise and clearly coded racialized language in this document is found in its third recommendation: for Campus Safety to increase “attention to anxiety levels heightened by encroachment of disrespectful members of the outside community, especially on the east side of the campus near the Duck Pond” (MacNutt 1986, 2). This single sentence reveals a number of crucial insights into institutional priorities and perspectives around the policing of campus space. As illustrated by maps of the area and census information from the 1960s, 70s, and 80s, the “east side of the campus near the Duck Pond” was, through that time period, home to communities which were significantly less wealthy and less white than the college or its other neighbors (Appendix B). In this recommendation, authors first validate racialized anxieties shared by presumably white students and faculty, citing those anxieties as justification for increased “attention” or securitization by campus police and administrators. With the language of “encroachment”, they reveal an understanding of Haverford’s campus as a bounded space under threat of being intruded on by people who do not follow the institution’s standards of “respectful” (white) comportment. Based on the context of their recommendations, they also tie “members of the outside community”, specifically those who behave in “disrespectful” ways, to safety—in other words, “safety” comes to mean white comfort.

In the context of the United States, any analysis of power as it relates to land and space must be rooted in an understanding of the colonial genocide enacted by European settler-slavers.
This violence is the foundation of any politics of space in this country, and one that has been erased and naturalized in the white, Western anthropological canon (Simpson 2018). Haverford College occupies land that for more than ten thousand years was lived on and cared for by the Lenni Lenape people, who were violently displaced by Quaker settlers including William Penn and his heirs (Haverford Township Historical Society, 2013). While exploring the dynamics of power animating the space of Haverford’s campus, it is necessary to foreground how the concerns of predominantly white and non-indigenous administrators, students, faculty, and campus police around “belonging” and “safety” are predicated on an assumption that the college itself belongs here and has the requisite authority to determine who else is allowed to pass through the land and how. This assumption represents what Lipsitz refers to as the “white spatial imaginary”, which “pursues the ideal of pure and homogeneous space through exclusiveness, exclusivity, and homogeneity”, and where legal ownership of space through contracts and deeds are “supreme authorities” (Lipsitz 2007, 14). On Haverford’s campus, this imaginary and the associated “safety” of the white elite in spaces they “own” has always been directly at odds with the safety of Indigenous people, as well as the safety of Black people who have lived in the region known as the “Main Line” since the Great Migration (Bailey 2020).

In “Phenomenology of Whiteness”, Sara Ahmed discusses whiteness as a material, lived mode of being that orients white bodies in space, affecting “how they ‘take up’ space, and what they ‘can do’” (Ahmed 2007, 1). In particular, her analysis of how whiteness functions to make space an extension of the white body is relevant to this section. I see this framework as in conversation with Harris’s analysis of whiteness as property (Harris 1993), specifically as one that makes clear the mechanisms connecting whiteness, embodiment, and space. In the context of the white, college campus—specifically a space understood by its white members as one under threat
or risk of “encroachment”, as described by MacNutt—Ahmed’s analysis re-frames the “anxiety” discussed by white students and faculty about non-white outsiders on campus as a response to their discomfort of having a space they are used to invisibly extending their white bodies being compromised. The “encroachment” of the white campus space becomes conflated with violation of the white body itself, not merely something it “owns” (whiteness as property), hence the connection to unsafety or bodily threat that leads this anxiety to be centered in a report on campus safety and security.

In addition to Ahmed’s framework, Combs’ framework of “Bodies Out of Place” also helps us understand the historical roots of how and why the low-income Black people implicitly referred to in this report come to be simultaneously and instinctively labeled as “disrespectful” and “outsiders”. As Combs identifies, ideologies of “who belongs where and with whom” are deeply embedded in every aspect of this country’s history, and white people in particular are finely tuned to respond to disruption with fear and violence (either with their own hands or the hands of police). The underlying process of identification can be effectively explained through Feldman’s framework of “telling”, where based on signifiers such as skin color, affect, and dress, people “[reattach] the spatial mobile body to a homogenous social field as a mobile part”. In other words, the people referred to as “disrespectful members of the outside community” are understood as mobile parts of the neighborhood “east… of the campus near the Duck Pond” and consequently “out of place”. Combs traces five typologies of responses and justifications for the white reaction to “bodies out of place”, however, all of them overlap in their impulse “to push those black bodies back into place—a place of subservience to whites” (Combs 2018, 51).
An understanding of racialized “outsiders” as subservient, and a desire to put their “bodies back into place”, by Haverford administrators, campus safety officers, and the consultants, is revealed in the following passage from the 1986 evaluation:

As far as the encroachment by “undesired” elements is concerned, selective enforcement of the Trespass statutes supported with appropriate signage and the use of “Trespass Notice” and record keeping may go a long way to stabilize this situation without having to resort to exclusion of all neighbors of the campus. If this fails consideration should be given to physical barriers such as perimeter fences and lockable gates (MacNutt 1986, 7)

In the context of power that is a wealthy, elite, white college, perimeter fences and lockable gates—physical, exclusive barriers meant to exclude some but not all “neighbors of the campus”—clearly mark a recognized superiority of those attached to the institution inside, and desire for separation from the local communities nearby, especially those who through their very being challenge the whiteness of the campus space. This assertion of superiority is again justified through the conflation of “outsiders” with unsafety, despite a total lack of evidence that the presence of these “undesired’ elements” is in any way actually posing a physical threat to “constituents” wellbeing.

Though distinct from the organized resistance posed by the Ardmore Coalition and the Black Students League at the end of the 1970s, the petty theft and vandalism enacted by lower-income, Black Ardmore residents during this period are also a form of resistance inseparable from the former. These mobilizations were connected in their shared challenge to the hoarding of college resources and the maintenance of Haverford’s campus as a white space. If we place this connected resistance at the center of our understanding of the college’s social and political environment at the end of the 1960s, it becomes clear that the development of Campus Security during this period was not coincidental, but a calculated response to the disruption of Haverford’s campus as an
unchallenged white space. This context—that Haverford’s current Campus Safety Department emerged in response to Black-led resistance to the college’s hoarding of resources and white space, in both formal and informal contexts—informs how we understand the dual construction of vulnerability and invulnerability that I interrogate in the following section.

**Carceral Protectionism and Constructing In/Vulnerability**

*Policing for the Policeman’s Children*

An older white man wearing glasses and a blue-striped-button-down shirt sits in front of a shuttered window and a beige wall. We are speaking through a computer screen. It is early January, and the just-retired executive director of Haverford’s Campus Safety Department has agreed to meet with me to share his experiences and perspectives on the department. We speak for around ninety minutes—having been at Haverford for over twenty years (following a career as a detective in the Philadelphia Police Department) he had a lot to share.

Of the stories shared through this interview, one in particular was formative to my understanding of the fundamental paradigms of campus policing: the structure of vulnerability and invulnerability that necessitates a specialized, spatialized form of policing on college campuses like Haverford’s. This story as it was relayed to me took place at some point in the early 2000s and centers an interaction between Haverford’s director of Campus Safety (my interlocutor) and a Pennsylvania state police chief, in which the former tries to convince the police chief to collaborate with the college’s (comparatively) relaxed approach to students’ use of alcohol and drugs, which includes no citations or institutional penalties for underage students drinking. The dialogue was shared as follows:
I said, “Well, let me ask you this, where'd you go to school?” And he said, “Oh, I want to Lafayette.” I said, “Did you drink?” He said, “Yeah, I was on the lacrosse team.” I said, “Oh, well, then, of course you drank.” And I said, “What would happen if you got really drunk?” He said, “they probably put me to bed, give me some water or whatever.” Then I said, “Well, do you have kids?” He goes, “I have two sons”, one was at the University of Pennsylvania and the other one was at Lafayette. I said, “Well, what's, you know, what’s their philosophy [on alcohol]?” And at the time, they had a sort of zero tolerance alcohol policy. And I said, “Well, do they drink?” And he said “Yeah, they play lacrosse too, so they probably do, I’m sure they do.” And I said, “Well, where would you rather them go? What kind of environment which is be more comfortable with—having a place where they could comfortably call Campus Safety for help or not?” And I’ve never seen it in forty-some years of being in this business, on a dime he says, “You’re right. How can we help you?” (Interview 1)

This story was presented to me as a moment of professional success, one in which a specific tactic of appeal—invo
ing the officer’s status as a parent—shifts their perspective enough to make collaboration possible. It was also deployed to help separate Haverford’s Campus Safety department from the state police, an institution that both members of the department who I spoke with were careful to separate themselves from. However, I first want to attend to why my interlocutor chose this tactic of appealing to the state police chief’s desires as a parent, and the significance of the police chief’s response to it.

By the end of this conversation, my interlocutor has effectively led the police chief he is speaking with to the conclusion that when operating in a “zero-tolerance” and punishment-oriented capacity towards rule-breaking—in other words, the foundational logic of state policing—campus safety infrastructures are an unsafe and ineffective resource for addressing conditions of harm. In other words: two police officers agree on the conclusion that, in this context, policing does not keep people safe. However, this conclusion only becomes relevant to the police chief in the context of his own children—white, male, middle- or upper-class college students. In this moment, a separation becomes clear between how the police chief understands what his children should have access to and what he believes should be available to the rest of society. This conversation, after
all, does not culminate in either person involved quitting their jobs—rather, it places the university in a separate, gentler space, one fit for their children.

Within the white liberal imaginary, as Dylan Rodríguez describes it, the predominantly-white university is positioned as a place of “presumed innocence”, with this presumed innocence extending to those who inhabit it (Rodríguez 2012). In this interaction, not only are the police officers’ white, male, lacrosse-playing sons positioned as innocent, but they are invoked as children. The understanding of college-student relationships as similar to a parent-child relationship is not a new one. From the legal framework of “in loco parentis” (“In place of the parent”, through which universities take on certain responsibilities and authorities over their students which are analogous to the responsibilities and authorities a parent has to a child) to the description of state police understanding Haverford through the lens of “Cool Parent Syndrome,” (Sweeney, Minutes for April 16, 2010 meeting), the conversation described here does not break any new ground. However, the positioning of white college students as innocent children, deserving of protection and a gentler form of policing than the standard, is significant in what it tells us about why campus policing exists and how it operates.

SM Rodriguez, Liat Ben-Moshe, and H. Rakes define the framework of carceral protectionism as a form of carceral feminism, in which “‘innocent’ women and children are constructed as deserving protection from the invulnerable, threatening other. Those othered are “disproportionately funneled into corrections (through psychiatrization, jails and prisons), incapacitation, or early death.” (Rodriguez et al 2020, 538). These two categories are unequivocally racialized, with those constructed as needing protection specifically being “white, non-immigrant, economically secure, cisgender, straight, abled” women and their children, and those constructed as threatening or invulnerable being their opposite (non-white, immigrant, poor,
trans, queer, and/or disabled). Though this framework is developed in the context of criminalization in the United States more broadly, it is relevant to my argument here because it allows us to understand that the construction of white (especially cis, male, and nondisabled) college students as innocent and vulnerable children relies on the construction of an “invulnerable other” (Black and Indigenous people and non-Black people of color; poor people; trans people; and disabled/mentally-ill people). In other words, I argue that campus policing at Haverford is predicated on the dual construction of a vulnerable, innocent, white subject (the archetypal nondisabled white cis male Haverford student) and a invulnerable, dis-innocent, non-white “outsider” (a Black, Brown, disabled/mentally ill, low-income, trans person). As Orisanmi Burton puts it, policing helps to “produce whiteness as a subject of protection and blackness an object of regulation” (Burton 2015). The former subject is who needs protection; the latter subject is who is needed protection from.

Carceral protectionism allows us to better understand the dynamics of Haverford’s campus as a space of “white innocence”, and how campus policing exists to preserve that space. It also allows us to better understand the tensions and contradictions inherent to institutional policing on this campus. One of these tensions arises from the assertion by members of Haverford’s department of Campus Safety (which, as I learned from the survey, is taken up by many students, staff, and faculty-members) that they are not police—an assertion contradicted by their structure, modes of operation, and their impacts.

*The Borderlands of In/Vulnerability*

This tension comes to the surface through another story shared during my interview with Haverford’s former executive director of Campus Safety, about a modification to Campus Safety’s
uniforms and a conversation with a female student of color in the early 2010s. Reflecting on the visual similarity between the uniforms of the Bryn Mawr Campus Safety Department officers (Bryn Mawr being Haverford’s sister school—another private, predominantly-white liberal arts college in the Philadelphia suburbs) and the officers from the Lower Merion Police Department (one of the township police departments overlapping with Haverford and Bryn Mawr’s campuses, also known as the LMPD) and his experience trying to convince a student that they were not, in fact, the same institution, he said:

I remember seeing a couple of the Bryn Mawr officers standing around a couple of the Lower Merion officers, and from a distance I couldn't tell them apart. They were both wearing boots. They were wearing boots and cargo pants. And I mean, you know, with uniforms—shirts with epaulettes and a badge. And it's just… I mean, I knew the difference, but it struck me that somebody casually looking [might not know,] that includes students not knowing. I remember speaking with a student a few years back who said… well, you know, just again one of these many opportunities we used to create to have conversations with students… saying, “Well, you know, I'm new here, and every time I see one of the little white trucks, I hide.” And I said, “Well, why is that?” And she said, “Well, um, I came from a small town in Alabama and the police were… we were afraid of the police. As a person of color, I was afraid of the police.” I said, “Well, you know, we're not the police” and all that, and she didn't know that, and it's like it just struck me that I'm not doing nearly good enough a job making sure that students, whether they're new students or not, have a clear understanding of what we are, who we are and what we're not. Now, after I said, “Have you ever had a bad experience with campus safety?” She said “absolutely not, nothing but good experiences”… So the uniforms is just one of the examples that kind of help separate us from the police. And not, again, not to say that we don't like the police or whatever. We want to make sure that students clearly understand who we are, what we're about and what we do and how we do it. (Interview 1)

The story opens with a discussion of uniforms—a topic that came up several times in conversations with the two Campus Safety officials I spoke to during the course of my research. Specifically, a concern is raised about how the similarities between the Campus Safety officers’ uniforms (at the time known as “Public Safety”) and township police departments’ uniforms are misleading to students because they threaten to conflate the two. The old uniforms, as the other Campus Safety staff-member put it, were “too police-y”. This concern speaks to an understanding
of Campus Safety held by its members and administrators as constituting a softer, *gentler* form of policing, fit for subjects perceived as vulnerable and innocent—like the police chief’s white, lacrosse-playing sons identified in the prior ethnographic story. In this vein, several members of Haverford’s administrative staff have reminded me to define Campus Safety *not* as a police force: “just to be clear, Campus Safety is not police, they’re just there to keep everyone safe”, as one person put it. Despite the implication here, that the police then do *not* keep everyone safe, my interlocutor and Haverford’s administrators more generally always move to clarify that they do like the police (or at least, not *not* like the police). What does this simultaneous distancing and disavowal of dissent—*we are not the police, we are better... but we like the police*—tell us about Campus Safety at Haverford?

There are significant differences between Campus Safety and state police forces—Campus Safety officers are not sworn and they do not carry guns. According to one of my interlocutors, they have been ahead of the curve on nearly every reform of college policing for the past several decades—the “Training” section of their website lists the many workshops on “fair and impartial policing” and “exploring unconscious bias” which the department has participated in. And yet, according to profiles listed on its website, nearly half of Haverford’s current Campus Safety officers have a background in state law enforcement (including police departments in and around Philadelphia as well as the United States military), and Act 120 (Police Academy Training) and Act 235 (the Lethal Weapons Training Program) trainings are “preferred” qualifications listed in job postings for the department. Campus Safety officers routinely call for Lower Merion police to come to campus, often culminating in the arrests of passers-by (as recorded in weekly Safety Briefings in the college newspaper, the Haverford Clerk). This is same Lower Merion police department that murdered a young Black person, 26-year-old Erin Forbes, in 2015 and is
notoriously anti-Black (Jones 2015). There is nothing “gentle” about this policing—it is deadly. Haverford’s Campus Safety are about as “reformed” as a private police force can get in this country, and yet they enact and condone anti-Black violence because no reform can change the fact that they are police.

The defensiveness around my characterization of Campus Safety as a policing structure reflects, again, a white liberal understanding of Haverford’s campus and its historical inhabitants (white men) as “innocent”, as well as knowledge that the “innocence” of the campus space relies on forces of state violence which are understood as external. In other words, these objections say “we don’t want the violent force of police for us (the vulnerable and innocent white student, staff, and faculty on-campus); we need it for them (the non-white, invulnerable “undesired elements”, as named in the prior section, who are perceived to threaten the campus). This rhetoric mirrors what was deployed by College President Wendy Raymond in response to Black and Brown students’ demands during the 2020 Student Strike that the Department of Campus Safety sever ties with the Lower Merion Police Department—saying in a town hall meeting that those relationships needed to be in place in the event of a school shooter coming to campus. Recognizing the reality that, as offered by one of the strike-leaders, Black students are significantly more likely to be killed by a police officer than in a school shooting\(^6\), this argument is not based in real assessments of

---

\(^6\) In any given year between 2001 and 2016 there were 16.3 million students, on average, in 2- and 4-year degree programs in the United States (Digest of Education Statistics 2019, Table 303.70). Conservatively assuming that this population turned over once every 5 years on average for both 2- and 4-year programs, we can assume that there were at least 48.9 million college students (16.3 million x (15years/5)) between 2001 and 2016. There were 167 college-affiliated people (students, staff, faculty, and campus visitors) killed in campus shootings between 2001-02 and 2015-16 (Citizens Crime Commission New York City, 2016). The risk of death by school shooting for a college student during this period is therefore, very conservatively, 1 in 300,000 (the actual risk is likely significantly lower considering that the Citizens Crime Commission includes non-students in its calculation, and that my turnover estimate is relatively conservative). By comparison, 1 in 1,000 (96 per 100,000) Black men and boys will be killed by a police officer over their lifetimes; and between 1 in 18,500 and 1 in 41,700 (2.4-5.4 per 100,000) Black women and girls will be killed by police officers over their lifetimes (Edwards, Lee, and Esposito 2019). In other words, Black people are at the very least 6- to 300-times more likely to be killed by a police officer than in a college campus school shooting. For people of all races, the risk of death by police is still significantly higher than the risk of death by campus
threats, but rather a series of assumptions: that violence and harm come from the invulnerable and dis-innocent space outside the white campus; that police officers themselves are not agents of harm; and that in order to survive, the white campus must be protected by the violence of policing.

This is the context in which I locate the hesitance and fear shared by the student in this interaction—a woman of color from Alabama. Recognizing that this student was not named nor able to share her perspective on this story, and wary over-interpreting her words as shared second-hand, I understand what this student recounts in the story not as a misunderstanding but a critical and accurate assessment of Campus Safety’s role and lineage on Haverford and Bryn Mawr’s campuses. Based on prior interactions with the police in her hometown, I argue that this student understands that there is no such thing as gentle policing—that policing in any form serves to “protect and serve whiteness” (Burton 2015) and therefore poses a danger to her as a woman of color.

While my interlocutor recounts trying to convince this student that Campus Safety is not the police and therefore not a threat and that she should take her lack of directly negative experiences with the department as a way to dismiss her fear, in doing so he is ignoring the significance of her initial reaction, and the significance of Campus Safety’s similarities to the local police force. Rather than hear her experience as a testimony to how police do not, cannot, and will not ever provide her with safety, he gaslights her by insinuating that her fear is an irrational response and the product of a misunderstanding rather than something which accurately reflects

shooting: the rate of police killings is about 1 in 2000 (52 per 100,000) for men and boys and about 1 in 33,300 (3 in 100,000) women and girls (Edwards, Lee, and Esposito 2019).

7 The terminology of “gaslighting” has become increasingly common in a variety of contexts beyond the one of intimate partner violence for which it was developed. I am using it here to describe a tool of oppression that uses manipulation to make marginalized people “doubt their reality for the benefit of their perpetrators” (Jagoo 2020).
her experiences of policing and his department’s relationship to white supremacy. By seeking to explain away her reaction rather than engaging it as legitimate, he fails to see the obvious and critical conclusion that Campus Safety’s presence does not create safety, but rather helps produce conditions of unsafety for students of color—and gender-marginalized students of color especially—on the campus. Her reaction is not the product of a misunderstanding; it is an expression of clear understanding that even “gentler” forms of policing do not extend reliably to her, or to other students who are routinely surveilled and coded as “out of place” on the white campus.

The student’s reaction here begins to show the fraught boundaries around in/vulnerability in the context of campus security. While my interlocutor, the Campus Safety director, is trying to convince the student that she falls into the category of vulnerability and therefore is protected from and by the force of policing, she understands that this is not true; or that it is only true as far as she can assimilate into the category of white innocence that is the “smooth surface” of the campus space (Ahmed 2007). Regardless of not having personally had negative experiences with the department, she knows from the shared uniforms and modes of operation that—regardless of what my interlocutor tells her—this is not an institution that exists to keep her safe. She occupies a borderland of in/vulnerability—where as a student she is theoretically a member of the protected vulnerable, but as a woman of color, she is “precariously situated” (borrowing the language of the Black Students’ League in 1972) on the white campus. The misnaming of her fear as misunderstanding rather than as a reflection of reality informed by generational knowledge and lived experience is critical to the maintenance of Campus Safety’s self-understanding as a gentle, softer, progressive form of policing.
In/Vulnerability, Sanism, and the Wellness Check

The boundaries of vulnerability and invulnerability are further revealed through the phenomenon of the wellness check—the carceral response to individual mental health or medical crises (as well as any behaviors or ways of being which are perceived to constitute crisis or a threat by bystanders) that involves state or institutional, most frequently one tied to punitive systems, intervention. Again drawing on the theory of Carceral Protectionism, I argue that the wellness check illustrates the liminal space between vulnerability and invulnerability, showing how people can move between these categories based on their perceived acquiescence to the white space itself.

Having spoken mainly about the axis of race as it relates to policing and white space, in this section I incorporate the transformative but fundamentally co-constructed concept of disability, specifically as it relates to perceived or lived mental unwellness. Returning to Sylvia Wynter’s “Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom”, the “Western bourgeois conception of the human” underlying the white, Western state and university relies in part on the concept of “rationality” (Wynter 2003, 266), which is structured in opposition to the “irrational/subrational Human Other” of Black and Indigenous people by white settler-slavers. To be irrational—neurodivergent, in crisis, psychotic—is therefore to exit or be further estranged from the category of Man. In the context of Carceral Protectionism, I argue that the “wellness check” on Haverford’s campus represents the transition from vulnerable innocence to invulnerable threat.

---

8 At the forefront of my mind writing this section are Scout Schultz, Dallas Punja, and Kirby Jackson, three trans students who were killed directly and indirectly by campus police at Georgia Tech in 2017 and 2018 during and shortly following a “wellness check” (Lieberman 2018). While, as I discuss in the conclusion of this paper, many may see the rage towards campus police by gender- and/or racially-marginalized m/Mad, disabled, mentally ill, and neurodivergent people as a form of “navel gazing” or indulgent outrage, our rage and terror is founded in a reality that campus policing—like all policing—is death-making. May Scout, Dallas, and Kirby rest in vibrance, peace, and power.
that occurs for students experiencing or perceived to be experiencing “irrationality/subrationality” through mental and emotional crisis. Though the concept of irrationality and its deployment is fundamentally connected to constructions of race, as Wynter illustrates, in this section I also want to recognize that students of all racial backgrounds are harmed by the carceral “wellness check”, though that harm is transformed by racial and ethnic background.

Understanding policing as raced, gendered, ableist violence, it becomes clear that not only does the presence of the “wellness check” fail to address the situation it seeks to “solve”, but it also actively exacerbates the situation it purports to address. Framing the “wellness check” as violence under the guise of care is both a theoretical move and one that reflects the deadly reality of carceral approaches to crisis (or perceived crisis) in this country, particularly for Black and Brown people. Atatiana Jefferson, Sandy Guardiola, Kenneth Chamberlain Sr., Valente Acosta-Bustillos, James Howard Allen, Douglas Harris, Travis Jordan, and Denis Reyes, are among those who have been murdered by police officers carrying out wellness or welfare checks in this country over the past decade (Hall 2020; Lennard 2020). All of them were Black and/or Latinx. Most died in their own homes. Their deaths make clear that even the most purportedly benign (or even “protective”) encounters with police, for Black and Brown people especially, remain violent scenarios that Smith describes as “[making] visible the ghosts of racial tension that haunt the nation” (Smith 2016, 11).

The carceral wellness check is founded on an understanding of people in crisis (or mad/disabled people, people of color and Black people especially, who are read as “different” or “out of place”) as problems to be solved—urgent threats to themselves or others. In this section, I again turn to the Mad/crip queer of color critique of carceral protectionism offered by S. M. Rodriguez, Liat Ben-Moshe, and H. Rakes to frame the accounts of wellness checks shared with
me during this project, and to engage the constructions of in/vulnerability and innocence/non-innocence more broadly within the institution of Campus Safety. As they describe it:

Within a carceral protectionist framework, perpetual in/vulnerability is relationally applied. It is racially constructed, related to pathologization (queerness/disability/madness) and deployed through criminalization. Carceral protectionism is about discourses of protecting “the innocent” from “dangerous” bodyminds and also protecting people from their own danger and for their own good (including medication, psychiatrization and placing in custody), which then manifests in what Ben-Moshe (2020) calls carceral sanism/ableism. (Rodriguez, Ben-Moshe, and Rakes 2020, 546)

Though Rodriguez, Ben-Moshe, and Rakes follow the legacy of carceral feminism to specify women and children as those who are seen as deserving protection, as I elaborate in the last section, I believe their analysis extends to include white, nondisabled, “rational” college students, who occupy what Dylan Rodríguez describes as a place of “presumed innocence” (Rodríguez 2012) in liberal imaginings of personhood. Such students are imagined as perpetually vulnerable and deserving of protection from another who is invulnerable and, by extension, less-than-human.

The accounts of wellness checks shared with me through this project—as well as those I have learned about in greater detail from friends and acquaintances, which will not be included here—range from relatively benign to profoundly traumatic. However, I argue that each of them illustrates that locations of vulnerable and invulnerable (protected self vs. threatening other) are fluid, especially as they relate to ableism sanism (systems of pathologization which, as Rodriguez, Ben-Moshe, and Rakes remind us, as does Wynter, are inseparable from racialized criminalization). Existing outside the bounds of white, Western rationality—in moments of crisis; flashbacks; psychosis; drug/alcohol overdose; and more—places one in a position of being at once a threat and (theoretically) an object of protection; at once, human and less-than-human. In a
variety of contexts, people who shared accounts of witnessed and lived wellness checks during the survey described how this space—particularly, the total loss of agency—exacerbated the conditions of crisis. Furthermore, for individuals’ peer support networks, the threat of carceral “protection” is isolating, compromising routes to external resources and contributing to community-level exhaustion/trauma.

The first account of the wellness check I wish to engage was shared by an Asian nonbinary student through the anonymous survey, who described the following encounter:

Once, while on campus, I received messages from a younger relation who expressed distress and fear because of treatment from adults at home. I was alarmed and wanted to help, but I did not want to call my hometown’s police. So I did not know what to do. Some students found me walking distressedly about campus, and (without my telling them details) decided to try to connect me with CAPS-on-call [the overnight hotline for Counselling and Psychological Services], and the Campus Safety person apparently requested that I go inside their office since I happened to be physically nearby the Campus Safety location. I ended up describing the basics of the home situation to the Campus Safety officer, who was being “friendly” and asking me “what’s wrong?”, before they connected me with CAPS-on-call. The CAPS counselor was helpful in calming me down and helping me to strategize about what I should do; they seemed to understand my concern about involving the police or certain other “authorities”. While I spoke with the counselor though, the Campus Safety officer decided to call the police in my hometown (in my distress, I had given them my home address as well). Only recently have I been told that Campus Safety only needs your name and number to connect you with CAPS-on-call and that I totally had no need to interact with the officer like I did. The officer’s calling the police certainly did not help the situation and instead caused more worry and harm. (Response 106)

In this situation, the student speaking is manipulated and stripped of agency as the Campus Safety officer exerts power beyond the bounds of the campus to put their younger relation in harm’s way. At once, the speaker is positioned as in need of help, but also as a threat—in this case, to their younger relative—in their desire not to contact the police or other state authorities. The subversion of their agency is not accidental, but deliberate and calculated—the Campus Safety officer asks the student to come to the office and obtains information to share with local police by being
“friendly” and comforting, but then waits until the student is on the phone with a counsellor to call 911. The students’ state of distress and vulnerability—perceived irrationality—renders their perspective on the situation irrelevant to the Campus Safety officer—the student (and their younger relative) must be protected from themselves. As a nonbinary person of color, the portrayal of this student as “irrational” and subsequent stripping of their agency (and arguably, their personhood) is inextricable from their position as a racialized and gendered subject. The officers’ actions do the opposite of “protect”—rather, the student is put in a position of greater stress, and their family-member is forced into potentially violent contact with a police officer. This experience has long-lasting ramifications, as illustrated in the subsequent response: “I would say that the less I interact with Campus Safety, the safer I feel.”

This account also illustrates that when interacting with “dangerous” or non-normative body-minds, the role of Campus Safety as a buffer to external carceral systems of institutionalization (including jail/prison or psychiatric institutionalization) is reversed—rather, Campus Safety relies on and funnels people into those systems. In another account, a Black genderqueer student describes another “wellness check” in which Campus Safety mobilize the systems of police and psychiatric institutionalization:

When I was a first year I was not aware of what power campus safety had so I called them to help with my dormmate in a health crisis. They proceeded to call the cops on a non-violent, suicidal black queer first year and he was involuntarily committed. (Response 268)

Rather than being met with support in a moment of crisis, the Black, queer first-year described in this account is implicitly framed by Campus Safety as irrational and undeserving of agency in their situation. In calling the police and beginning the carceral process that results in this student’s institutionalization, Campus Safety frames the student both as a threat to himself as well as a threat to others. This framing and the actions it justifies are devastating. Forced institutionalization is
traumatizing, expensive, and for people navigating suicidality something that actively increases the likelihood that they will die by suicide later on (Jordan and McNiel 2019). In explicitly describing their dormmate as “nonviolent”, I interpret the author of this account as challenging Campus Safety’s framing, revealing that the framework of violence or unsafety that they employ has nothing to do with preventing harm and everything to do with the preservation of the campus as a space of white innocence⁹.

The creation of a “vulnerable” category to be directly protected through reformist college policing practices necessitates the creation of an “invulnerable” – an irrational, non-white Other who must be regulated through the more deadly violence of state policing; who is threatening to the vulnerable student. We see the boundaries of those categories in the lived knowledge of gender-marginalized students of color and in the experiences of students who embody non-normative ways of being or crisis and experience the “wellness check” (including both Black students, non-Black students of color, and white students). The boundaries between vulnerable and invulnerable, as well as the spatial and racial boundaries of the campus, are maintained through institutional policing, and are inextricable from concepts of who “belongs” in the campus space (at Haverford, the archetypal white, nondisabled, rational, upper-class, cis male student). However, as I discuss in the following section, the formal infrastructure of Campus Safety is far from the extent of policing on college campuses.

⁹ However, I also want to emphasize that even if this first-year had been “violent” in a context of harming themselves or others, the mobilization of police and involuntary psychiatric institutionalization would not resolve the situation but merely “displace” it (Davis 2003). This account directs our attention beyond the moment of crisis, to the conditions of hostility within the college environment which exacerbate and produce trauma and crisis, especially for Black students, Indigenous students, and other students of color.
Policing Beyond the Police

The Department of Campus Safety is not the beginning or the end of policing at Haverford College. Though perhaps it is one of the more visible or obvious forms, it is not the only form of policing on Haverford’s campus, nor necessarily the most pervasive or harmful. By this, I do not mean to absolve the department of the harms it causes or to minimize the significance of its existence, but rather to point to the reality that policing – the construction and preservation of white space and “safety” – is at the very core of this institution and actively upheld in a variety of ways by many people within it. If we understand policing as a social relationship built on practices empowered by a state (or institution embedded in and upholding a state) to enact social control (Critical Resistance, 2020), we open the space of understanding how policing can be and is enacted by individuals outside the formal, visible apparatus of police or securitization. This space is critical to understanding why and how the white university space actively produces unsafety and unbelonging for certain individuals who pass through it; in other words, why and for whom the university is made an “inherently hostile site” (Rodríguez 2012, 309). In this section, I attend to how white students, faculty, and staff on Haverford’s campus engage in policing on a daily basis, and how that policing impacts people of color in the campus space. This is not remotely a new analysis or revelation—the reality that white people are (or have the constant and devastating capacity to become) police or agents of unsafety has been described by Black people, Indigenous people, and people of color within and outside of academic institutions for generations. White people are and have long been aware of this power too, as is described by Nikhil Pal Singh in his analysis of “The Whiteness of Police” (Singh 2014). However, despite its obviousness, the police power of white people outside the named infrastructure of policing bears continued emphasis because of both the harm it continues to cause and because white Haverford continues to try and
deny its own culpability for the unsafety of its campus for Black people, Indigenous people, and people of color.

In this section, I make two arguments: first, based on narratives shared by Black and Brown survey respondents, that policing at Haverford is expansive, pervasive, constant, and inextricable from whiteness; second, how narratives shared by white survey respondents’ show that white individuals’ sense of safety is predicated on the continuous unsafety of Black people, Indigenous people, and people of color. Finally, I describe how these conditions of white safety/non-white unsafety are upheld and naturalized by institutions on campus, including Campus Safety.

Surveillance and Embodied Unsafety: Black and Brown Students’ Experiences of Policing

The question “When you think about ‘policing’ on Haverford’s campus, what comes to mind?”—like nearly every other question on the survey—elicited a huge variety of responses, most of which I will not be able to engage in this paper. The responses shared by many Black students and non-Black students of color illustrate the impossibility of safety, as discussed in the introduction, and belonging for Black people, Indigenous people, and people of color in white spaces, and how that impossibility is linked to the everyday forms of policing enacted by white people on Haverford’s campus.

To engage these responses, any notion that Campus Safety is the defining example of policing on Haverford’s campus must be abandoned. Take, for example, how one Black student described his associations with policing on campus, saying: “I think about how white students look at and treat me when I'm on campus, how campus security treats POC and specifically Black students, the tone policing of BIPOC students when expressing their rightful grievances, the unwillingness of Haverford students to confront and have a dialogue rather than just using their
institutional power as a hammer”. The ways white students harm their peers of color, specifically their Black peers, through surveillance, differential treatment, and tone policing\textsuperscript{10} is just as much policing as the actions of Campus Safety. An exclusive focus Campus Safety fails to encompass the realities of policing at Haverford, because policing is not limited to an individual body or department. Rather, it is a tool—as this respondent names it, a “hammer” of white institutional power—that can be deployed at and with devastating consequences to the people targeted by it.

Connecting these ideas to his conceptions of safety and belonging on campus, this respondent added: “While I don't feel as if my life is in immediate danger, I do feel as if I'm always being watched, always being held to a higher standard, treated significantly differently from my white peers. I feel as if at any moment they could wield their institutional power against me, and I would be helpless.” In this response, the speaker intervenes in the hegemonic definitions of “safety” that structure institutions like Campus Safety and the college at large—definitions of “safety” that rely on the absence of physical, perceived threats to whiteness and white space, or as Setha Low describes it, the conception of a “safe environment” as one that “excludes all those who are considered dangerous, who consequently become increasingly defined by their isolation and indices of race and class” (Low 2009; Low 2008). Writing as a young Black man who is constantly surveilled in the space of Haverford’s white campus, this respondent pushes against Low’s proposed white definition of safety and instead identifies it as something that actively makes him unsafe. Feeling like your life is not “in immediate danger” does not constitute being safe. A definition of safety that focuses on this will ultimately fail students of color by failing address to the precarity, othering, surveillance, and aggression they face on this campus on a daily basis.

\textsuperscript{10} “Tone policing” is a term commonly used in activist circles by Black Feminists, which is illustrated by Lorde’s quotation of a white woman at an academic conference saying in response to her anger, “Tell me how you feel but don’t say it too harshly or I cannot hear you” (Lorde 1984).
Unsafety is inextricable from being treated differently, held to a higher standard, and overall being made to not belong in the white campus space. White policing of white space—the enforcement of who belongs in the campus space, through surveillance, differential treatment, and the constant threat of institutional power—in the name of white safety actively produces not only un-belonging but un-safety for this speaker.

The survey respondent’s description of the feeling of “always being watched” also points towards safety and belonging (and conversely, un-safety and un-belonging) as embodied states of being. Several other respondents shared this perspective, including one Asian student who described that in their experience, “often times [safety is] felt more physical than mental. I feel my body relaxing and my tongue loosening. My heart isn't seized and my smile isn't feigned. Parts of Haverford—those spaces that I intentionally create and join, are safe space, but the rest, maybe not so much. I honestly don't know how genuinely safe I can feel surrounded by white people[…].”

The experience of safety and belonging is, for this author, defined primarily through the sensation its embodiment—relaxation and comfort. It is also an experience that is prohibited in spaces where the speaker is “surrounded by white people”, including the general, public white space of Haverford’s campus. The impossibility of safety in predominantly-white spaces at Haverford, for this speaker, leads them to find and create intentional and separate spaces for themselves—a reflection also shared by several other respondents, and which has also been discussed in prior anthropological engagements with race and gender on Haverford’s campus (Robinson 2020).

Returning to Sara Ahmed’s discussion of a phenomenology of whiteness, in which she describes whiteness as an orientation and white space as an extension of the white body, I read these descriptions of embodied unsafety-unbelonging as reflecting the precarity imposed on someone whose body disrupts the “surface” of a white space—whose existence challenges the
white space itself and is therefore placed under scrutiny (Ahmed 2007). Attending to the experience of being stopped (questioned and asked to justify one’s presence in word or deed) for people of color in white spaces, Ahmed describes how such experiences turn the body itself into site of social stress (Ahmed 2007, 161). What does “safety” mean when one’s body is made a site of stress by stoppage, surveillance, and policing, or their constant threat in white space? What does it mean when, as one student put it, it “feels like I'm underneath a magnifying glass” of the white gaze?

As authored by members of the Black Students League in their letter to the Board of Managers in 1971, to occupy white space as a Black person is to be constantly in a state of precarity which is antithetical to safety: “We black students realize that we are tenuously situated upon this white campus. We are fully cognizant of the fact that we may be invited to depart in droves just as we came” (Black Students’ League Letter to the Board of Managers, 1971). Safety for Black people, Indigenous people, and people of color on the land known as Haverford’s campus begins with the destruction of the campus as a white space, and by extension the destruction of the campus itself, putting it fundamentally at odds with the historical and present goal of Campus Safety and security and initiatives at this college which seek to maintain and preserve that space.

Reading the above responses in the context of the Fall 2020 Student Strike, which took place approximately two months before the survey was distributed, is significant not because the perspectives described in them are necessarily related to the strike, but because white people’s reactions to the strike made especially visible the forms of institutionally-backed violence that these students are calling attention to. Throughout the strike and afterwards, white faculty, staff, students, and their families showed their vested interest in the maintenance of Haverford as a white space and sought to exercise their institutional power to crush the mobilizations of Black students,
Indigenous students, and students of color. Parents and administrators threatened possible legal action against students, administrators, and sympathetic faculty (who were disproportionately faculty of color)\(^\text{11}\); white students published “anonymous letters” challenging the strike, wrote op-eds in defense of police, and supported attack pieces by conservative reporters (Publius 2020; Lasinsky 2020; Kay 2020). As they continue to have devastating consequences for the people targeted by them, these tactics and the discourses surrounding them are relevant to this argument in that they make unavoidably clear the extreme and current interest that white people have in maintaining Haverford as a white space—interest usually couched beneath language of corporate diversity, equity, inclusion, and progress.

In this context, it is important to recognize that forms of interpersonal policing—surveillance, questioning, and microaggressions—are not disconnected from formal institutions of campus policing. In other words, white people on Haverford’s campus understand that institutions like Campus Safety exist to help maintain Haverford as a white space, seeing (and sometimes using) it as a tool to preserve their comfort and maintain spaces of unchallenged whiteness.

*When “Safety” is Code for White Supremacy: White Notions of Safety as Reliant on Black and Brown Unsafety*

During a conversation over the winter, a current member of the Campus Safety Department informed me that a (presumably white) parent had called them in distress, seeking recourse for their white child, a student who had been verbally “bullied” during the strike. For context, the allegations of bullying leveled by white students who refused or expressed reluctance to participate

---

\(^{11}\) This was shared with me by a faculty member and several student strike organizers, who I will not name here to preserve their privacy.
in the strike was a response not to any threats of harm, but rather an expression of indignance at the possibility of being held accountable for their apathy—in other words, anger that the “presumed innocence” they enjoy in Haverford’s white space was being disrupted. The demands of accountability from students leading and joining the strike were framed by this student and her parent as a threat to her safety because they threatened white space. In calling Campus Safety, the parent in question—an adult white person, unaffiliated with the college—reveals that those familiar with white space and power know the tools available to them to preserve it, of which Campus Safety is one.

Campus Safety, in promoting and maintaining Haverford as a space of smooth, unchallenged whiteness, does signify safety to certain white students—not in spite of, but because it prohibits safety to those who may challenge them or seek to hold them accountable, particularly Black and Brown students. Perhaps the most explicit example of this perspective came from one white survey respondent, who when asked to describe her sense of safety on campus, stated: “the strike made me feel unsafe but the campus safety cars all around make me feel safe”. By naming the strike—a campaign which sought to open the possibility of safety for low-income, gender-marginalized Black students, Indigenous students, and students of color at Haverford—as something that made her feel unsafe, this student reveals that her conception of safety is rooted in white space and—by extension—the unsafety of her peers of color. By placing the strike movement in opposition to the visible presence of Campus Safety, which makes her feel safe, this student also reveals, again, how Campus Safety functions to preserve white space.

Though many white respondents did not share this perspective, or at least did not express it in their survey responses, the vast majority did understand that their whiteness was something that created safety and opened access to institutional power for them on Haverford’s campus.
Putting it simply, one white male student responded, “I feel like I can do almost anything and not face consequences.” This student was seeking in part to call attention to his relative comfort in comparison to many of his peers, beginning another response by describing what he termed “the elephant in the room”: “Since I'm white and a cis man, I have a baseline level of comfort on campus that others don't. Regrettably, the school was expressly built for people like me”. Though this response does not specifically demonstrate policing, his comment is significant because it describes his attitudes towards policing. With the language of “regret” and the past tense (the school “was built”), the speaker historicizes the production of the campus as a white space and denies its continuous re-making. Though perhaps seeking to criticize it, his comment continues to naturalize the campus as a white space and positions him as incapable of both committing or preventing harm. As a white student, I want to be careful of placing blame or criticism here that I would not extend to myself, and I want to believe that at least some of these reflexive responses from white students, staff, and faculty came alongside material solidarity with people of color who are harmed by policing on this campus and beyond. However, the degree to which many students confessionally articulated their proximity to whiteness I also read in the context of liberal performativity—a verbal divestment from systems of violence which maintains the “presumed innocence” of the white student. The boundaries of performativity and genuine, material solidarity fall far outside the scope of this paper—however, as we consider the many interlocking forms of policing on this campus, I want to be attentive to how this performative awareness coupled with denial of responsibility and failure to act enables the continued maintenance of the white space just as much as the forms of policing I have described in this chapter.

Campus Safety is not and never has been oriented to promoting the safety of people of color on Haverford’s campus because its existence is rooted in preserving the conditions of
pervasive, unchallenged whiteness that make the campus so unsafe for them. To occupy a space where one’s body does not “fit”, where one’s body is made a site of stress through hypervisibility and continuous stoppage (Ahmed 2007), precludes the possibility of safety or belonging. However, Campus Safety is only a tool of the much wider system of policing which upholds whiteness on and beyond this campus—a system through which white people are empowered to surveil, stop, question, and otherwise harm Black people, Indigenous people, and people of color.

**Conclusions: What Can Bloom?**

The morning I started writing this conclusion, (technically, late the night before) I got a message from a friend of a friend asking if I was writing my thesis on Campus Safety. I said yes. She proceeded to tell me about how the prior night, a Campus Safety officer had screamed at her—a Black senior—and several of her friends, who were listening to music and playing games outside of their dorm, that “the party was over”, threatening to call the cops and ultimately flipping a table. Punctuated by “lol”s and another story about how this same officer had harassed her at a party her freshman year for making out with a boy at a party (“your mom did not send you to college to do that”), our brief exchange illustrated the tension between the mundane and the extraordinary violence that comprises policing in this country and on this campus. By using physical force, invoking gendered respectability (“your mother”), and weaponizing Blackness (“I will call the cops”) to exert control and instill terror, in both these interactions the officer reinscribes systems of violence that Haverford’s administration and department of Campus Safety love to locate elsewhere. On the one hand, what happened could have been worse—ultimately, the officer didn’t call the cops, and the students involved were able to get inside, only shaken. On the other hand, these experiences—bookends of this student’s four years at Haverford—show how “Campus
“Safety” represents, most often, a violent antithesis of safety, especially but not exclusively for Black students on Haverford’s campus.

This passing conversation on Facebook messenger took place on the day that a Black boy—20-year-old Duante Wright—was murdered by a police officer in Brooklyn Center, Minnesota. He was a loving father of a one-year-old child; he was a brother, uncle, grandson, son, and boyfriend. He called his mother when he got pulled over. The world should burn for Duante Wright. It should burn for the 27 people who have been killed by police in this country since his murder and the day I am turning in this draft—including Anthony Thomson Jr. (17), Peyton Ham (16), Ma’Khia Bryant (16), and 24 others who though older still should have had more life to live. It should burn for the millions of people killed by the state before them whose names and stories have been erased. Who reside in the murky depths of childhood and past-life memories, among the stars, or perhaps nowhere at all.

A Brooklyn Center police officer murdering Duante Wright and a Haverford Campus Safety officer flipping a table occupy different scales of violence, but they are events that cannot be disconnected. Duante Wright was the same age as many students at Haverford when he was killed; his murderer could easily have been someone Campus Safety officers would call for “backup”. He was a victim of the constant surveillance that white and non-Black people—those who call themselves police and those who do not, including students, staff, and faculty at this school—enact on those who they believe do not belong. Though institutions like Haverford may portray their students as separate from Duante and other Black and Brown people murdered by police, that portrayal is nothing but a mirage while they remain invested in and dependent on practices and systems that surveil, criminalize, and murder Black and Brown people regardless of whether or not they hold a diploma.
This constant death is the volatile and sickening context in which policing is lived. It is why there is no such thing as “gentle policing”. And it is the context in which this project was produced. This is what I think I would share with a white staff-member who responded to the survey, leaving the following comment in the space on the survey where respondents could share any lingering comments, questions, or feedback: “I’m really concerned that there's a lot of navel gazing on the topics of “safe spaces” and “policing” that's only being done by the places where these aren't actually a problem.” (Response 237). To this person, I would say that policing is most definitely a a problem here, because it’s a problem everywhere, and none of it is benign. The university is not a space of innocence—its very existence, the existence of this campus, is situated in all the forms of violence that structure this country and actively replicates them. The college is the cops. People are harmed here and by this place every day in profound ways. And regardless of how conditioned you—especially if you are white—or anyone else may be to accept those harms as the price of doing business, I suggest that you engage with the work of people who I have cited here who would tell you that the business is fucked and needs to go. Beyond the daily forms of violence outlined in this project, Haverford graduates have gone on to start billion-dollar death-making corporations like Palantir (Alex Karp, Class of 1989); a 5-minute search on LinkedIn shows college alumni and faculty listing current or previous positions with Raytheon, Blackrock, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Homeland Security. The current chair of the Political Science Department is a former member of the Israeli Defense Force. The former head of the Campus Safety Department was a Detective in the Philadelphia Police Department when the city firebombed the residential home of the MOVE family in 1985. People in or from this place are actively involved in the systems of violence the white liberal imaginary would encourage us to locate elsewhere, and that mis-location is part of the violence.
Another genre of comments that appeared through the survey that I want to address are ones of concern, effectively saying that nobody should interfere with Campus Safety because their presence means that the Lower Merion Police Department—a more dangerous, armed, sworn police infrastructure—does not come on to campus. Well, I agree to this with some extent, and can empathize with where the fear is coming from. However, the LMPD does still come on to campus, most frequently when called by Campus Safety. While the college police can be argued to provide a buffer between students and the card-carrying township cops, that selective protection is exactly that: selective. It relies on and upholds the criminalization, surveillance, incarceration, and murder of people who are seen as unworthy of protection and safety: Black people, Indigenous people, people of color; m/Mad, neurodivergent, mentally ill, disabled people; gender-marginalized people; poor and working-class people. In response to this comment, I look to what Aurora Levins Morales shares in her preface to the 2015 edition to Eli Clare’s *Exile and Pride*, that “when two legitimate needs seem to be in conflict, neither side is asking for enough.” (Morales 2015, xv). The demand that Campus Safety not be critically engaged with or exposed as enacting harm because it might create a wider opening for the LMPD is not asking for enough. Abolition means not asking for a choice of police force. It means safety. It means no police, and instead working towards a world without them.

*What can bloom?* At the end of a meditation on the abolitionist strike at the University of Michigan, anonymous authors for *Black Ink* ask readers in earnest, “What can grow from the ashes of an anti-Black, settler colonial, and extractive institution like [Haverford College]? What can bloom?” (Black Ink 2020). They name the University of Michigan rather than Haverford College, but I have taken the liberty of substituting the name, because those are the questions I have on my mind in reference to the institution I currently inhabit. For anyone reading this text, they are real
questions, not rhetorical ones. I don’t know the answers, but the importance of actively moving towards them cannot be overstated. Taking up Tina Campt’s grammar of Black Feminist futurity, *what can bloom* is “*that which will have had to happen*”, it is “an attachment to a belief in what should be true”, it is “the power to imagine beyond current fact and to envision that which is not, but must be”. Moving towards *what can bloom*—a world without policing and prisons and all anti-Black, ableist, transphobic systems of violence; by definition, a world without the university—requires “living the future now… as a striving for the future you want to see, right now, in the present” (Campt 2017, 17).

Especially as a white person who has been insulated from the brunt of police violence in so many ways, it has felt fraught and at times inappropriate for me to be writing about policing when it is such a hyper-visible, daily, deadly, life-stopping (both in the physical sense and in the sense of witness) reality for Black and Brown people in this country and across the world. It feels especially inappropriate to talk about “what can bloom” when policing is the antithesis of anything blooming, when it produces death. But “living the future now” is a responsibility and a necessity. This process has been a project of witness: a project that, as Christen Smith describes it, serves not to distance the witnesser from violence but implicates us in it. “*Coming to know the stories of the dead incriminate us all*” (Smith 2016, 206). Or as my advisor, Professor Juli Grigsby, put it while trying to remember Smith’s words: “now that you have read this, you are part of this”. You cannot say you do not know. You are part of this, just as I am part of this. This is not a guidebook; it is an offering to those who are already working towards liberation and a demand to those who are not. *What can bloom?*
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APPENDIX A

Anonymous Survey and Informed Consent

I shared an anonymous online survey entitled “Campus Policing, Belonging, and Safety at Haverford College: Anonymous Survey” with Haverford College faculty, staff, and students (current and former) following IRB approval in January 2021 through Google Forms. It remained open until early March 2021 and was advertised through physical posters, campus-wide emails, Facebook posts on College Class and Alumni pages, and a staff-meeting. It received over 250 responses. For those interested in reading the entirety of the survey questions and more of the survey’s responses, that information will be made available in a forthcoming website. The Informed Consent information for that survey read as follows:

This anonymous survey is part of a senior thesis project in the Haverford College Anthropology department exploring the history and present impacts of the Haverford College Campus Safety Department, as well as experiences of policing on campus more broadly. It includes questions about your background, experiences on Haverford’s campus, experiences with Campus Safety, perceptions of Campus Safety, understandings of policing on campus, and senses of safety and belonging on the campus.

Anyone over the age of eighteen who has spent time in or near Haverford’s campus is welcome to complete the survey, including anyone living in Ardmore, Haverford, and surrounding townships who are not affiliated with the college; students and alumni; faculty members; and all staff members, including those who currently work with Campus Safety. Participation is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate or to stop participating at any time with no penalty. All questions are optional and may be skipped for any reason. No compensation will be provided for responding.

All responses are anonymous and confidential, and your complete responses will only be available to the student researcher and their faculty advisor. No link will be made between your identity and the responses you choose to provide. This project has been designed entirely independently from the Campus Safety Department, or any department/office at Haverford other than the Anthropology Department. In the interest of making this study as transparent and accessible as possible, some partial, anonymized responses to this survey will be included on a public website outlining the project in Spring 2021.

If you would prefer to participate in a virtual interview on this topic rather than fill out responses here, please contact the student researcher, Frances Condon, directly (fcondon@haverford.edu) or through the interview registration form at https://linktr.ee/hcpolicingsurvey. If you have any questions regarding the survey or project as a whole, please contact Frances, their faculty advisor, Professor Juli Grigsby (jgrigsby@haverford.edu), or the current chair of the Institutional Review Board, Professor Benjamin Le (ble@haverford.edu).

Thank you for your time and consideration!
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