ONE

The Usable Past of Kent State
and Jackson State

At the end of April 1970, students at Kent State University in Ohio began to demonstrate against the US invasion of Cambodia, the subsequent deaths of US soldiers, and the massacres of Vietnamese men, women, and children. For many people, the bombing of Cambodia, conducted to defeat Vietnamese rebels who were positioned there, suggested that the war in Vietnam was continuing rather than ending. Moreover, students were also protesting the draft, which mandated military service for the Vietnam War and by and large selected young men from economically and racially disfranchised backgrounds. By May 3, almost one thousand National Guard soldiers had been dispatched to the campus; in retaliation, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps building was set on fire. When Ohio governor James A. Rhodes visited the campus and observed the demonstrators, he said,

> We are going to eradicate the problem.... These people just move from one campus to the other and terrorize the community. They're worse than the Brown Shirts in the communist element and also the Night Riders and the vigilantes. They're the worst

14

type of people that we harbor in America. And I want to say that they're not going to take over a campus.

On May 4, students continued with their demonstrations, defying orders to cease, and the day ended with National Guard soldiers firing on them. In a matter of seconds, sixty-seven bullets were unleashed on the protesters; nine people were wounded, and four people—Jeffrey Glen Miller, Allison B. Krause, William Knox Schroeder, and Sandra Lee Scheuer—were killed.[1]

On May 14, 1970, just ten days later, local law enforcement in Jackson, Mississippi, received word that students at Jackson State University, a historically black college and university, were pelting rocks at white motorists on one of the main roads on the campus, a road that was often the site of racial harassment of students by whites. A rumor that Charles Evers, a local civil rights leader and politician and the brother of the slain civil rights leader Medgar Evers, and his wife had been killed spread through the campus as well. A dump truck was set on fire, escalating the situation. The police came and were met with rocks and bricks thrown by angry students and locals. They responded by riddling one of the women's dorms with a barrage of bullets—about four hundred, according to an FBI investigation. Two young black men, Philip L. Gibbs, a junior at the school, and James Earl Green, a high school student, were killed in the confrontation.[2]

What happened at Kent State and Jackson State is usually told as examples of the tragedies and the turbulence of student protests in the 1960s and '70s. But they were also important junctures in the history of the American university and indeed of American society. After the killings at these universities, dozens of college presidents in the United States petitioned their state legislators not to curtail but to augment police powers on their

campuses. This chapter ponders the irony, then, of how an institution presumably dedicated to the education of young minds could produce the conditions for their possible annihilation. As I will show, the events at Kent State and Jackson State set in motion a series of interrelated processes—including the criminalization of students, the extension of university administration, the use of ideologies of diversity and tolerance against social insurgencies, and the expansion of police forces on campus yards—all of which created this peculiar institution of the current American academy and its particular view of student protest, an institution and a view that have helped to authorize ideological forces and repressive powers that shape our present day.

DEMANDING NEW INSTITUTIONAL AND SOCIAL ORDERS

Think back to the 1960s and '70s student movements and how large the word *demand* loomed in radical manifestos that called for widespread social change then. In 1968, the Third World Liberation Front of San Francisco State College issued its "Notice of Demands," listing the establishment of "a School of Ethnic Studies" as the number one demand.[3] In 1969, the Lumumba-Zapata Coalition, a student group at the University of California at San Diego, on hearing of the institution's plans to build a new—"Third"—college, responded, "We demand that the Third College be devoted to relevant education for minority youth and to the study of the contemporary social problems of all people."[4] In that same year, African American and Puerto Rican students at the City College in New York issued their "Five Demands," intended to change the university's institutional and intellectual structure to speak to the histo-

ries and realities of Puerto Rican and African American students at that institution.

The lists of demands put together by students at San Francisco State, UCSD, and City College inspired similar campus movements across the United States. The SF State demands signaled an interest in the reorganization of institutional life *and* in the reorganization of knowledge on college campuses and in American universities. Student activists on other campuses followed suit, recognizing that changing the social climate of the university meant admitting more students and faculty of color as part of an effort to change the intellectual climate of the university. Hence student activists called for greater numbers of people of color in universities, along with the creation of curricula that would be relevant for a world riddled by war, racism, sexism, poverty, and colonialism. For the students, to "demand" meant that it was time for a new social and epistemological climate to emerge at American universities and colleges.

As student activists worked to assert their demands as the means to change the university and the larger social world, other social forces responded by trying to reassert authority over the transformation of the academy and the larger world. The US government and university administrations worked to convince campus communities and people outside the university that the administration could best manage the progress and the direction of the university. One strategy was to deploy the category "diversity" against the students and their visions of social justice.

For instance, on June 13, 1970, President Richard Nixon established the President's Commission on Campus Unrest in response to the killings at Kent State and Jackson State. Its account of these incidents, titled *The Report of the President's*

Commission on Campus Unrest, begins by arguing, "The crisis on American campuses has no parallel in the history of our nation."[5] While it locates the causes of campus unrest within the racial divisions at the heart of the nation, the report is overwhelmingly dedicated to constructing students as potential criminals, who—if unchecked—could disrupt the social order. Addressing student demonstrators as the cause of such disorder, the report states, "There can be no more trashing, no more rock-throwing, no more arson, no more bombing by protesters. No grievance, philosophy, or political idea can justify the destruction and killing we have witnessed. There can be no sanctuary or immunity from prosecution on the campus."[6]

While the report claims that the commission was formed in "the wake of the great tragedies"[7] at Kent State and Jackson State, it actually performs a kind of sleight of hand. Even though it states that it was motivated by the killings of student protesters, the report frames student activists as threats to democracy rather than as people whose freedoms should have been protected under democratic law. The report's argument that students were the cause of social disorder is therefore ironic, given that students were the victims killed by state violence. Thus, the commission emerged presumably in response to the senseless deaths of student protesters, only to criminalize student activism.

This irony—of an expressed concern for student activists joined with a real suspicion of them—was a signature feature of the Nixon regime. Nixon made his reputation by straddling the border between promoting law and order and seemingly advocating for civil rights. In his 1968 speech accepting the presidential nomination of the Republican Party, he argued for social order against what he perceived as threats from activists. Refer-

ring to racial uprisings that broke out in Detroit, Washington DC, Chicago, and Baltimore, as well as the catastrophes of the Vietnam War, he stated, "As we look at America, we see cities enveloped in smoke and flame. We hear sirens in the night. We see Americans dying in distant battlefields abroad. We see Americans hating each other; fighting each other; killing each other at home." Here he saw an opportunity to use the discourse of civil rights—not to ensure greater freedoms for blacks and other minorities but to preserve the social order. As he stated, "Let those who have the responsibility to enforce our laws, and our judges who have the responsibility to interpret them, be dedicated to the great principles of civil rights. But let them also recognize that *the first civil right of every American is to be free from domestic violence.* And that right must be guaranteed in this country" (italics mine).[8] Nixon was evolving a strategy to use the key phrase of social justice—"civil rights"—to redirect authority away from grassroots efforts and organizations and back toward dominant social institutions.

What's striking about Nixon's statement is the subtle way that civil rights is removed from the circumstances of racial exclusion for people of color and cast instead as the general problem of individual well-being for all Americans, regardless of social privilege; the well-being of average Americans, this suggests, is jeopardized by activism and outcries against structural racism. This statement serves as an example of a strategy that Nixon deployed throughout his tenure as president—that is, the use of discourses of civil rights to refortify and extend the powers of the US government and to preserve the dominant social order. Later on he used the language of black power to promote what he called "black capitalism," an economic program that mobilized the language of self-determination and racial pride to encourage racial

minorities to identify with rather than think beyond the free market system. In a similar spirit and as part of a plan to recruit racial minorities to the Republican Party, he established the Minority Business Development Agency (later renamed the Office of Minority Business Enterprise) to provide business loans to minority entrepreneurs.[9]

Similar to how Nixon used civil rights language, the commission deployed the civil rights categories of diversity and tolerance in an attempt to promote law and order. The report presents itself as an upholder of the right to dissent. This pretense could also be seen in the makeup of the commission. For instance, James E. Cheek, then the president of Howard University, was one of its members. When Cheek assumed the presidency, Howard students had been protesting for two years, even closing the school in 1968 and 1969 over such issues as the university's crackdown on students who called for changes in the curriculum and for greater responsiveness to student grievances by the administration.[10] Howard University received much of its funding from the federal government, and at one point Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia argued that the university had become "infiltrated, infested, and contaminated with black power."[11] Cheek sometimes wore dashikis and had even debated Martin Luther King Jr. on the viability of nonviolence. Moreover, on the presidential commission he stated, "Students are determined they are not going to be fired upon and not be prepared to fire back, and I think it is a dangerous kind of situation where students are confronted with officers who overreact." But Cheek combined a rhetoric of self-defense and the aesthetics of black power to ultimately enforce order on the campus. Indeed, his obituary in the *New York Times* points to how he soon became a symbol of order: "At the start of the 1969–70 academic year, he

said he would 'not attempt to administer under intimidation, violence or coercion of any kind.'"[12]

Another key person on the commission was James F. Ahern, a former police chief. When thousands of protesters rallied for two days in New Haven on behalf of eight members of the Black Panther Party who were awaiting trial on charges of murder, he was credited with defusing this potentially volatile situation and gained national fame. Like Cheek, Ahern became a symbol of establishment sympathy with protesters—having called for the arrest of the National Guard soldiers who killed students at Kent State—and maintenance of the social order in the face of social protest.[13] In many ways these two men embodied the commission report's attempt to straddle an acknowledgment of student grievances and a desire not only to maintain order but to multiply the forces for keeping order.

Hence, the report begins by affirming the activists' sense of inequality in the United States:

> The shortcomings of the American university are the third target of student protest. The goals, values, administration, and curriculum of the modern university have been sharply criticized by many students. Students complain that their studies are irrelevant to the social problems that concern them. They want to shape their own personal and common lives but find the university restrictive. They seek a community of companions and scholars, but find an impersonal multiversity. And they denounce the university's relationship to war and to discriminatory racial policies.

The report juxtaposes its misgivings about student activism to a demand for tolerance in order to construct the students as potential victims of conservative violence from citizens who "believe that students who dissent or protest—even those who protest peacefully—deserve to be treated harshly."[14]

After conceding some of the students' grievances, the report abruptly changes its tone and criticizes students as agents of a grave misconception: "Behind the student protest and on these issues and the crisis of violence to which they have contributed lies the more basic crisis of understanding." In an ostensible defense of diversity, the report makes a case for the social heterogeneity of US society: "Americans have never shared a single culture, a single philosophy, or a single religion. But in most periods of our history, we have shared many common values, common sympathies, and a common dedication to a system of government which *protects our diversity*" (italics mine).[15]

This construction of the United States as a paragon of diversity is then tied to another, one that assumes that students themselves are threats to diversity:

> Among the numbers of this student culture, there is a growing lack of tolerance, a growing insistence that their own views must govern, an impatience with the slow procedures of liberal democracy, a growing denial of the humanity and good will of those who urge patience and restraint, and particularly of those whose duty is to enforce the law.

For the report's authors, the results of the students' alleged intolerance is clear: "A small number of students have turned to violence; an increasing number, not terrorists themselves, would not turn even arsonists and bombers over to law enforcement officials."[16] The stakes of this intolerance are not simply academic but national:

> If this trend continues, if this crisis of understanding endures, the very survival of the nation will be threatened.... Despite the differences among us, powerful values and sympathies unite us. The very motto of our nation calls for both unity and diversity: from

many, one. Out of our divisions, we must now recreate understanding and respect for those different from ourselves.[17]

A report that begins apparently as a way to call attention to the vulnerability of students to state violence spends most of its pages constructing student demonstrators as the cause of social violence, as potential criminals in need of state regulation.

Part of constructing students as potential criminals means rendering student activists as irrational actors, irrational not only in their demands but also in their speech and conduct: "Students must accept the responsibility of putting their ideas in a reasonable and persuasive manner." The students' irrationality is also un-American, the report implies, since their lack of reason is understood as inimical to American values: "They must recognize that they are citizens of a nation which was founded on tolerance and diversity, and they must become more understanding of those with whom they differ."[18] In a context that regarded student activism as dangerously vulnerable to irrationality and violence, student demands were not seen as critiques of the social order and calls for social transformation but instead were often viewed as by-products of the students' irrationality. Only by submitting to the norms and orders set by the state and administration could students hope to regain their status as rational patriots, as stewards of an American regard for tolerance and diversity. For university and political elites, then, the social categories "tolerance" and "diversity" were never meant to inspire appreciation for the student movements, movements that might shed light on social inequalities and recommendations for transcending them. "Tolerance" and "diversity" were instead ways of saying "Society must be defended"—that is, protected from the student, who was understood to be a criminal from the start.

DIVERSITY AND THE EXPANSION
OF ADMINISTRATION

If calls for diversity and tolerance were ways of saying "Society must be defended," then academic institutions were obliged to put certain mechanisms and apparatuses in place for that defense. This entailed the expansion of administrative procedures, offices, and relationships. It was an expansion of both ideological and repressive systems. The Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci's theorization of the role of intellectuals in social reproduction can help explain what took place as universities responded to student agitation. In "The Formation of Intellectuals," he wrote,

> Every social group, coming into existence on the original terrain of an essential function in the world of economic production, creates together with itself, organically, one or more strata of intellectuals which give it homogeneity and an awareness of its own function not only on the economic but also in the social and political fields.[19]

For the report, the student movements were occasions to clarify the "essential function" of the university for a liberal democracy. It can also be read as an intellectual document meant to give the university "homogeneity and an awareness of its own function not only on the economic but also in the social and political fields." For example, the report organizes that homogeneity and awareness around "values held in common," values that stand for "the importance of diversity and coexistence to the nation's health."[20] The report thus calls for the creation of a stratum of intellectuals who would use diversity to manage conflict in the student body in the name of the life of the campus and the health of the nation.

To handle the grievances that student activists put before the university, the report recommends what it calls "the ombudsman method":

> The ombudsman is an individual who acts as a mediator and fact-finder for students, faculty members, and administrators. To be successful, the ombudsman must have both great autonomy and support of the university president. He must not be penalized by the college administration if his findings and recommendations embarrass university leaders.

In addition being an independent entity, the ombudsman, according to the commission's members, would explicitly work on behalf of the managerial aims of the university where student activism was concerned:

> Some universities have appointed special student affairs administrators to act as liaison between students and the administration. These men and women are sometimes recent graduates. For example, a young, independent, black administrator often serves in the role of spokesman, mediator, and advisor for black students. Because these administrators have the confidence of the students, they can suggest *practical modifications of student demands* [italics mine] without being automatically branded as "sell-outs." They can formalize complaints or proposals and bring them to the attention of appropriate faculty members and administrators.[21]

The report reveals that the university intended from the beginning to use the ombudsman's seeming autonomy and racial identity as resources for rather than hindrances to the administration's efforts to manage activism and conflict. The job of the ombudsman was to take demands that might push against the university's institutional order and bring them within that order, to—as the theorist Sara Ahmed has put it—make them "[cease] to cause trouble"[22]

Bringing the students' demands within the university's terms of order meant taking the students as figures of disorder. Understanding their demands as personal grievances was crucial to

that rendering. Specifically, by reducing student activism to expressions of personal grievance, universities could abstract any and all visions for institutional and social transformation from student demands. Hence, alternative models for curricular development, faculty hiring, and student admissions could be understood as responses to individual complaints, which would be better resolved through simple bureaucratic procedures. Reducing demands for institutional transformation to grievances required offices predicated on narrowing visions for wholesale institutional and social change, offices that—oftentimes despite the best intentions—rendered those visions as hysterical and fanciful nonsense. In an ideological climate like that, how could there ever be any hope for redistribution?

THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND CORPORATE SPECIALIZATION OF DIVERSITY

As minority difference was made into a resource to improve the brand of dominant institutions, as seen in the example of the ombudsman, those same institutions of state, academy, and capital responded to student movements calling for greater racial and gender representation by making diversity an administrative specialization—hence the rise of diversity offices, diversity officials, and what we might think of as the diversity bureaucracy.

Rather than a result of student demands, we might more accurately think of diversity offices as the administrative and bureaucratic response to those demands. The sociologist Max Weber said about bureaucracy, "Office management, at least all specialized office management—and such management is distinctly modern—usually presupposes thorough and expert training. This increasingly holds for the modern executive and

employee of private enterprises, in the same manner as it holds for the state official."[23] As diversity was literally turned into an administrative specialization, it moved further away from what students in the 1960s and '70s intended when they radicalized forms of difference such as race, gender, class, and disability for revolutionary transformation. That radicalization was meant to be the basis for critically reorganizing knowledge within and outside the academy and promoting the entrance of minoritized subjects as central producers and consumers of that knowledge. Folding diversity into the bureaucratic machine and moving it up into the administration was one way of mitigating student demands and preventing them from becoming matters of social transformation.[24]

As part of the bureaucratization of diversity, and as the example of the ombudsman shows, institutions of power learned to extend their influence by promoting a few minorities—raising them up as examples of what could be done, even going so far as to extol the virtues of their cultural differences and histories—and by paying lip service to the idea of increasing the number of underrepresented students and faculty while actually keeping their numbers low, creating a climate in which minority difference could conceivably be affirmed without the presence of minoritized subjects and communities.

While the student movements used radical critiques of race, gender, class, and sexuality to call for increases in the numbers of students of color, women, and queers in the academy, the academy and its compatriot entities—the government and US corporations—presented those differences not to engender radical social transformations but to improve their brands. These maneuvers by academic and corporate elites gave birth to multiculturalism in the 1980s and '90s and became—as Jodi Melamed

has shown—the basis of "official," "state-recognized," and university-certified antiracism.[25] Through neoliberal multiculturalism, capital and academy presented themselves as the real achievements of student and social protest, producing products and constructing brands that bore the marks but not the substance of movement ideals and visions. This was not evidence of state and capital adhering to the vision of social movements but rather an indication of their move away from them. Under neoliberal multiculturalism and through the powers of academic and corporate elites, demands for racial, gender, and class representation were used to meet administration and corporate needs rather than the intellectual and social needs of communities that sat just outside university gates.

SECURING THE CAMPUS

For an ideological project that criminalized student activism and promoted diversity as a rationale for law and order, it should come as no surprise that the presidential commission's report recommends the buildup of security forces as the means to protect diversity and tolerance. As it states, "The university's police or security force is its ultimate internal resource for preventing and coping with campus disorder."[26] To forestall and manage disorder, campus security must be able to distinguish between "disorder and orderly protest." Disorder, it says, comes in the forms of "disruption, violence, and terrorism." *Disruption* can be defined as "any interference with others to conduct their rightful business."[27] This includes "obstructive sit-ins, interference with academic activities, the blockading of campus recruiters, and interference with the rights of others to speak or to hear others speak."[28] The report defines *violence* as "willful injury to

persons or damage of property." It describes *terrorism* as "the organized, systematic use of violence by clandestine groups, usually in pursuit of political objectives."[29]

The broad definition of *disruption* is striking, justifying police repression in the name of order and relying on the university administration—and not the faculty or students—to determine what is the rightful business of the university and what is not. According to the report, it is the job of university officials to determine what is orderly and what is not: "[University officials] must increase their capacity and bolster their will to respond firmly, justly, and humanely to disruption."[30] Here we get a glimpse of how the report encourages the university to model its security units on the police forces that characterize the larger society. Obliging the university to maintain its ideals of diversity and tolerance and regulate its populace through the development of security systems, the report states,

> Many universities today have the attributes and managerial problems of civil communities. They are the scene of growing numbers of demonstrations and of an increasing rate and variety of crime.... A fully staffed and trained campus police force at its best can perform the functions of a small municipal police department with respect to campus disorders.[31]

Initially, campus security was made up of lone police officers rather than entire campus police forces. According to a 1971 document published by the US Department of Justice's National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, "The development of the automobile marked the beginning of the 20th century campus security officer. The control of traffic and the problems incident to parking necessitated laws and individuals to enforce the laws."[32] Regulating the mobility of the automobile

was part of ensuring the gender propriety of women as well: "The automobile problem was more than one of merely lack of parking space. It was a question of students, particularly women, behaving within proper moral constraints"—that is, not having sex outside marriage. As the document states, "The doctrine of 'in loco parentis' required that the institution serve in the stead of the parents and the exercise of this policy required a force equipped to patrol the campus, its vehicles and environs."[33]

While the automobile and the university's role "in the place of a parent" occasioned the emergence of twentieth-century campus security, the rise of the student demonstrator occasioned a shift in campus security and encouraged the university to become less parentlike and more statelike. After student protests in the 1960s, US college presidents lobbied their state representatives for authorization to create on-campus police departments. As of 2015, more than forty states had passed laws to allow campuses to form their own police departments. Most public schools with more than twenty-five hundred students and over 90 percent of private schools with that amount have their own police departments.[34]

The French intellectual Michel Foucault argued that Western society's institutions of power have historically based themselves on the maneuvers and goals of war. Describing the ways that relationships of force have helped to shape institutions in the West, he contended, "The role of political power is perpetually to use a sort of silent war to reinscribe that relationship of force, and to reinscribe it in institutions, economic inequalities, language, and even the bodies of individuals."[35] By using the killings of student activists to expand rather than curtail police powers, *The Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest* attempted to do something similar. It recommends that univer-

sities and colleges reinscribe relationships based on force and the maintenance of order within institutions, relationships that would distinguish between those people and groups that represent order on campus and those that represent disorder—and whose management would require administrative and security apparatuses. Present-day campus security is thus a product of the set of force relationships that constitute the contemporary university, relationships of force justified by a fear of students and an ostensible respect for diversity. As an institution that was adopting the force relationships of the larger society, the university was turning itself into a microcosm of the state, inventing new ways to legitimate and extend conditions of violence as it talked of order and peace.

THE UNIVERSITY AND ITS ORDERS OF VIOLENCE

The convergence of administrative and police powers is alive and well in the contemporary university. What I have described so far is an institution that dramatically transformed itself from a simple and straightforward academic enterprise into an administrative system that has become more and more statelike, with apparatuses that try to ensure order both by persuasion and by force. Indeed, the university after the student movements of the 1960s and '70s became a platform for education, bureaucracy, and security. Thus, police violence, administrative violence, and ideological violence have come together in an institution that is at once a bureaucracy, a school, and a police station. The university is now an institution that enacts and legitimates not one type of violence but several.

One recent example of the university's use of repressive (i.e., police) violence to assault student protesters occurred on

November 18, 2011, at the University of California at Davis. Students associated with the Occupy movement at that university occupied the campus quad, where they erected tents, in protest against tuition and fee increases. University police, according to a UC Davis task force report, were instructed to remove the tents. While they were doing so, one police officer used pepper spray on a group of protesters who were sitting peacefully on a walkway. Offering context, the task force report stated,

> The incident also took place against the backdrop of worldwide student protests, including demonstrations by the Occupy Wall Street movement, which triggered similar events across the nation. These protests presented challenges for all affected *universities and municipalities* in attempting to balance the goals of freedom of speech, maintaining the safety of both protesters and non-protesters, and *protecting the legitimate interests of government and the non-protesting public.* [Italics mine.][36]

This report positions student protests as a shared police concern for "universities and municipalities," revealing just how normal the overlap between university and state practices has become and how student activism is already presumed to be a problem of order for administrative and police powers, one that must be managed in the name of not only the university but also society in general.

Another expression of the university's investment in forms of violence appeared in the case of Professor Steven Salaita, a case that illustrates how the university legitimates ideological and administrative violence. In August 2014, the administration at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign fired Salaita for tweets attacking Israel's bombing campaign in the West Bank. In her justification of the termination, then chancellor Phyllis Wise invoked the protectionist logic of diversity. In an open letter to

the faculty, she stated, "We have a particular duty to our students to ensure that they live in a community of scholarship that challenges their assumptions about the world but that also respects their rights as individuals."[37]

In fact, according to Salaita's book *Uncivil Rites: Palestine and the Limits of Academic Freedom,* the board of trustees used the phrase "entry not approved" to carry out the termination. Discussing the phrase, he writes,

> During the vote, the trustees referred to me as "Item 14, page 23, number 4." … When it comes to budgetary and ideological concerns, we are not human beings, but agenda items.
>
> Such is the tenor of "entry not approved," a technical dictum replete with human interest but wholly oblivious to any iteration of humanity.… This bureaucratic flourish forestalls emotion by deploying pragmatic judgment in a passive voice. Nobody, according to the record, is actually responsible for that judgment. Like all acts of bureaucratic management, it was done by fiat of habituation.[38]

With this passage, Salaita points to how the university behaves with the dispassionate violence of the state, having very little care for human and personal costs, and reveals that the university contains administrative and repressive (i.e., police) infrastructures like those of the state. Recalling instances of the state's use of "entry not approved" in distinct and overlapping contexts of race, empire, and colonialism—the checkpoint that regulates the movement and evaluates the personhood of Palestinians, the "whites-only" signs that restricted the mobility and questioned the humanity of African Americans, the anti-Semitic policies that barred Jews from colleges and universities—Salaita shows that his firing was an administrative decision not divorced from histories of racial and colonial violence but part of those histories.

As the university administration evoked the histories of settler-colonial, segregationist, and anti-Semitic infrastructures, it also expressed its own administrative and policing powers, demonstrating that Salaita's dismissal was both an administrative matter of his employment and a policing matter concerning the presumed security of the university and its students. As he states,

> I was thus barred from the university. In barring me, the trustees also banished a set of ideas it considers threatening while codifying others it finds appealing (based on administrative interests). The body of the dissident scholar personifies a breach of institutional virtue; he is thus banished from entry as both physical object and intellectual subject.[39]

Read as an ideological expression of diversity, Salaita's termination was—in the administration's eyes—a rational act aimed at protecting the student body from a faculty member now constructed as a threat to the university's social order. Firing Salaita, a faculty member of color of Jordanian and Palestinian heritage, was also a way to regulate and expel certain critiques from the university, critiques having to do with occupation and settler colonialism. Both the assault on student activists at UC Davis and the firing of Salaita are part of a longer history, one born in that moment when the university—on the government's advice—began to manage conflict and exercise police power in the name of protecting diversity and social order.