

Claremont Colleges

Scholarship @ Claremont

Pitzer Senior Theses

Pitzer Student Scholarship

2019

Un-containing and Institutional Erasure of Memory: A Platform Proposal for the Claremont Colleges

Sophia Rizzolo

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.claremont.edu/pitzer_theses



Part of the Arts and Humanities Commons

Un-containing and Institutional Erasure of Memory:
A Platform Proposal for the Claremont Colleges

By Sophia Rizzolo

A senior project submitted to the International Intercultural Studies Field Group in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree in Bachelors of Arts

Pitzer College
Claremont, California
Professor Joe Parker
& Professor Hamid Rezai
April 29th, 2019

Table of Contents:

Acknowledgments	2
Abstract	3
About me	4
Introduction: What are the goals of this project?	5
A New Sense of <i>Time</i>	10
History, Memory, and Knowledge Production	19
Collective Agency and Meshworks.....	25
Collectivizing Histories of Action.....	30
Centering groups of Campus Activists and Resistance Through Place.....	34
Cries for Justice: Attempts at defining un-containing	38
Containment, Law, and the Claremont Colleges	51
Multi-Issue Coalition Building in Place: Across Networks and Time.....	54
G(r)asping For Freedom: Conclusions	59
Bibliography	61

Acknowledgments:

Firstly, I would like to thank all of the students, faculty, staff, and community members who have put in countless hours in search of a more just campus, city, nation, and world. Your work is valuable beyond measure. I would like to acknowledge and thank Professor Joe Parker and Professor Hamid Rezai for working with me on this project and guiding me. I would also like to thank Sara Chetney for her commitment to the project and all of the work she has done to make the platform possible. Lastly, I would like to thank the community members who have and will contribute to the platform; your work will continue to reach toward a more just world.

Abstract

This paper accompanies an archive platform for campus activists--students, faculty, staff, and community members--at the Claremont Colleges to use as a means to address institutional erasure of memory of activism. The platform attempts to provide a way for campus activists to rewrite the history of the colleges by exposing the work that past activists have done surrounding any variety of issues. In other words, campus activists can find particular issues in the archive that they may want to organize around and can use the information they find about past actions to create a narrative that may be different than the one that the colleges write about themselves. The paper offers a roadmap for campus activists to practice collective agency through its discussion of strengthening meshworks, new conceptions of time, and a process of un-containing. The paper argues that the project has the potential to disrupt the pattern where valuable memories of organizing are contained from the community as student activists graduate, as the colleges confine student dissent into single-issue movements, and through a normalizing history of the colleges. The paper proposes that un-containing takes place in the archive as campus activists create critical histories of the Claremont Colleges.

About me

My name is Sophia Rizzolo and I have had the opportunity to attend Pitzer College and major in International & Intercultural Studies. I wrote this paper to accompany a campus activist archive platform as a way to apply what I have learned at the Claremont Colleges. Throughout my time at Pitzer I began to learn about the importance of campus organizing and the distinct power it had to challenge the status quo. As I began to learn more about organizing and interact with campus organizers, it became clear that there was a need for a platform to preserve memories of actions as to challenge institutional erasure of memory. This project is an attempt to fulfill that need; I hope that this project will be useful and that it will come to reflect the powerful body of organizers on these campuses.

Introduction: What is the goal of this project?

The Claremont Colleges claim to be peaceful campuses where students come to learn how to address the problems that the world faces in the 21st century; they claim to be a harmonious and safe place for all students situated in a quiet residential neighborhood where students come to be taught the tools to successfully impact the world. It is necessary to disrupt the narratives that the Claremont Colleges tell about themselves to expose the ways that students, faculty, and staff experience a different, often more violent, version of the colleges. These disruptions take place when new histories critique dominant power structures. This paper proposes an archival platform where campus activists--students, faculty, staff, or friends of the community who offer alternative histories of the colleges--can share histories of organizing around any issue(s). The platform will house histories that reach back into the decades and those that are currently deliberated on campus. Activists groups have the ability to create folders where they can consistently add documents, posters, fliers, videos, photos, etc. and they have the ability to see other folders with different and just as complex histories. The potential for additions to be made at any time and the ability for organizers to see other work is the site at which new knowledge--a new history of the colleges--is produced. The alternative histories that already exist in organizing groups can be linked with other histories and a new, more comprehensive view of the colleges will come into view.

Moments of dissent can be preserved within the archive as a way to maintain a critical awareness of actions and choices that the Claremont Colleges make. Often times, moments of dissent lead to contention--protests, sit-ins, die-ins, hunger strikes, prayer vigils, letters of demands, etc.--where critiques are mounted and if some of those moments are preserved, have the potential to challenge the narrative that the colleges so carefully maintain. When the history

of the colleges is refashioned, documents, emails, posters, videos, photos, and many other records are produced. The archive is a place for those records to be stored and used. Any student, alumni, faculty, staff, or friend of the college can add to the archive, they do not need to be a part of an organized group or consider themselves an activist. This paper will refer to anyone that makes a contribution to the archive as a ‘campus activist.’ Campus activists have the ability to add and interact with the archive and the additions that have been made to it, however they cannot delete anything from the archive because periodically the submissions will be printed and placed into a physical archive at the Honnold Mudd Special Collections. An alternative history of the colleges will be maintained in the library archives so others may continue to produce knowledge about these institutions.

The goal of this project is broadly to challenge the power of state and how it (re)produces knowledge and to have an impact on organizing in a broader sense. The project aims to disrupt and challenge the process of forgetting as a means of history-making, to point out the ways that freedom is contained in particular institutions, to offer a process of un-containment as an agentic move toward collective justice, and to rather re-think time as a resource for organizers to use as a way of imagining the future. Freedom is contained in Claremont Colleges and in other institutions because they maintain manicured narratives and histories that obscure alternatives that may reach toward justice. In other words, because of the distinct and cultivated history of the Claremont Colleges, alternatives are not obvious; a process of un-containing suggests that new histories must be written through campus activist narratives that challenge the constructed history of the colleges and expose alternatives. This can only be done if the process is takes place through collective agency or the open and connective process of knowledge production that is often in tension with the narrative constructed by the Claremont Colleges.

Un-containment is also important to this project as a means to decenter whiteness and capitalism as they relate to the Claremont Colleges. The process of un-containment suggests that contentious actions on campus must not be encased. In other words, actions that call into question whiteness and capitalism as a means of criticism, decenter their importance. Whiteness and capitalism are not the cornerstones of this project. George Lipsitz in his essay *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness* suggests that whiteness is embedded in the culture of the United States and suggests that the term “American” is often equated to whiteness (Lipsitz 11). Lipsitz sites Walter Benjamin and suggests that in order to decenter whiteness, “precise awareness of the present moment requires an understanding of the existence and the destructive consequences of the possessive investment in whiteness that surreptitiously shapes so much of our public and private lives” (Lipsitz, 11). Importantly, Lipsitz is not suggesting that simply knowing the intimate relationship between whiteness and power is enough to challenge it, he suggests that decentering it to expose its malice might instead work to change the power of whiteness. Lipsitz examines the connections between colonialism, conquest, slavery, segregation, immigrant exclusion, and indigenous genocide (Lipsitz, 13), however, he does not discuss the ways that capitalism intersect with and undergird the project of whiteness.

An analysis of whiteness and capitalism is outside the scope of this paper, however Steve G. Hoffmann makes an important link between universities and capitalism in his article *Academic Capitalism*. Hoffmann outlines the ways that these institutions of higher learning have shifted their focus toward research and such that benefits corporations, and the labor market is marked by inequality (Hoffmann, 13). Hoffmann suggests, “while universities have long been deeply intertwined with markets and states, a series of relatively novel trends have emerged in the contemporary United States to warrant the term “academic capitalism”” (Hoffmann, 13). He

suggests that throughout time it has been argued that universities have transformed into another site of capital production precisely because of the potential to harness research and other knowledge to further state and corporate initiatives. Hoffmann argues that academic capitalism “now typically refers not so much to the colonization or capture of higher education by industry, but to a more profound blurring of public-private boundaries, in which the material base and normative assumptions of academic life are being transformed” (Hoffmann, 13). Academic capitalism suggests that the Claremont Colleges have different goals than the students that attend the schools, as the colleges may want to further blur the lines between profit and academic endeavors.

Hoffmann’s work therefore suggests that this project highlights the moments when campus activist ask the colleges to set aside the profit margin and take seriously the changes and demands that campus activists are making. The platform is therefore not inherently anti-capitalist, but it does not center capital production at its core. In addition, the project does not center whiteness in its alternative history because it collects and highlights non-white narratives that may expose the malice of whiteness as Lipsitz discusses. The project should begin to expose the ways that the Claremont Colleges are firmly rooted in capital production and rest in the power of whiteness and provide a platform for campus organizers to begin to critique those structures of power.

The Claremont Colleges—and most educational institutions—are built upon a timeline that consistently defines when students can begin school, when the students have to leave campus, and defines when specific events occur. The timeline manifests in the form of emails, faculty meetings, various college council meetings, and particularly by comments made by each of the college Presidents. The timeline created by the Claremont Colleges is textured with clear

beginnings, clear endings, and quietly remain inside the outbox of various administrative employees. The timeline is linear and relies on students returning to and leaving the colleges at distinct times, like summer and winter break; particular events occur between those distinct breaks and often the breaks work as a tool of erasure and obstruction. In order to refashion the history of the Claremont Colleges, we can rethink time as *time* in a kind of *time*-line, where there are constantly demarcations of events, these events, in this new kind of *time*, hark back to a previous event in a curving motion that both reaches back and points forward. There is a kind a futurity and reaching to the past through this project only to be created and used by the present organizer. The project is a way to create knowledge that opens, rather than contains organizing, it aims to imagine what is possible, and it is a project of liberation and resistance. This project aims to keep records as a way to push up against and transcend containment, which challenges previous conceptions of record keeping that attempt to create and maintain knowledge containers or disciplines. The processes of keeping records from the 18th century, as they call back to scientific racism, work to fragment the complex life-worlds of organizers, the connections across movements, and the ways in which organizing always addresses more than one issue and stands in solidarity with many other organizers whose goals are infinitely as complex. This project is a means of centering those complex life-worlds and connections between and through issues and movements. The project asks the collective history making to work outside of containers and to strengthen the collective agency and meshworks that already exists through *time*. *Time* and collective agency take up power as resistance and challenge the power of institutions, in this case at the Claremont Colleges. *Time* asks students to look back at previous organizing and imagine what still can be done, and collective agency responds by honoring the connections between any actions. A broad goal of this project is to create New Freedoms that work within history. These

New Freedoms are not seeking an empire; rather they attempt to capture the goal of organizers throughout time: multiple and complex there can be not one freedom but many, and they overlap, deepen each other, and mix, constantly being produced everyday. In short, this project creates new--alternative--histories and allows organizing groups to release themselves from the containers that they have been circumscribed within.

A New Sense of *Time*

Michel Foucault across his work in *The History of Sexuality* and *Discipline and Punish* are helpful for this project to think about how both ‘bio-power’ and ‘disciplined time’ alter the experience of a subject in the state and how the state reaches through the colleges to impact the subject. This section will work to more clearly define how time is an apparatus for state and institutional power and work to describe how a new sense of time will be helpful for campus activists in maintaining collective agency and more broadly can help us imagine what collective agency can look like across a larger scale. In order to imagine what any kind of collective agency might look like, Linda Tuhiwai Smith makes an important disruption in this paper’s conception of time in her book *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous People*. Although Tuhiwai’s work is not the only work that has conceptualized the impact of colonial perceptions of time and what it might look like to imagine a world outside of it, her book makes an important assertion about transforming the relationship between knowledge production and colonized peoples. In order to imagine a world where collective agency is possible, it is important to work to address violence(s) that occur within the state and how they reach through various institutions. Tuhiwai Smith’s work importantly attempts to imagine that alongside the reader. Foucault and Tuhiwai Smith’s work both challenge how time has currently been constructed, how it impacts the subject/student, and what important moves can be made to resist the discipline of time.

In order to avoid any particular kind of slippage, it is important to expose the State and the University as two sides of the same coin; time for the state is the same conception in the university. The academic institutions of the United States are embedded within the culture of the country. This culture was built upon a systematic genocide of indigenous people and non-human beings and enslavement of black people. Because the culture of the United States functions as a result of those two historical processes—whose ramifications reverberate today—the culture and state are therefore anti-black and anti-indigenous. In order to more clearly express why this claim is true, it is important to understand hegemony as Antonio Gramsci describes it and to simultaneously understand why the consistent investment in whiteness as explored by George Lipsitz comes as a result of hegemony. Gramsci firstly identifies two levels of society: “one that can be called “private,” and that of “political society” or “the State” (10). He goes on to relate hegemony to the two structures by stating: “these two levels correspond on the one hand to the function of “hegemony” which the dominant group exercises throughout society and on the other hand to that of “direct domination” or that of the state (Gramsci 10). The function of hegemony is to rule the masses by the expectations, and laws, etc. of the dominant group. The governed group experiences two forms of control because of this: one that is rooted in the state and the other that is rooted in the culture. Gramsci points out that the governed approve of being governed because they approve of it via elections and because the state “also “educates” this consent, by means of the political and syndical associations” (10). In other words, the culture of the United States of America and its reproduction and expression in the university and college maintain both similar goals and means to the end of those goals.

In many ways, the college student subject is socialized to mimic a factory worker; both roles as the factory worker and student are imperative in understanding expressions of bio-power

and maintenance of disciplines. Michel Foucault introduces the concept of bio-power in his book *The History of Sexuality*. The beginning of the period of bio-power as Foucault describes it “...was an explosion of numerous and diverse techniques for achieving the subjugation of bodies and the control of populations” (*History of Sexuality* 140). Foucault is describing an important shift around the 18th century when bodies were seen to constitute populations by the way of techniques such as “...universities, secondary schools, barracks, workshops,; there was also an emergence, in the field of political practices and economic observation, of the problems of birthrate, longevity, public health, housing and migration” (*History of Sexuality* 140). A combination of assigning bodies subject status and doing so via various apparatus’ allows the bodies to not only be sorted, but further defined and created with these new disciplines. Importantly, Foucault also asserts that there was another important shift in the 18th century: where there was an acute attention paid to life “characterized a power whose highest function was perhaps no longer to kill, but to invest in life through and through” (*History of Sexuality* 139). When considering the student and factory workers, Foucault’s theory of bio-power suggests that each of the bodies has been categorized and observed in a way that allows them to be inserted into the “machinery of production and the adjustment of the phenomena of population of economic processes” (*History of Sexuality* 141). In other words, the creation of sexuality, the shifting of the action sex into a way of being, asserted that not only would the category of sexuality be discrete and obvious, it would in many ways be categorized as a way to provide a population to the state. The concept of bio-power suggests that the state, through its various apparatuses, defines the body and dispenses life as it sees fit, rather than dispensing death. Take for example a man who commits sodomy on another man, his actions would categorize him as homosexual, and throughout time he would be placed into different

apparatuses of the state that not only produce knowledge about him to confirm his existence but work to create places where capital can multiply. This man might be placed into a mental institution during the 19th century, by which himself and others would need to be taken care of and studied, creating a need for an institution of care as well as a body of knowledge that asserts power over him. This practice is carried out by the state in order to dispense life to its citizens, the bare necessity of life in order to continue to expand capital. If the university is part of the state, and of course not in the way that Foucault had suggested of France, but in the way that the universities in the United States maintain and practice the laws of the country, suggests that it too is still an arm of the state, just one where the profits of the students are siphoned off to private capitalists. The university works to maintain disciplines by constantly creating knowledge within those disciplines and by practicing the laws of the state in the name of profit.

Alongside *The History of Sexuality* it is important to discuss another of Foucault's important works, *Discipline and Punish*. Although his book is important in parsing out the ways in which power and discipline found in prisons are refracted in schools, barracks, and hospitals the scope of the book is beyond the reach of this project. In the future, it would be insightful to understand the ways in which schools, from elementary schools to universities, and prisons continue to mirror they ways that each of them practice punishment and contain organizing. *Discipline and Punish* is important for this project because it comes into discussion with the concept of bio-power in Foucault's other work, and suggests the importance of time, which is important for this analysis. Foucault makes particular remarks about time. His revelations about time will be projected up against his discussion of bio-power in the next section of this paper in hopes that it will begin to expose the ways in which the university uses time as a way to manage students and campus activists. In order to strengthen the analysis of Foucault's writing, a part of

the text *How to Read Foucault's Discipline and Punish* by Anne Schwan and Stephan Shapiro will be used. Foucault begins to address time, directly, in a sub-section of *Discipline and Punish*, entitled "The Control of Activity." In this subsection, he begins to describe the ways in which activity has begun to be controlled in four distinct ways, the time table, "the temporal elaboration of the act," (151) the "correlation of the body and the gesture" (152), and "body object articulation" (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 153). He begins the section with the discussion of time and its influence. Foucault suggests that the time-table "...was no doubt suggested by the monastic communities" (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 149). In many ways, the time-table and the monastery bells that marked each hour began to set a rhythm to the rest of the institutions and from the 19th century reached into the lives of wage workers (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 149). Foucault importantly notes an important shift in the conception of time in the 19th century, "but an attempt is also made to ensure the quality of the time used: constant supervision, the pressures of supervisors, the elimination of anything that might disturb or distract; it is a question of constituting a totally useful time" (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 150). Schwan and Shapiro suggest that the changed sense of time that Foucault suggests creates utility "created by the 'temporal elaboration of the act,' which gives a timed value to physical acts" (151). The importance of time is therefore works to articulate actions in a precise manner and as Foucault asserts, disciplines the body in a way that makes the body more similar to machine (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011). Foucault's final assertion, exhaustive use, suggests that it is "...forbidden to waste time, which was counted by God and paid for by men; the time-table was to eliminate the danger of wasting it – a moral offence and economic dishonesty" (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 154). In many ways, Foucault is working to describe how time both enters into the body and works to maintain an order in the body precisely for the purpose of being productive.

Despite the fact that Foucault uses his assertions to make claims about the factory, in many ways his claims prove that this particular version of time is pervasive in society and dispensed by the state, today.

Foucault's construction of time as discussed above reflects how the university implements control and how students experience time. Because there is a corporeal element to time, the students experience the university through physical and temporal planes and have affective responses. The Claremont Colleges, because they are embedded within a larger social state and global topography where capital and the embodied changes from the 18th century that Foucault outlines throughout his work, depend on time to gain the most profit out of their students while spending the least amount of money. The Claremont Colleges therefore layout each semester with a start date and an end date, shuffle students into and out of their dorm rooms, and send emails about precise events that occur on campus. In creating a specific timeline, the Claremont Colleges are expertly able to prevent any kind of student contentions or concerns from cascading into each other. In other words, through the function of time as Foucault has outlined, the Claremont Colleges contains student actions by making distinct the actions they take and methodically splicing student actions in attempts to stifle dissent. In *The History Of Sexuality* Foucault suggests that creation of disciplines works as a result of bio-power. Bio-power, in short, shifts the control from power to punish and to make dead to the power to dispense life.

Foucault's close examination of the perception of time as it has evolved provides a limited view of the world, albeit revealing. It is important in this section of the paper to suggest not only that there are other perceptions of time that organize the world but subsequently social topography. Linda Tuhiwai Smith both recounts some of the processes of colonization and how

they influence research, but she also imagines a new way in which to conduct research. Although her work is imperative to refashion and imagine forms of decolonized knowledge production, an intense analysis of her work is not within the scope of this paper. However, further critiques of Foucault's work, of the perception of time, and of the university institution via Tuhiwai Smith's work would further unmask the pervasive power of colonization and aid in the processes of decolonization.

Tuhiwai Smith discusses time throughout her book, and in many ways expounds the ways in which time has been used as a tool for colonization and the ways in which conceptions of time resist colonization. Tuhiwai Smith does not work to define what time had looked like in the past, as that might be a slippage in the goal of her book; rather, she suggests that there are intimate ties between and through process of colonization and violence(s) of time. Tuhiwai Smith uses the example of Joseph Banks who was a cook on the some of the first ships to voyage to the South Pacific (111). He recorded nearly everything on time-tables essentially trying to temporally map out how people in that region of the world organized and went about their lives. However, his final conclusion about the experience was "...that he was unable to get a 'complete idea' of how people divided time" (Tuhiwai Smith 112). This suggests that despite his ability to collect data, he was unable to fully understand and define how time was used. His reflections suggest two things. Firstly, it suggests that the ways in which "*colonized time*" cannot comprehend anything outside of itself (Tuhiwai Smith 64). Secondly, Banks' reflections suggest that time can *be* colonized but there is something remaining that maintains and controls the cosmological organizations of the subjects life. In other words, Tuhiwai Smith suggests that the conception of colonized time is not pervasive and not all powerful in organizing time.

Tuhiwai Smith suggests time is a tool that is used by the colonizer to produce knowledge about the colonized and to place the subject onto a sliding scale of progress. In other words, she importantly asserts that the implementation of time is connected to the Enlightenment and processes of modernization. Tuhiwai Smith suggests that the colonized conception of time has defined “what has come to count as history in contemporary society” and she goes on the point out that this “is a contentious issue for many indigenous communities because it is not only the story of domination; it is also a story which assumes that there is a ‘point in time’ which was ‘prehistoric’” (113). Tuhiwai Smith’s discussion of time makes an important interruption in Foucault’s construction of time: time, as Foucault describes is outward looking from the colonial project. The organizational structure of time does in fact refract back to the colonial polis, through settler colonial societies, yet the impetus is very much rooted in the original colonial project(s) that traversed the world making new knowledge about the “other.” Now, there is a clear distinction between colonized-time and an emergent variety of other times.

It is important to note that this project is not inherently decolonizing and nor does it claim to encompass any kind of indigenous conceptions of time, despite its possibility to do so. The project will only become a kind of decolonizing tool once deeply reaching and transformative relationships are built between students of indigenous and settler decent, between the community of indigenous people in the area and the Claremont Colleges, and between the land and the settlers. Reciprocal relationships need to be built between those who are indigenous and of settler decent in order to critically address power and the multiple techniques it embodies because indigenous existence in itself challenges power. Therefore, this project is a pivotal point in which students can imagine what decolonization might look like in practice and across time. This is not to say that conceptions of time would revert back to those prior to colonization or prior to the

changes that Foucault traces from the 17th century to the 1970s. However the project pushes up against the power that both Foucault and Tuhai Smith have exposed and it asks us to consider what new episteme might do to organize the world in a new way.

As discussed in the introduction, this paper theorizes a new conception of time, or *time*. *Time* works to expose the ways in which students who organize collectively interact with the past, future, and present. In other words, there is organization of the life-world of students that is outside of the school work, that cannot be commodified or translated into the factory line, office building, Wall Street, classroom, etc. Rather, the world of the student is organized by consistent arching backwards and leaping forward in temporal organization. The Claremont Colleges constantly challenge this life-world organization by implementing a time-line in which students follow: the semester system, four-year graduation track, and creation of distinct events. In other words, the Claremont Colleges create a history where there is clear progress on the terms of capital extraction. Therefore, this project is not about writing a history of contentious movements at the Claremont Colleges, but a pivot point in *time*, a shift from one organization of life to another—one where temporal organization is structured differently, and it centers and reflects student collective action.

History, Memory, and Knowledge Production

History, memory and knowledge production are intimately connected and their productions have important implications for the present and future. The campus activist organizing platform that this paper discusses works to produce both knowledge of activism and organizing and an alternative history of the Claremont Colleges. This section seeks to discuss how knowledge creates history and how the dense scholarship of memory may obscure the goals of this project. Importantly, this section takes up the argument that history is varied and there

have been and will be many different versions of history. Karl Marx, Michel Foucault, and Howard Zinn have importantly re-written the history of the West and have challenged the structures of power that maintain a particular history. Marx, Foucault, and Zinn challenge the non-violent nature of the history of progress in the West and their work can be an access point to critique the West and Eurocentric power, but their work can also importantly suggest the importance of providing alternative histories. This section of the paper will also discuss the ways that history and knowledge production hide crucial moments, like Martin Luther King Jr.'s *Beyond Vietnam* speech in which he begins to make clear the violent goals of the United States of America. Finally this section will suggest that preserving the history of campus activist work at the Claremont Colleges will importantly provide an alternative history to the colleges, but it will also prevent particular actions from erasure.

Famously, in *The Communist Manifesto*, Karl Marx suggests that there is a new epoch of history that organizes the world. Marx suggests that this new history is not unlike past histories precisely because “The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles” (Marx 1). However, he goes on to say that this particular moment in history is defined by the distinction between the Bourgeoisie and the Proletariat (Marx 1). He traces how colonialism, the transition out of Feudalism, the rise of markets and industry (Marx 1) have built up the Bourgeoisie. Marx challenges the perception of progress by retracing the ways that the bourgeoisie came to power: through plunder. This alternate history positions Marx to make a radical suggestion to alter the status quo, he proposes the practice of communism as an alternative to the violent and classed capitalist structure. Marx’s move here is important, he retraces the history of capital and rather than relying on narratives of progress a new history is

formed that reevaluates structures of power and the organization of the world. Marx suggests that this new history can also position him to suggest what a new world and future might look like.

In response to Marx, Foucault suggests that power is not in exploitation, as Marx discusses about classes, but rather power rests in various channels and discourses, which “reach the most tenuous and individual modes of behavior” all of which can have “effects that may be those of refusal, blockage and invalidation, but also incitement and validation” or the “polymorphous techniques of power” (Foucault *History of Sexuality* 26). Foucault provides yet another version of history throughout his lifeworks but particularly in his book *The History of Sexuality*. In the book he discusses the ways that control have shaped the world and how control has infiltrated the Western body, family, and organization of space and time. Foucault suggests that “by placing the advent of the age of repression in the seventeenth century, after hundreds of years of open spaces and free expression, one adjusts it to coincide with the development of capitalism: it becomes an integral part of the bourgeois order” (Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, 5). He suggests that prior to the seventeenth century, society was more free and open, particularly around the topic of sex and sexuality. He goes on to trace the creation of disciplines in the “discursive explosion” (Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, 17) and how this allowed the codified use of particular kinds of discourse. In other words, Foucault traces a history of discourse around sex as a tool for pluralizing techniques of power and dispensing of life. His work importantly suggests that alternative histories can be critiqued and interrupted to make more clear structures of power.

To more clearly understand how alternative histories might look outside of the world of critical theory, Howard Zinn his book, *The People's History of the United States*, the power of interruptions of national narratives will become clear. Zinn begins the book with a chapter about

the history of indigenous Americans and recounted many of Bartolome de Las Casas's reflections. He was a Spanish historian who worked to describe the initial interactions between and through the Spanish settlers in Haiti and the Americas and the indigenous peoples. Zinn exposes the ways that Las Casas's work has been glossed over and used to create a national narrative. Zinn writes

“thus began the history, five hundred years ago, of the European invasion of the Indian settlements in the Americas. That beginning, when you read Las Casas--even if his figures are exaggerations (were there 3 million Indians to begin with, as he says, or 250,000, as modern historians calculate?)--is conquest, slavery, death. When we read the history books given to children in the United States, it all starts with heroic adventure--there is no bloodshed--and Columbus Day is a celebration” (Zinn 7).

Zinn importantly highlights the erasure of violence when most European Descended American historians write the history of early colonization in the Americas. Zinn goes on to discuss how his historical project rejects the dominant historiographical practices. Zinn writes that the goal of this project while “still, understanding the complexities, this book will be skeptical of governments and their attempts, through politics and culture, to ensnare ordinary people in a giant web of nationhood pretending to a common interest” (Zinn 10). When the book is written from a perspective that is critical of dominant structures of power then new forms of knowledge and new histories are produced. Although Zinn is not the first (or last person) to consider the perspective of indigenous people in history, but his position as a white historian does challenge the power of normalizing historical narratives. Zinn's book provides an important example of the potential power alternative histories can do in challenging power. If Claremont College campus activists use particular actions that have occurred to create alternative histories, then they will be positioned as Zinn was. In creating a new history, Claremont College activists can challenge the dominant narrative that works to obscure the experiences of particular groups of people, particularly those who are black, brown, people of color, LGBTQIA+, non-binary and female, etc..

Alternative histories can be powerful in critiquing structures of power, but it is also important to recognize the ways that some histories continued to be erased. A sanitized history often times takes into account the narratives that support its goals and ignore and purposefully overwrite the actions that challenge that narrative. An important example of sanitized history can be seen in the retelling of Martin Luther King Jr.'s work and life, and particularly how little his speech *Beyond Vietnam* is taught and addressed. In the last few years of his life, King began organizing around civil rights and its intersection with class. *Beyond Vietnam* is an important moment in King's career because he begins to connect the dots between class, race, and United States Imperialism. In his speech, he addresses his past silence on the war, and responds that "their questions hit home, and I knew that I could never again raise my voice against the violence of the oppressed in the ghettos without having first spoken clearly to the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today -- my own government" (Luther King Jr. 1967). He evokes images of black and white soldiers dying in Vietnam on television screens as juxtaposed to images and struggles of segregation. His speech leaves the audience asking how this nation could attempt to achieve democracy or justice in one part of the world but so epically fail in providing the same in its own state. In highlighting this paradox, King exposes how the United States requires a divided nation through the strife during the civil rights movement so it can undertake its violent projects in places like Vietnam. This important speech challenges the validity of democracy in and the power of United States of America, and yet it is not a part of national narrative about Martin Luther King Jr.. Alternative histories must therefore highlight these instances.

The process of writing an alternative history to the Claremont Colleges asks campus activists to take into account instances of actions that have been obscured or erased overtime. This project has collected an number of alternative histories, but one that importantly challenges

the Claremont Colleges history and the city of Claremont occurred in 1999. A young black man was fatally shot by the Claremont Police Department in January, his name was Irvin Landrum. The Los Angeles Times reported on the shooting and the subsequent rally that occurred in front of Town Hall. The article discusses some of the details of the shooting and the reactions of Claremont residents, and includes that “The U.S. Department of Justice is investigating the shooting for possible civil rights violations, and an official for the department said Wednesday that the federal investigation could take months to complete” (Winton 1999). In 2004 the newspaper posted a follow-up article discussing the settlement that the city undertook with Landrum’s family, but the LA times reports that “The settlement involved no admission of guilt by the city. It closes the books on a shooting that prompted numerous protests and prayer vigils” (Woodson, 2003). In short, the general history created by the Claremont Police Department surrounding the event erased any actions from the family or community in pressuring the department to continue their investigations. However, an addition to the campus activist archive platform that comes from the Intercollegiate Women’s Studies Coordinating Committee provided details from the college faculty that highlighted not only the activism that occurred after the shooting and it importantly exposed how the Claremont mayor has been in effort to “suppress full and open discussion of a public issue; [rather] to silence and intimidate Claremont citizens who have every right to speak their own minds and hold their elected representative accountable to their actions” (IWS Coordinating Members 1999). Although many of the documents that describe how the organizing took place are not yet available, the document that was submitted to the platform offers an alternative history to the event. Importantly, the document offers a jumping off point for a more critical history of the city Claremont and its relationship to the Claremont Colleges to be created.

The organizing platform that accompanies this project will not only create alternative histories but it will also act as a place for those histories to be transformed and re-fashioned as more documents make their way into the platform. The platform can importantly preserve actions that challenge the narratives that the Claremont Colleges choose to share about themselves, as a means of challenging power. If the platform works to create history and create alternatives histories, then it is important to make a distinction between history/knowledge production and memory. The scholarship around memory is dense and may work to obscure the efficacy of the project precisely because the project works to rewrite history. In other words, this project will use memory in the colloquial terminology as a means of expressing a particular history of an event. However, this project will not discuss memory production as it may distract from the power the project has.

Collective Agency and Meshworks

Campus Activists do not exist in vacuums, rather they are intimately interconnected with the world around them precisely because they have life-worlds that traverse both the campuses and the communities that surround the Claremont Colleges. This section works to describe the ways that campus activists create and maintain collective agency. Arturo Escobar importantly explains the ways that the world can be remade and how knowledge can be reconstructed in his chapter *Actors, Networks, and New Knowledge Procedures; Social Movements and the Paradigmatic Transition in the Sciences*. He takes up a discussion of the way that anti-globalization movements are constructed and how they can surmount change. Escobar writes:

“Meshworks are self-organizing and grow in unplanned directions (akin to Deleuze/Guattari’s rhizomes, 1987); they are made up of diverse elements, including of course human and nonhumans, organisms and machines; they usually exist hybridized with other meshworks and hierarchies; they accomplish the articulation of heterogeneous elements without imposing uniformity; and they are determined by the degree of connectivity that enables them to become self-sustaining” (Escobar, 278).

In his definition of meshworks, Escobar underscores the complex life-worlds that activists already inhabit and how it informs and occupies their work. In other words, the activists cannot be removed from the life-worlds that they inhabit as they are the realities from which they surmount resistance. He also suggests, importantly, that the differences between activists and their movements does not limit them from overlapping with other movements and realities.

Escobar's discussion of difference as it relates to meshworks is important in structuring resistance because it takes into account current political and social experiences and folds them into experience and practice of meshworks. Escobar suggests that "many movements struggle against various forms of power simultaneously (e.g. ethnic domination, ecological degradation, patriarchy and economic exploitation)" (Escobar, 280). He goes on to say that "for the same reason, meshwork strategies are pluralistic; they take difference-in-equality as a point of departure and render obsolete the us/them distinction, although without erasing it for obvious political reasons" (Escobar, 280). If campus movements at the Claremont Colleges are to be analyzed using a meshworks approach *and* if the platform that this project proposes is a way for campus activists to work within a meshworks shema, then the linking between and through groups has the potential to enact broad scale change that includes difference. In other words, the campus activist platform can be used to support and build meshworks networks that account for difference and are constantly reactive. The meshworks schema does not streamline or homogenize campus activism and organizing. Rather, it works to expose the ways that campus activists interact with the political world around them and how difference is an imperative factor in resistance to various forms of power. Escobar discusses the distinct propensity for knowledge production about the impacts of globalization between a variety of actors on global and local levels in Colombia and their responses to the problems the phenomenon imposes (Escobar, 285).

Escobar's example suggests that through and precisely because of difference, resistance to power can take place.

Escobar's definition of meshworks can articulate the ways that various movements can create actions and other actions from another group may also occur around the same time. For example, if campus activists plan a rally around one issue say, supporting a student whose scholarship had been revoked, it may be more likely that other actions, like the occupation of a College Council Meeting at Pitzer College might also occur. Because the campus climate shifts towards mobilization and there may be overlap between some members or participants of the rally and the occupation, the meshworks of campus activism is articulated towards action. In other words, if one group of campus activists plan an action it is more likely that other actions will take place around the same time because of the connections between actors in the movements. Escobar does not use the language of collective agency, but meshworks will undergird the way that campus activists exercise their agency because of the connections that organize their life-worlds.

Escobar's description of meshworks is a rejection of and response to the modern and its totalizing power that manifests in its globalizing hegemony and protection of the interests of the rich (Escobar 289). It does so precisely because meshworks takes into account difference--which is important to the modern project--but it does so as a means of highlighting connections between activist groups rather than breaking those connections. Various activist groups around the Claremont Colleges campuses produce their own knowledge through particular kinds of critique of the colleges, inter/national activist networks, and specific issues that they address, which is unique in comparison to academic disciplines despite the fact that both entities produce knowledge. Although Michel Foucault suggests that disciplines and the institutions that uphold

them exist as a result of biopower in the *History of Sexuality*, the mere existence of the disciplines continue to structure and inform the world. A discussion of bio-power and Foucault will be taken up in a later part of this paper, but his critique should not ignore the ways that disciplines continue to produce knowledge and direct and effect the world. In other words, disciplines do not only exist as a way to exercise power, but they exist as site where knowledge is produced. Importantly, Orlando Fals-Borda and Luis E. Mora-Osejo write in their chapter entitled *Beyond Eurocentrism: Systematic Knowledge in Tropical Context. A Manifesto*, about the ways that specifically Global South disciplines can reject eurocentrism and intellectual colonialism. The two authors come from very different academic traditions but write the manifesto from the perspective of the Global South that calls for a system of knowledge that reflects the Colombian reality (Fals-Borda & Mora-Osejo 399).

The system of knowledge that Fals-Borda and Mora-Osejo propose a blend of local historical knowledge and disciplined knowledge that they had learned in their formal training as a means to achieve something that functions in their life-world. Fals-Borda and Mora-Osejo write about context and suggest that it may mean something that is a “dynamic, open phenomenon that implies a respect for, and concern with, meanings, symbols, discourses, values and norms connected with a complex time-and-space dimension that is ecological, social and cultural” (Fals-Borda & Mora-Osejo 399). Providing context to knowledge production de-centers Euro-knowledge because it considers the paradigms that shape reality of those locales which are “more open than those imported from advanced countries, could offer constructive ways out of our problems” (Fals-Borda & Mora-Osejo 401). In other words, providing context can importantly shift the kind of knowledge that is produced and thus challenge the European power-knowledge system because it is no longer centered in the analysis of the life-world of the actor.

Although Fals-Borda and Mora-Osejo speak of Colombia and how contextualizing knowledge de-centers Euro-knowledge, their work is important in articulating the potential power contextualizing knowledge can be when resisting dominant structures of power and exercising collective agency. Again, the explicit term ‘collective agency’ does not appear in the work of Fals-Borda and Mora-Osejo, but it speaks to an imagined organization or platform of knowledge that calls for community as a means to solving a problem or set of them. The Claremont College activist meshwork, that this project intends to grow and strengthen, encompasses a number of variations of knowledge production--many of which are firmly rooted in critical Euro-centric form--that address structures of power in attempts to solve problems. Fals-Borda and Mora-Osejo call for a kind of open and participant-centered knowledge production and action as a means to resist Eurocentric homogenization of place. The organizing platform that this paper proposes may be an important echo to the kind of open site of knowledge production that Fals-Borda and Mora-Osejo discuss in their chapter. Again, it is important to acknowledge the stark differences between local knowledge production in Colombia and their particular position to critique and resist Eurocentrism in the academy, but their work can inspire similar critiques of power from within the Eurocentric academy. A knowledge of place across sites of knowledge production importantly suggests that there is potential to resist structures of power as collective agency.

This paper will use Escobar’s proposal of meshworks to undergird Fals-Borda and Mora-Osejo’s proposal for an open and connective process of knowledge production to direct collective agency. Campus activists on the Claremont College campuses work within dense meshworks, and the proposed organizing platform will more clearly articulate the ways that actions are a part of collective action. In other words, the platform can record--and even predict--

the connections between actions as a means of collective agency. Campus activists do not see each of the problems or structures of power as singular, so the organizing platform must in response provide ways for meshworks and open knowledge production to be seen.

Collectivizing Histories of Action

In order to fully center and reflect student action, it is important to rely on and strengthen meshworks which expose and rewrite histories of action from the perspectives of a variety of campus activists. The knowledge, or potential for knowledge, that this project has, is in its ability to expose how campus activists continue to work toward similar, overlapping, and entangled freedoms. This project also importantly preserves memories of the ways that the schools reject, bar, and veto student resistance as a way for these apparatuses to be more clearly exposed. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak is helpful here in introducing an important relationship between resistance, knowledge production, and justice. In Spivak's interview with Brad Evans, *When Law is not Justice*, Spivak suggests that knowing the narratives of particular people can open up analytical space to consider new knowledge or new potentials for freedom. Spivak speaks broadly of nation states to say that

“In globalization as such, when the nation states are working in the interest of global capital, democracy is reduced to body counting, which often works against educated judgments. The state is trapped in the demands of finance capital. Resistance must know about financial regulation in order to demand it. This is bloodless resistance, and it has to be learned. We must produce knowledge of these seemingly abstract globalized systems so that we can challenge the social violence of unregulated capitalism” (“When Law is Not Justice”).

Despite the fact that Spivak is discussing large scale and broad phenomena that traverse nations, her examination of structures of power and the possibility to resist them can be slightly rescaled to see the potential for resistance at the Claremont Colleges. Spivak's definition of resistance is rooted in global contextualization of struggles and intimate knowledge of the global phenomenon

that create them to challenge the violence done onto the masses (“When Law is not Justice”). Spivak displays how the nation states work to continue the project of capital production, and in many ways, the Claremont Colleges work similarly to further capital production through endowments and tuition and to dispense laws or rules that prevent any threats to the production of capital. The board of trustees maintain power at the Claremont Colleges and expose the direct influence that capital has over decision making. Spivak goes on to suggest that the resistance must be aware of the structures in place, the goals that they have, and to produce knowledge about the abstract systems. The platform acts as an opportunity to place memories alongside each other to expose the abstract power of the Colleges as a way to create knowledge to challenge the structures in the future.

If campus activists are able to collect histories of both successful attempts at organizing and those when movements were quelled, dismissed, and vetoed, then important versions of the history of the Claremont Colleges are able to be uncovered. If the colleges are complicit in purposefully quelling student actions and this complicity is brought into tension with the colleges investment in particular students, then they’re goals become more clear. If students, for example, organize to propose that the colleges should practice Boycott, Divest and Sanctions (BDS) against Israel and their actions are blocked on multiple occasions, these actions begin to overlap with those from the past to expose patterns of decision making by the administration. The Claremont Colleges might in one action suggest that BDS is an action that is too radical and in another action support or even encourage corporations like Google to hire from the colleges. In a Bloomberg.com article, Mark Bergen discusses the ways that the Google corporation works with the United States of America military to produce smarter military equipment, which heightens and speed of the impact of violence (Bergen, “Google Renounces AI Weapons; Will Still Work

With Military”). Google’s support of the United States military action directly through its development of new technology supports acts of violence to maintain global hegemony in the capitalist system. How then, can the Claremont Colleges justify one action, while it condones another? Both actions are associated with political outcomes, but only one is subjected to a kind of law that results in its condemnation. The efforts of campus activist organizing was vetoed because because the Pitzer College President, Melvin Oliver, wanted to maintain a particular history of the college. Of course, the broad differences between BDS and United States Imperialism should not be ignored, but will not be taken up by this paper. However, it is important to compare these two actions by the colleges to highlight capital’s impact on the direction of rules, norms, and laws on the campus.

Spivak discusses with recourse the necessity of thinking deeply about true resistance and the remaking of the present (“When Law is Not Justice,” 2016). Therefore it is important to think closely about what a revolutionary collective project has the potential to look like. bell hooks in her book *All About Love*, writes about the work of love and its possibilities. Throughout the book, she walks the reader through a number of scales of love, and in chapter 8 she begins to discuss community. Within the first few pages of the chapter, hooks comes to the conclusion that “talking together is one way to make community” (133). She emphasizes the importance of preventing dysfunction through consistent and effective communication. She goes on to discuss how friendships can teach us “...to process all of our issues, to cope with differences and conflict while staying connected” (hooks 134). These spaces allow for people to grow, learn and make connections about things that may be important to their identity or their life. Toward the end of the chapter, after hooks has made clear the necessity of love for friends and its balance with romantic love, she discusses the necessity for sacrifice and recognition in communities (143).

Importantly, student organizing occurs in these spaces of love, friends organize together, and friendships blossom because of organizing and strangers are introduced and cared for. This project has the potential to facilitate interactions that are geared toward friendship and recognition, during a predominantly digital era. The online folder can trace connections between groups and has the potential to be used collaboratively to recognize new groups or needs in the greater college campuses.

The collective histories of action that are collected with this project work to expose structures of power that the Claremont Colleges use to control student action while simultaneously heightening the community connections between students that are used to build and imagine resistance. The power of collectivizing memories does not foreclose the power of the colleges immediately, however. The collective and community work must continue to be strengthened to surmount the the power structure of the colleges and it must reach across time and space in order to do so. This project has the potential to build lasting coalitions because of its flexible structure that adapts to the histories that are placed into the drive. In other words, this project acts as an attempt to practice collectivizing histories in a community setting as a means of resistance.

Centering groups of Campus Activists and Resistance Through Place

To avoid an analysis that robs campus organizers of their power, an investigation of knowledge production as power will be addressed. Michel Foucault discusses and theorizes the concept of power-knowledge which may lead an analysis of the Claremont Colleges to suggest that most of the power resides on the side of the administration and the official history of the colleges. However, the site knowledge-power does not exclusive to campus organizers. Foucault suggests that when one thinks about power,

“perhaps, too, we should abandon a whole tradition that allows us to imagine that knowledge can exist only where the power relations are suspended and that knowledge can develop only outside its injunctions, its demands and its interests” (Foucault, “The Body of the Condemned” 26).

As we abandon the tradition that allows us to suspend power relations and think about the production of knowledge, we can imagine that knowledge is produced as a response to power-over. In other words, in the context of power relations, knowledge production importantly happens at the site of struggle; campus activists and the colleges produce knowledge when there is struggle or contention. Foucault goes on to say

“...in short, it is not the activity of the subject of knowledge that produces a corpus of knowledge, useful or resistant to power, but power-knowledge, the process and struggles that traverse it and of which it is made up, that determines the forms and possible domains of knowledge” (Foucault, “The Body of the Condemned” 26).

Therefore, we can begin to see how, despite the fact that knowledge about campus activists was created by a power-knowledge matrix of the Claremont Colleges, campus activists can identify the knowledge that is being produced about them and rewrite it as a means of resistance. However, Foucault does not address in this essay the ways in which resistance to the power-knowledge regime will take form. If the Claremont Colleges power-knowledge regime on student organizing is challenged via this project and new knowledge is produced on the platform, what is the result? I hypothesize that because the project is critical to the Claremont Colleges and more broadly to the dominant knowledge(s) of the world, the knowledge created by the project is a resistant one that relies on a new kind of *time*.

Relying on a new kind of *time* that is constantly reaching back and moving forward--as to rewrite history--asks this paper to consider how resistance, in the form of creating new knowledge, can be rooted in community. Community is rooted in both place and people and it is able to maintain a relationship with *time* that institutions cannot. In other words, communities

always have the potential to reach back to the past to inform present and future actions. bell hooks' *All About Love* will lie the foundation of community for this paper as a means of resistance and a site to (re)write history through *time*. hooks discusses in her chapter "Community: Love in Communion" how love asks community members to be compassionate and forgiving. She suggests

"while forgiveness is essential to spiritual growth, it does not make everything immediately wonderful or fine. Often, New Age writing on the subject of love makes it seem as though everything will always be wonderful if we are just loving. Realistically, being a part of a loving community does not mean we will not face conflicts, betrayals, negative outcomes from positive actions, or bad things happening to good people" (hooks 139)

In other words, hooks asks the reader to be wary of the trap that a loving community must be a kind of utopia. She suggests that past conflicts even, can inform the way that loving communities are created, hooks' chapter comes into contact with *time* because she suggests the past and present/future are constantly contested over in loving communities. hooks goes on to say, that in spite of the conflicts that one turns to compassion and forgiveness as a means of maintaining a community, strengthening it, and imagining a future where the community continues to exist despite some of these negative tribulations. hooks in some ways is speaking directly to a temporal and physical experience of community as well, in the way that she suggests that compassion and forgiveness are tools for which to hark back on a previous relationship with someone as well as looking forward to maintain a future with them. These experiences happen in space, as she suggests in her example with her co-worker. The conflicts may occur over the phone, via email, anonymously, in person, or any variety of other ways, but they occur in space. Each party experiences the hurt of the community in space and can only mitigate and heal that pain by the way of compassion and forgiveness, as hooks suggests.

The students/faculty/staff/etc. who work alongside and with organizing groups continuously rewrite the histories of the Claremont Colleges and in doing so, they always have the potential to face disagreement and conflict. However, because of their position to the Claremont Colleges, there is a sense of community that continues to challenge the decisions and actions of the institution. Despite student disagreement, it becomes clear that compassion and forgiveness are present because of a constant leaning toward critical conversation. hooks' proposal for a loving community suggests the colleges have the potential to grow to be a more loving community *because* conflict and critical conversation are present. Because of this leaning toward critical conversation, there is a nearly tangible disposition of the colleges changes when a community disagreement or conflict arises. The disposition sits in place and hangs over the campuses like blanket. The change in campus mood is the growth of a loving community and a rewriting of campus narrative--namely the peaceful and happy one--and how those might inform the future as reactions of the past.

This project attempts to continue to document these moments where the community not only produces knowledge, it also aims to add an alternative of the past of the colleges when the campuses physical space was not perceived in the same way. In other words, the project exposes actions that alter the perception and use of the space. The sprawling lawns across the colleges become sites where students gather, chant, and cut across space in search of justice. Doreen Massey, in her chapter entitled "A Global Sense of Place" in her book *Space, Place, and Gender*, about the formations of space across difference. She suggests that power and difference influence the space-time compression for various people, some have more power over changing or perceiving it than others (Massey 150). She goes on to say that the time-space compression is "a highly complex social differentiation. There are differences in degree of movement and

communication, but also in the degree of control and initiation” (Massey 150). She goes on to suggest that people experience the time-space compression in a variety of ways that are incredibly complex.

As students perceive the time-space compression differently than the administrators and the Claremont Colleges Presidents, it is important to note that students also experience the phenomena in a variety of different ways. It is their experience as students that works to connect them and provides a possibility for power in creating place. Massey takes up the issue of creating a progressive place that both rejects the same-ness that is created by the globalizing capital phenomena and does not employ the trope of a fully authentic place. Massey suggests that places are “absolutely not static” (155) because they are made of the constantly changing social interactions. Massey evokes Marx and his analysis of capital, as she comes to the conclusion that “places are processes” (155).

If we consider the Claremont Colleges as places that are made of processes and social relations, we can see their possibility for not only uniqueness, but their ability to impact other networks across time and space. In other words, the dynamic network of students, alumni, staff, faculty, etc. have the distinct ability to impact the Claremont Colleges as places as well as other locations where dense networks can begin to adopt and rewrite histories that are in connected to the Claremont Colleges, even distantly. Therefore, there is a distinct shift away from the perception that the Claremont Colleges are simply exercising their power on a power-less group of students. Rather, there is a dynamic interplay of powers between the students and the Claremont Colleges that occurs in place. Evoking the power of place allows students and campus activists to envisage a means of resistance that reaches back in time through the archive because of the particular social relations that make the colleges distinct. Therefore, when the Claremont

Colleges make decisions for campus activists, or alter their decisions they make, during or before breaks in the academic year, yet campus activists are still able to organize and continue to resist those decisions. Campus activists are able to do this as they reach out to dense networks from campus, in their communities, and now through the archive.

Cries for Justice: Attempts at defining un-containing

In order for the Claremont Colleges to continue to function as a capital producing and site of training productive bodies (Foucault *History of Sexuality* 1990), it must importantly create and maintain laws that uphold its goals and to achieve its objective as a site for conditioning for the state. If the Claremont Colleges dispense, uphold, and create laws aimed at students, faculty, and staff, there is a distinct opportunity for those groups of people to use those laws to assert justice. Jacques Derrida hypothesizes the ways in which the creation of laws can simultaneously act as an opportunity for justice to be surmounted through the practice of deconstruction. Derrida posits that deconstruction can be a means to justice. In his book *Deconstruction in a Nutshell: A Conversation with Jacques Derrida*, John Caputo edits and comments on an interview with Derrida to decipher what deconstruction is and importantly for this project, the ways in which justice can be achieved.

Derrida's conceptualization of deconstruction organizes the world into things that are deconstructable and undeconstructable or have a nature of undeconstructability. Derrida's conception of undeconstructability takes shape, in Caputo's analysis where he writes:

“Everything in deconstruction is driven by the undeconstructable, fired and inspired, inflamed and impassioned, set into motion by what is not deconstructable. Deconstruction is internally related to the undeconstructable-- justice, the gift, hospitality, the *tout autre l'avenir*--is neither real nor ideal, neither present nor future-present, neither existent nor idealizable, which is how and why it insites our “desire,” driving and impassioning deconstruction” (Caputo, 128).

In other words, the conception of undeconstructability rests in a kind of impossible justice. This is not to suggest that justice cannot be defined, rather it is to suggest that the conception of justice cannot be described by conceptions of law. For Derrida, laws are “the positive structures that make up judicial systems of one sort or another” (Caputo 130). If laws are essentially designed to be a site or place where judicial decisions are made, then he argues they are deconstructable.

In order to deconstruct laws, Derrida did not see laws as something that need to be flattened or torn down, rather he suggested that the structures of laws should loosen up and account for change. Caputo writes that the deconstructable nature of laws “is the condition of legal progress, of a perfectible and gradually perfected, a self-corrected a self-revising ensemble of norms that distills the knowledge of generations” (130). Therefore, Derrida’s conception of laws allows them to be seen as something that is adaptable by its nature. As compared to law then, Derrida sees justice “in itself, if such a thing exists, outside or beyond law, is not deconstructable. No more than deconstruction it itself, if such a thing exists” (Caputo, 131). In other words, the use of deconstruction to laws is a means to justice. However, Derrida is clear to make a distinction that he had not seen justice, rather he uses this schema to hypothesize where justice might sprout and how it can exist.

Although Derrida discusses the existence of justice, he is careful to suggest that it is not something that can be in the present. Caputo works through Derrida’s rumination to say

“justice is rather the relation to the other, the disjuncture that opens space for the incoming of the other. The essence of justice, thus, is to have no essence to be in disequilibrium, perpetually disproportionate with itself, never to be adequate to itself, never to identical with itself. Justice never exists, that is essential to justice, for justice” (154).

In other words, Caputo is trying to evoke a kind of non-sameness of justice, that it is importantly not able to be explained or amalgamated into itself or moments mistaken for it. He alludes to the never now experience of justice. Importantly, Caputo goes on to say “the specter of justice

disturbs the assured distinction between what is and what is not, between to be and not to be” (155). Therefore, justice or its always potential makes a distinction of the present and a kind of undefined futurity. The distinction between what is and what is not encourages a kind of daydreaming about justice and its potential.

Derrida would suggest that this project should not aim to achieve justice but rather suggest that the specter of justice might come to displace and threaten the perception of the present and what could be the non-present future, for students at the Claremont Colleges. To follow Derrida’s suggestion, this project will importantly not make claims of achieving justice, but rather it will aim to identify undeconstructable moments and memories. The campus activist archive platform has the potential to recall and retrace the ways that laws on the Claremont College campuses have not been loosened and therefore where there cannot yet be justice. The unconstructability of justice will be made clear through the project as the memories will only be maintained as a kind of device for knowledge construction after the actions have happened. The undeconstructability of laws however, suggests a kind of lingering potential. Derrida’s work suggests that the project should practice a kind of deconstruction of law and to know the unconstructability of justice.

Derrida has provided a way to destabilize the meaning of justice and to challenge the perception that one is able to obtain it through particular kinds of actions. His framework challenges this project to account for the laws that organize the broader social structure on campus and can undergird the process of un-containing that this project proposes to address the ways that the colleges undermine student actions and positions students to resist. With a destabilized view of justice, this project can work to avoid slippage into an essentialized view of organizing and its potential on campus. A process of un-containing therefore would work

alongside a non-normative vision of justice to produce constructive knowledge that exposes connections between problems and solutions and can be helpful to build coalitions. In order to more intimately understand the potential that this project has to impose resistance, it is important to pivot with Derrida toward Spivak.

Spivak, in an interview with the Los Angeles Review of Books reported on conversations.e-flux.com recounted her first encounter with Derrida's work. She sees how Derrida's view of the eurocentric project is challenged by deconstruction by its nature. She recalls how he addressed the failure of memory in the West, and suggests that Derrida said in *Grammatology* to "look at reality carefully. It's coded so that other people, even if they're not present, can understand what we are saying" (Spivak, "Gayatri Spivak on Derrida, the subaltern, and her life and work"). The connections between Derrida and Spivak become clear in the interview as she discusses how she had not only wrote a book translating his original work from French to English, but she also wrote a new book about his thoughts as a way of bringing it into the world. The connection between these authors is important, not to assume that their projects are entirely the same nor have the same goals, however their connection can importantly encourage this project to see the linkages between the suggestions made by Derrida and Spivak.

Gayatri Spivak discusses two particular phrases that she uses in her work as a means of action in her interview with the New York Times and Brad Evans. She discusses, toward the end of the interview "imaginative activism" and "affirmative sabotage" (Spivak, "When Law is Not Justice"). Spivak suggests that imaginative activism "takes the trouble to imagine a text — understood as a textile, woven web rather than narrowly as a printed page — as having its own demands and prerogatives" (Spivak, "When Law is Not Justice" 2016). This assertion suggests that the ability to interact with a text not on the basis of its relevance but to imagine what the

writer or text might be trying to say, can more deeply inform activism and actions. She goes on to say that the literature should not simply be of use to the person or group interacting with it. In fact, she suggests that one should not ask what the text can do for them, rather work to uncover its imagination and in doing so they will more educated when making decisions (Spivak, “When Law is Not Justice” 2016). Imaginative activism has the potential to slow down immediate reactions and actions to make them more meaningful; in other words, this process might encourage an extra step or pause in thinking that could provide space for new possibilities to take root.

Spivak also discusses the practice of “affirmative sabotage” as a way to achieve something new. She highlights the use of sabotage as a tool to criticize and take action against oppressive systems, but suggests that there is space to re-fashion sabotage. Spivak suggests that she used the term affirmative sabotage

“to gloss on the usual meaning of sabotage: the deliberate ruining of the master’s machine from the inside. Affirmative sabotage doesn’t just ruin; the idea is of entering the discourse that you are criticizing fully, so that you can turn it around from inside. The only real and effective way you can sabotage something this way is when you are working intimately within it” (Spivak, “When Law is Not Justice”).

Spivak importantly shifts the use of sabotage away from simply taking up the tools of the master to devastate the present reality of the discourse. Rather she suggests that affirmative sabotage requires someone to be able to use the tools of the master to truly *transform* the system because they understand how the master’s power works and those same tools might work to subvert it. She goes on to describe the ways in which Immanuel Kant’s suggestions about imagining a new person can expose the efficacy of affirmative sabotage. She suggests that “Not only does Kant insist that we need to imagine another person, he also insists for the need to internalize it to such an extent that it becomes second nature to think and feel with the other person” (Spivak, “When

Law is Not Justice). To be more precise, Kant ignores slavery in his book that Spivak is referring, and he suggests that women and domestic servants do not have the capability to think civically (Spivak, “When Law is Not Justice). However, Spivak turns to the idea of affirmative sabotage here to expose the way that women, domestic servants, and slaves are in constant motion to assume and know what the master (read white man) needs so much that it “became second nature for them to serve” (Spivak, “When Law is Not Justice). She finds these sites of potential resistance and imagines that knowing the intimate parts of the masters as a means to and end.

Because Spivak has been influenced by Derrida, she importantly pulls back on her proposition for resistance. She does not foreclose on the the idea that it might exist, but she rather suggests that a possible resistance is not something that can yet be understood or sit properly in to the reality of the world. Spivak suggests there could not be an educated resistance, or that “...it would misfire, because society is not ready for it. For that reason, one must continue to work — to quote Marx — for the possibility of a poetry of the future” (Spivak, “When Law is Not Justice). There is an important connection that Spivak is evoking between Marx, Derrida, and herself: there is a constant remaking of the possibility of the future, it almost stays at arms length away but it holds the attention of these authors and encourages them to dare to imagine a potential for a new world.

If this project is a gesture toward a new world or a potential platform by which a new world can be imagined from. In other words, this project generates a kind of vision of the organizing and student actions that happen on the Claremont Colleges that removes the actions from particular categories and figures them to exist in an *uncontained*. If the colleges use laws, as discussed by Spivak and Derrida, to impose norms and codify actions then students resistive

actions transform those norms and codes. Student actions are defined by the laws as taking place in space, within a particular time-frame, and in response to particular instances. In organizing student actions like such, student movements are contained within proximities that work to limit their reach and impact. This is not to say that the colleges actively choose to contain actions and direct its employees to do so nor do they empower students to maintain lasting actions against the colleges that manifest in change. Rather, the Claremont College cannot see the actions as a process of knowledge production that reaches toward justice. Therefore, the process of un-containing makes clear the necessity for new knowledge production to take place. This project attempts to allow students the opportunity to maintain the connections between movements, to see actions as cyclical and connected occurrences.

The idea of un-containing student experience in many ways works to rewrite history, just as Gloria Anzaldua does in her book *Borderlands/ La Frontera*. She attempts to describe the tensions that come about when the banging up of life-worlds against each other causes “the space between two individuals [to] shrink with intimacy” (Anzaduala 19). In many ways, Gloria Anzaldua is writing about and to the mix of cultures and peoples in an near the southern border of the United States of America. However, Anzuldua also write about the “psychological borderlands, the sexual borderlands and the spiritual borderlands” (19). Her close attention to the ways that the inner self interacts with and traverses these borderlands suggests that a process of un-containing at the Claremont Colleges might allow for the students who are organizing around a certain issue to in many ways can begin to traverse a borderland or a history that has not been offered to them. In other words, Anzuldua’s work suggests that there is a distinct possibility to create a new history, one that is often made up within the contact between two or more groups, and can encourage growth (20). Groups that organize at the Claremont Colleges

can use the archive to share and view past and present actions that they would not have been able to see without the project; contact between groups therefore creates important linkages and potential to create new knowledge. Her text is a critical self reflection of life on the border and asks the reader to rework their relationship with the reality of our perception of identity and how any kind of distinction might work to inflict change upon us just as we do upon it.

Important to this project is Anzaldua's description of the borderland, she suggests

“A boarderland is a vague and undetermined place created by the emotional residue of an unnatural boundary. It is in a constant state of transition. The prohibited and forbidden are its inhabitants. Los atravesados live here: the squint-eyed, the perverse, the queer, the troublesome, the mongrel, the mulato, the half-breed, the half dead; in short, those who cross-over, pass over, or go through the confines of “normal”” (25).

Her description very clearly speaks to the kinds of affective and almost bodily responses people have when they cross a border. Her description of the border works to describe the tensions of colonialism, imperialism (particularly from the United States of America), and the legacies of globalization, on the person. People from all over the world come to the Claremont Colleges and feel the effects of these violent global systems on a variety of levels. Anzaldua makes in clear in the line just below the above text, that whiteness is equated to and aligned with power (25).

Importantly, this project attempts to suggest that whiteness and its connection to power divides, unevenly, the emotional and lived experiences of organizing on campus; in other words, white people who are doing organizing work at the Claremont Colleges experience that work differently and will understand the concept of un-containing in a way that does not resonate with Anzaldua's work.

Through Derrida, Spivak, and Anzaldua this project importantly sees the potential to reach towards justice and to do so from the outside of Claremont Colleges nexus of power. Rather this project proposes a process of un-containing to re-fashion conceptions of student

actions and organizing that disposes students to a framework of knowledge that imagines possibilities of a new future. The project of un-containing however, has not properly addressed the relations of power that manifest in race, gender, culture, sexuality, and class. In their bodies of work Spivak and Anzaldua work to address intersections of identity and their ability to direct resistance. However, because Derrida is part of the Second Wave feminist movement his work faces critique for its white-centric and classed model. Therefore, it is important to take up concerns of power difference in the process of un-containing.

Spivak in her chapter “Feminism and deconstruction, again: negotiating with unacknowledged masculinism” in the book *Between Feminism and Psychoanalysis* addresses the ways that transgress the process of deconstruction rather than abandon it completely (206). She suggests that her refashioning of Derrida’s deconstruction is “a negotiation and acknowledgement of complicity” (Spivak, “Feminism and deconstruction, again: negotiating with unacknowledged masculinism” 206). In other words, she suggests that in order to maintain a feminist practice, it is important to negotiate with deconstruction and take into consideration the points of time when one is complicit in patriarchy and oppression(s). Important for this project, Spivak suggests that deconstruction can be modified to account for power differences and identity. Spivak comes into conversation with Jacqueline Rose’s book *Sexuality in the Field of Vision* and particularly with Rose’s discussion of Derrida. This is where Spivak differentiates rejecting deconstruction from *refashioning* it. Spivak suggests that Rose’s “text is based on a *reading of Derrida*” and Spivak comes to defend Derrida because of this dismal and claims that she does so because of her experiences in India that gave her “a sense of how peculiarly uneasy people were about the imperial legacy of imperialism” (Spivak, “Feminism and deconstruction, again: negotiating with unacknowledged masculinism” 206). In other words, Spivak saw the

potential for deconstruction to be used not only as a narrative (Spivak “Feminism and deconstruction, again: negotiating with unacknowledged masculinism,” 208) as Rose suggests, but as useful to expound difference. Spivak boils down her critique of Rose from the perspective of a disenfranchised women. Spivak suggests

“It is the disenfranchised who teaches us most often by saying: I do not recognize myself in the object of your benevolence, I do not recognize my share in your naming. Although the vocabulary is not that of high theory, she tells us if we care to hear (without identifying our onto/epistemological subjectivity with her anxiety for the subjectship of the axiological, the subjectship of ethics) that she is not the literal referent for our frenzied naming of woman in the scramble for legitimacy in the house of theory. She reminds us that the name of ‘woman,’ however political, is, like any other name, a catachresis” (“Feminism and deconstruction, again: negotiating with unacknowledged masculinism” 218).

In short, Spivak suggests that the use of a deconstructive feminism would highlight a process of mis-naming, or catachresis, essentializing an other, and evoke the dangers of ascribing referent status. Spivak suggests that the intimacy that a person shares with theory does not require them to be able to recite or recount it, in fact she suggest that the interaction between--for example-- a disenfranchised woman and theory exposes the inability to name the woman, *woman*. In many ways she reworks and challenges the codified attributes that label her as such--in the practice of deconstruction as a reach toward justice.

Spivak importantly evokes a kind of deconstructive feminism that accounts for a variety of people precisely because of their ability to practice deconstruction through catachresis and mis-naming. Spivak’s critique and example of the disenfranchised woman harks back to the Combahee River Collective Statement. Although Spivak is not in direct conversation with the Collective in her chapter, her example of the disenfranchised woman bangs ups against the critiques launched by the Collective at Second-Wave feminism. The Collective states “Black, other Third World, and working women have been involved in the feminist movement from the start, but both outside reactionary forces and racism and elitism within the movement itself have

served to obscure our participation” (Combahee River Collective 273). The Collective pivots toward a critique that confronts structures of power that allow white women to be able to maintain a feminist movement that actively excludes and erases non-white participation. The Collective outlines the importance of doing political work for black women as way to address the intimate interminglings of race and gender (Combahee River Collective 1977). The Collective might agree with Spivak’s assertion that phrase ‘Woman’ is and always will be a catachresis because they see the ways that the experience of gender is not dispensed equally across race and even class; how then, could a word be able to capture the distinct experiences of communities of women?

The connection between Spivak’s critique of Derrida and the Combahee River Collective statement suggests that there are important interruptions that need to be made to reshape deconstruction to address race, class, etc. as complex life-worlds. In other words, Spivak and the Combahee River Collective suggest that the theory of deconstruction has the potential to make meaningful strides towards the rewriting of history as it addresses expressions of power. Importantly, Anzaldua makes an interruption at the site of identity as well. She evokes an experience of transnational identity and exposes the ways that power transforms from one place to another only after experiencing a kind of crossing. Anzaldua writes of the experience of crossing over the United States border from Mexico and upon arrival “those who make it past the checking points of the Border Patrol find themselves in the midst of 150 years of racism in the Chicano *barrios* in the Southwest and big Northern cities” (12). The transnational movement across space alters how power is expressed and experienced. Anzaldua’s concept of traversing borders is helpful to this project in two ways. Firstly, it can more clearly expose the ways that the Claremont Colleges continues to act as an arm of the state in policing and limiting students or

their relatives who have made journey across the Southern border. This is an obvious and literal translation of her work onto the experience of students at the Claremont Colleges, but not one to ignore. Importantly it asserts that knowledge of the world is produced through these experiences and directs powerful critiques of the Western world as it purports to be. Secondly, Anzaldua's work is important to this project to destabilize the notions of identity, groupings, and/or one-issue movements. The vastness of the border between two things and the ability to cross them, provides new language, new perceptions of structures of power, and the ability to move horizontally to build coalitions.

In short, the process of un-containing in this project addresses the varied experiences of power across students by interrupting the normative state of white-ness through a feminist approach to deconstruction that can be seen in the non-identification and mis-naming of the experience of gender. The interruption also happens when stable notions of normal are challenged and pushed across or outside of their organization.

Un-containing is defined as the process of deconstructing laws as a reach or gesture toward an undeconstructable justice. Tools like affirmative sabotage and imaginative activism suggest that the current structures can be reworked so long as the master's tools are learned intimately and used properly to transform the structure. The potential for coalition building and for new knowledge production arrives at the moment when borders or limits are crossed. In short, un-containing offers the potential to reach towards justice through the intimate knowledge of power itself and the courage that it takes to draw linkages across time and place.

The campus activist archive platform is an attempt at un-containing because it pulls together memories of contention and success at the Claremont Colleges and allows those memories to bang up against each other. The potential to collect knowledge and memories at the

Colleges surmounts a powerful resistance movement that rejects student dissent as particular and contained. The un-containing process uses *time* to build present that demands the Colleges to see *all* student movements as connected.

Containment, Law, and the Claremont Colleges

In order to engage with the process of un-containing, it is important to expose the ways that the Claremont Colleges practice containment, codify laws, and obscure student movements from reaching towards justice. The process of un-containing can expose the ways that the Claremont Colleges align themselves with and even work with the Claremont Police Department through the codes and laws that they write.

The scope of this section of the paper is limited to the current Claremont Colleges Policy on Demonstrations because it applies to all of the Colleges and directs most of the actions taken by each of the schools. Although specific policies from specific schools will not be taken up in this discussion, this analysis can direct critical inquiry of those policies and their impacts. This section of the paper will examine closely the language of the policies as they direct a process of containing student movements. This is not to say that the policy of demonstrations directs or informs all of the actions that the colleges take in relation to student actions, however it acts as a particular point in time in which the colleges actions can be analyzed in their most exposed form.

The Claremont College Policy on Demonstrations has been amended over time, the most recent iteration of the policy was published and has been enforced since November 7th 2001. The policy discerns the difference between peaceful and non-peaceful or disruptive demonstrations, outlines the ways in which individuals can be charged for not adhering to the policy, and it outlines the means of enforcement. The policy suggests that despite the potential difficulty in differentiating what a peaceful and non-peaceful or disruptive demonstration would look like, it defines them in this way:

“Non-peaceful actions or demonstrations are those that endanger or injure, or threaten to endanger or injure, any person, or that damage or threaten to damage property. Disruptive actions or demonstrations are those that restrict free movement on any of the campuses, or interfere with, or impede access to, regular activities or facilities of any of the Colleges or CUC. If an officer or designee of an affected College or CUC informs individuals in a given area that their collective actions are judged non-peaceful or disruptive and that they should disperse, individuals remaining may be charged, on their home campus, with a violation of this policy. Any individual acting in a non-peaceful or disruptive manner, whether he or she is acting individually or within a group, may be charged on the basis of the individual’s or group’s behavior with a violation of this policy. Ignorance of this policy or lack of intent to violate this policy is not an acceptable justification for violating it. Lack of intent or lack of awareness of the existence of College or Consortium policy will not excuse violations. Charges will be brought at the home college of the accused. Any President on his or her home campus, or designee, or the Chief Executive Officer of CUC, or designee, on the property of CUC, is authorized to take action against any individual violating this policy. Actions may include arrest, or other legal action, or notice of disciplinary charges and handled through the home College’s disciplinary procedures. The Presidents and the Chief Executive Officer of CUC may delegate their authority to act” (“Claremont Colleges Policy on Demonstrations”).

The policy directs student demonstrations as something to be seen as non-disruptive, and the dissent should allow the administrative actions to continue. The policy also suggests that students should not impede or change the use of space, overcrowd or alter the movement of anyone else on campus. Importantly, the colleges suggest that the policy should discipline students who might have the intent to cause injury to someone or damage or harm the College’s property. An important distinction is missing here as the property of the Colleges and the lives of staff, faculty, and students are almost seamlessly compounded into one swift sentence. What value do the Claremont Colleges actually have in the lives of its community *if* they see those lives as equal to property.

In addition to specific language that directs the demonstration towards a particular version of demonstration--without disrupting the physical or social ecosystem of the colleges--the policy uses language that purports a particular kind of subjectivity onto students. Students can be determined, by the Claremont Colleges, to be in violation of the policy which disrupts the

Claremont Colleges itself. A disturbing paradox arises when the colleges have the power to determine what is not permitted to happen and who should be disciplined for an action. The paradox arises from the sense of justice that the Claremont Colleges evoke a sense of law-fulness when they suggest that a student who has been accused will subject to “referral to the home campus disciplinary body” (“Claremont Colleges Policy on Demonstrations”). Importantly, the sense of lawfulness encourages a sense of justice, where students can share what they have done and appeal to the colleges. However, the justice that students seek cannot be found in the college disciplinary body precisely because they purport that the laws that delimit and obscure justice. The subjectification, or the process and project of making someone a subject of power, of students occurs when the Claremont Colleges create a version of a student involved in contention on campus. In other words, the policy creates a subject/student--who can and will be prosecuted--by the formation of the policy in itself. The student did not become a contentious subject before the laws were created to circumscribe them into subjectivity in the first place. In short, the policy creates a vision of a student who will be punished while involved in demonstrations therefore limiting the potential for other demonstrations, for the potential to reimagine space, or to reimagine how the colleges value bodies.

The Claremont Colleges created a Demonstration policy that worked to create a set of laws by which students should obey, to organize students into particular categories of peaceful and non-peaceful, and to categorize them as subjects to the law. This process becomes clear only with the language surrounding particular moments of student action on campus that the Claremont Colleges can assert are dangerous, costly, or threatening. The moments of protest, demonstration, or student assembly are points when the density of bodies becomes obvious and their power--or potential for power--expose the Claremont Colleges’ true fear: that the students

will actually produce change. In other words, the Claremont Colleges cannot work to limit student organizing outright because it would be too obvious, rather they must wait to control student dissent at the one moment that is most logical to the reality it has created: a student centered reality. So, the Claremont Colleges suggest that the policy keeps students safe and keeps the Colleges running in order to help the students, when in fact, students organize in order to keep their peers safe and to rework the systems that fail students in the first place.

Multi-Issue Coalition Building in Place: Across Networks and Time

Campus organizers at the Claremont Colleges have altered the uses of space on campus and inform the perceptions of the spaces during moments of protest and organizing and can invoke a past/future dichotomy that is important in shaping future student movements. Although the issue of *time* and the creation of history has been taken up in previous sections of this paper, Nella Van Dyke, in her article *Hotbeds of Activism: Locations of Student Protest*. Van Dyke discusses the ways in which history and culture influence the ways that students protest, where they protest, and how the construction of a student protest might influence the decisions students make on campuses in the future. Van Dyke's work is helpful in mapping out the ways in which students interact with past student movements despite the fact that the work only follows protests. It is important to understand that protests and student organizing are not one in the same, but often protests sprout from student organizing and can be important markers of organizing in the past. Van Dyke's article comes into conversation with formations of *time* when he discusses the ways the student movements are always in conversation with one another: "...in retrospect, we often think of the 1960s movements as distinct entities, activists at the time did not. They saw themselves as involved in a massive restructuring of society, a project aimed at

curing numerous social ills, not merely those confined to a single issue or group of people” (Van Dyke, 208).

Van Dyke used data from a number of campuses across the United States to map out these connections through protest. Although Van Dyke does not suggest that these processes entirely inform current and continuing social movements spurred by students, he does suggest that there is a potential to build wide reaching multi-issue coalitions. Notably, Van Dyke makes another claim that is in conversation with the assertions made in this paper. Van Dyke claims that he is

“able to document the role that activist subcultures play in contemporary protest activity. I propose that multi-movement activist subcultures exist during cycles of protest, especially on college campuses or other geographically-bounded locations. During periods of heightened activity, these subcultures may expand to become social movement communities (Buechler, 1990), that include organizations and informal networks of individuals active on a number of related issues. The presence of a multi-issue activist network on a campus helps explain the presence of activism around a variety of issue on the same campus” (208).

Van Dyke suggests that there is always a potential for a place to have the ability to maintain a role in lasting campus organizing in broad coalitions around multiple issues. Importantly, this paper will pivot towards a multi-issue group of protests that span across a number of years that occur because students maintain complex life-worlds that overlap and inform others.

The Claremont Colleges have seen a complex relationship between the campus demonstration policies and organizing by non-white bodies for #BlackLivesMatter. Although tensions between non-white/black students and the demonstration policies have undoubtedly been ongoing, the scope of this paper will address a number of demonstrations and student responses to on campus events from 2014 to 2017 for the sake of brevity and detail. In addressing these particular protests, the differential treatment that the demonstration policies assign to different students will become clear and the ability for students to organize broadly

over time and in spite of the policies themselves will also be exposed. In addressing three separate instances of student contention Van Dykes assertion about complex sub-cultural connections becomes more clear and we are able to see the ways that students use *time* to build coalitions and movements.

On December 10th and 11th, Black students at the Claremont Colleges organized two “die-ins” in two separate dining halls. Students laid on the ground during dinner time in the Frary dining hall at Pomona College and the McConnell dining hall at Pitzer College. The protests were a way to stand in solidarity with the events that occurred in Ferguson earlier that year. In a video created by Ida Kassa entitled “Yik Yak Responses to Black Lives Matter Claremont Die-ins,” black students read anonymous comments that were made on the Yik Yak smart phone application. It is presumed that the students reading the comments had either been a part of the die-in or had been in support of it; the students read hateful and inflammatory comments made by their peers about the die-in. The video exposes the way that other students disapprove of and reject the interruptions that the protest made and how the disapproval was rooted in racism. The comments help illuminate two things. Firstly, the ability for the protest to disrupt and reuse space was one of the first complaints launched by the anonymous students online. The normalization of the control of space, by the college, made students unwilling to allow themselves to reimagine what the potential could be for the space. Secondly, the comments expose the ways that the demonstration policies work to obtain their goal via the discomfort and frustration felt by non-protesting students. If the Claremont Colleges are able to hear complaints by students about the blocking of fire exits and the disruption of dining-hall routines, then they are able to fabricate a story that excuses non-protesting students from engaging. Because of the limited access to memories of this action, the ways that students were able to organize are unclear, however the

die-in marks an important trajectory moment to trace recent student organizing on the campuses of the Claremont Colleges.

Although the organizers of the die-in protests are not easily identifiable because of the lack of memory retained about the event itself, important linkages between this action and one that occurred on the campus of Claremont McKenna College expose the ways that students maintain and use memory to evoke and surmount movements against the colleges. On April 6th, 2017 Heather Mac Donald was asked to speak at the Claremont McKenna College Athenaeum. Mac Donald is a political commentary and has written books that outline her stance on policing and essentially outlines her thoughts on the #BlackLivesMatter movement. Her book entitled *The War on Cops: How the New Attack on Law and Order Makes Everyone Less Safe* can essentially be outlined in her comment about it in an interview with Ben Weingarten: “there is no government agency more dedicated to the proposition of “Black Lives Matter” than the police” (“Heather Mac Donald on “The War on Cops”). Her comment, ignores the ways that the Black Lives Matter movement sees black bodies in relation to the state and policing. Mac Donald’s comment in fact is in direct opposition to the Black Lives Matter platform that states the “mission is to build local power and to intervene in violence inflicted on Black communities by the state and vigilantes” (Black Lives Matter, “About”). The clear tension between Mac Donald and the Black Lives Matter community came to fruition on April 16th.

The protest of Heather Mac Donald’s athenaeum talk evoked images of the Black Lives Matter die-in from a few years earlier through the distinct uses of bodies to disrupt space and prevent the event from taking place. The clear linkages were not simply because both movements were in support of Black Lives Matter. In addition, the Mac Donald protest also made interventions between the Claremont Colleges and the physical space. The reworking of

space--from a space where a speaker was to share a lecture to a zone where no one can enter--in the Mac Donald protest pinpoints the exact moments where the Claremont Colleges can no longer exercise control over the ongoings of the students at the colleges unless they use force. The aftermath of the atheneum protests resulted in student expulsions and highlighted the attempts that the colleges made to further implement laws and codes that directed student actions, but importantly the protests called back to student actions from the past.

The two distinct protests relied on similar uses of bodies, disruptions of space, and evoked responses from the Claremont Colleges suggesting that this form of protest is not allowed on the campuses by way of policy. It should not be overlooked that both demonstrations were about Black Lives Matter and many black students attended these protests. The intersections of the two protests and the responses of the colleges, over time, suggests that the colleges may be practicing anti-black racism in their application of demonstration policies. If two Black Lives Matter demonstrations used space as a way to disrupt daily routines at the colleges, and the policies explicitly suggest that those actions are not permitted, then there is a clear tension that becomes obvious between the students and the Colleges. In this way, we are also able to see the dense network of students who are in support of Black Lives Matter and how the network of students may use memories of these demonstrations to direct their actions. Only when the two demonstrations are put together side-by-side can some of these patterns emerge. In this way, the efficacy of the campus activist archive platform becomes apparent.

G(r)asping For Freedom: Conclusions

The organizing platform that accompanies this paper has the potential to be a functional tool for student/faculty/staff or campus activists at the Claremont Colleges. Its potential to create new histories and to unleash critiques about the power of the Claremont Colleges while simultaneously strengthening the power of campus activists. The platform may face barriers and

rejection in the future from campus activists for a number of reasons, some of which being distrust and unfamiliarity.

Sharing sensitive information or documents might put students/faculty/staff at risk. The platform only shares information that is willingly given and can be redacted, if needed. However, because of the nature of activism and organizing, sensitive information has the potential to harm students/faculty/staff by threatening future employment when they are added to lists like Canary Mission, marking campus activists as dangerous after they participate in peaceful and non-peaceful demonstrations, after campus activists have been policed physically, and even personal information has been shared online to various forums. Websites and groups like Canary Mission collect information about campus activists and share that information as a tool for doxxing, or barring activists from particular places even countries, like Israel. These risks should necessarily be taken seriously and that can only be done if students are allowed to manage the information that they share on the platform. A paradox thus arises, that campus activists should necessarily preserve histories of organizing to reach towards a more just campus, but can only do so within a parameter of safety concerns and anxieties outlined by many of the systems they work to push up against. The platform may not be able to address concerns of safety precisely because it deals with organizing and activism which always push the safety of participants to a more precarious position politically than they may have been in the first place.

Other challenges that the platform may face rest in the perception of what freedom could look like. In many ways, justice that functions within the Claremont Colleges suggests a kind of domestication through the modern academy. The liberal perceptions of freedom, democracy, and justice influence the way that campus activists do their work. The protocols of the academy and therefore the modern circumscribe freedom and justice into particular iterations. Through the

process of un-containing, freedom and justice are not longer circumscribed because campus activism is no longer separated and common goals can arise. Un-containing grasps towards an unknowable future of justice and freedom and it takes into account their potential impossibility. However, this project suggests that there is potential for campus activists to rewrite the history of the campuses that they inhabit and create meaningful change. In other words, this project reaches towards justice and freedom in its support of meshworks and collective agency, fashioning of *time*, alternative history writing, and process of un-containing. The project imagines the Claremont Colleges as a place where these actions can converge and where campus activists can shape the world around them to achieve a more just campus.

Bibliography

“About.” *Black Lives Matter*, blacklivesmatter.com/about/.

Anzaldúa, Gloria, et al. *Borderlands: La Frontera*. Capitan Swing, 2016.

Bergen, Mark. “Google Renounces AI Weapons; Will Still Work With Military.” *Bloomberg.com*, Bloomberg, www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-06-07/google-renounces-ai-for-weapons-but-will-still-sell-to-military.

“Claremont Colleges Policy on Demonstrations.” *Claremont Colleges Policy on Demonstrations - Claremont McKenna College - Acalog ACMS™*, catalog.claremontmckenna.edu/content.php?catoid=22&navoid=2463.

“Combahee River Collective.” *The Combahee River Collective Statement : Black Feminist Organizing in the Seventies and Eighties*, Kitchen Table : Women of Color Press, 1986.

Derrida, Jacques, and John D. Caputo. *Deconstruction in a Nutshell a Conversation with Jacques Derrida*. Fordham University Press, 2008.

Dyke, Nella Van. “Hotbeds of Activism: Locations of Student Protest.” *Social Problems*, vol. 45, no. 2, 1998, pp. 205–220., doi:10.1525/sp.1998.45.2.03x0166j.

Escobar, Arturo. “Actors, Networks, and New Knowledge Procedures; Social Movements and the Paradigmatic Transition in the Sciences.” *Cognitive Justice in a Global World: Prudent Knowledges for a Decent Life*, Lexington Books, 2007.

Evans, Brad, and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. “When Law Is Not Justice.” *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 13 July 2016, www.nytimes.com/2016/07/13/opinion/when-law-is-not-justice.html.

Fals-Borda, Orlando, and Luis E. Mora-Osejo. “Beyond Eurocentrism: Systematic Knowledge in Tropical Context. A Manifesto.” *Cognitive Justice in a Global World: Prudent Knowledges for a Decent Life*, Lexington Books, 2007.

Foucault, Michel, and Robert J. Hurley. *The History of Sexuality*. Vintage, 1990.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*. Vintage Books, 1995.

Gramsci, Antonio. “Hegemony.” *Power: a Critical Reader*, Pearson Education Inc., 2005, pp. 10–11.

- Hoffman, Steve G. "Academic Capitalism." *Contexts*, vol. 11, no. 4, 2012, pp. 12–13., doi:10.1177/1536504212466325.
- IWS Coordinating Committee Members. "Draft December 1999." Received by Claremont City Council , 1999.
- Karenarchey, et al. "Gayatri Spivak on Derrida, the Subaltern, and Her Life and Work." *Conversations.e-Flux.com*, 1 Aug. 2016, conversations.e-flux.com/t/gayatri-spivak-on-derrida-the-subaltern-and-her-life-and-work/4198.
- Vimeo*, 22 Dec. 2017, vimeo.com/126350878.
- Lipsitz, George. "The Possessive Investment in Whiteness." *Power: a Critical Reader*, Pearson Education Inc., 2005, pp. 11–17.
- Luther King, Martin. "Beyond Vietnam." *American Rhetoric* .
www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/mlkatimetobreaksilence.htm.
- Mac Donald, Heather, and Ben Weingarten. "Heather Mac Donald on 'The War on Cops'." *Encounter Books*, www.encounterbooks.com/features/heather-mac-donald-on-the-war-on-cops/.
- MARX, KARL. COMMUNIST MANIFESTO. VINTAGE, 2019.
- Massey, Doreen B. *Space, Place, and Gender*. University of Minnesota Press, 2009.
- Schwan, Anne, and Stephan Shapiro. *How to Read Foucault's Discipline and Punish (How to Read Theory)*. Pluto Press, 2011.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Zed, 2012.
- Spivak, Gayatri. "Feminism and Deconstruction, Again: Negotiating with Unacknowledged Masculinism." *Between Feminism and Psychoanalysis*, Psychology Press, 1989, pp. 206–225.
- Winton, Richard. "50 Rally in Claremont to Protest Police Slaying of Black Motorist." *Los Angeles Times*, Los Angeles Times, 5 Aug. 1999, www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1999-aug-05-me-62788-story.html.

Woodson, Joy L. "Claremont Settles Lawsuit in Fatal Police Shooting." *Los Angeles Times*, Los Angeles Times, 19 Apr. 2003, www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-2003-apr-19-me-claremont19-story.html.

Zinn, Howard. *A People's History of the United States: 1942-Present*. Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 2005.