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Higher Education and Necropolitics: Tracing Death and Violence in Higher Education

E. Jeremy Torres

Although scholarship has focused on the role of higher education in the development of neoliberalism, little has been done to identify how it contributes to the perpetuation of violence and death in the US. This article aims to shed light on the relationship between higher education and the perpetuation of violence and death in the US.
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In the United States (U.S.), institutions maintain the longevity of dominance and subordination through a patriarchal matrix of white supremacist power relationships. Institutions and individuals within them are part of the fabric of larger social, historical, and political contexts (Hurtado et al., 2012, p. 41). The state erects institutions to assist in enacting state sanctioned violence, represented through their shared system of power. Paisley Curah (2014) suggests we should view the state/institutions as a messy and complex entity that “smuggles within certain expectations: an ordered hierarchy, a comprehensive rationality, a unity of purpose and execution” (p. 197). A wealth of scholarship deals with the role of higher education in perpetuating the death and violence of marginalized students and staff within the institution. The violence experienced from members of the institution ranges from experiences with racialization and racism (Karaman & Christian, 2020; Hotchkins & Dancy, 2017; Stubbs & Sallee, 2013) to misogyny (Ballysingh, 2019), gender norms (Sallee, 2019), and ableism (Cai & Richdale, 2015; Binder, 2017). From the criminal system (Spade, 2011), surveillance through medical and psychiatry (Beauchamp, 2014; Stryker, 2014), gender and family (Spade, 2011; Padilla & Rodriguez-Madera, 2021), and countless other institutions in the U.S., it is clear how domination, subordination, and hierarchical systems continue to exist over vulnerable populations.
Violence is best understood not as an isolated act, but as one that takes place within a length of practice and broader social context, beyond physical acts and all-encompassing of verbal, psychological, symbolic, and spiritual attacks (Roark, 1993; Nicoletti et al., 2008). Roark's (1993) definition of violence centers on behavior that by intent, action, or outcome harms another person. Institutional agents, comprised of boards of trustees, chief investment officers, presidents to name a few, within higher education are confronted with urgent questions about their role in the intensification and seduction of performing death and violence. Minimal higher education research has incorporated how institutional agents propel necropolitical dynamics of death and violence.

Little is written about how institutional actors in higher education exert deathly power over vulnerable communities and exertion of power over vulnerable communities. Scholarship in higher education has primarily focused on internal institutional issues facing higher education and student success. In the U.S., the history of death and violence is not new to colleges and universities. Death and violence can be traced from the actions of the nation's oldest institutions. For example, land-grant/grab universities stole nearly 11 million acres of land from 250 native Indigenous tribes (McCoy, Risam, & Guiliano, 2021). Additionally, colleges are complicit in their role in kidnapping Indigenous folks from their land to assimilate them into white Eurocentric society, which led to disproportionately high suicide rates of Indigenous youth, death by homesickness, death of cultural heritage, and death by uncontrolled disease (Peterson, 2001). Furthermore, colleges and universities are complicit in death and violence through their investment in the early to mid-1900s in the eugenics movement (Miro & Gordan, 2018), their involvement in race-based admissions practices (Castro & Magana, 2020), and stockpiling COVID-19 test during the COVID-19 pandemic (Nadworny, 2020). As a higher education scholar, it is essential to explore how higher education agents conspire in their ongoing oppression. As the killing of those at the margins of neoliberal sovereignty continues to be glamorized and fetishized in the name of “democracy” (Agathangelou, Bassichis, & Spira, 2008), including the expansion of education.

Given recent calls by students, student affairs professionals, and activists to dismantle systems of oppression, the findings from this analysis underscore the value of using a critical lens to expose higher education’s deathly investments. Within the analysis, each theme/type of neoliberal investment pres-
ents a dichotomous relationship with capital gain and death. First, the role of investment in expanding student populations contributes to the expansion of college campuses in urban cities, consequently impacting locals by raising rents resulting in displacement (Wiess, 2013). Second, the role of protecting new properties created from practices of gentrification resulting on the dependence of police and police state to protect those properties, results in higher incarceration rates and death for community members who live in and near the campus environments. Third, their refusal to adopt new practices to support a diverse set of student populations; queer and trans students (QT), Black Indigenous People of Color (BIPOC), students with disabilities, and working students with a diverse set of needs consequently negatively impacts students’ persistence, retention, and safety within the institution. Lastly, the prioritization of returning to normal during a global pandemic consequently exposes populations such as students, staff, faculty, and community members situated near the University to death in the most severe way. This research in the most literal sense unearths the factors and investment that creates conditions where the most marginalized in society must navigate their daily exposure to death and violence.

As an activist, the language of this article is intended to identify power, the exertion of power, and the deadly impact of power. Campus violence expert Mary Roark (1993) describes the importance of naming. Naming power is essential. “Once we name something, we can go beyond vagueness to clarity that favors efforts in prevention and control.” Words are powerful, and naming gives us the ability to describe, discuss, understand, and ultimately bring about change.”(p.6). Through this analysis there is hope that presidents, boards of trustees, CFO’s, donors, and other leaders within higher education come to acknowledge their practices as having negative life impacts on various communities.

**FRAMEWORK**

Mbembe (2003) introduced necropolitics as an idea of bio- and necropower that illuminates the insufficiencies of Foucault’s (1979) biopolitics to consider contemporary forms of subjugation of life to the power of death. Weapons and strategies are deployed in the interest of maximum destruction of persons and the creation of death worlds, understanding new and unique forms of social existence where vast populations are subjected to conditions of life conferring upon the status of living dead. Mbembe describes our contemporary world in which racist nationalism is rising and relations of enmity are reconfigured. He reminds us that necropolitics is a matter of the colonial past and a characteristic
of the present. He explores the notion of being alive, both as the basis of exercising critique and the premise of potential change. The idea of the alive human, with potentially newly found bonds to other humans, surfaces on the horizon of possibilities for change.

A necropolitical framework helps higher education institutions understand how their investments in a global phenomenon claim that certain bodies are valued while others are not (Torres, 2018). Wars and border controls (Ritchie, 2014; Montenegro, Pujol, & Posocco, 2017; Shakasari, 2014; ), surveillance and transphobia (Edelman, 2014; Posocco, 2017; Spade, 2011), incarceration (Bassichis and Spade, 2014; Lamble, 2008), and the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic reveal how increasing masses are now governed by direct and indirect death.

For Mbembe (2003, 2019), necropolitics includes the authority to impose social and civil death, the right to enslave others in other forms of violence. Necropolitics rationalizes death and violence as a way for the sovereign state to sustain its survival. The killings, however, are justified through this framework. The sovereign state’s killings are self-present, clean, quick, rational, and necessary (Masoumi, 2016, p. 28.). Necropolitics concerns itself with social and political power to dictate who and how populations should live or die. Necropolitics is more than the sovereign’s power to kill but to expose other people, even the sovereign’s citizens, to death. The exertion of power can take actual control over biological existence or social death, which involves exile or systematic exclusion from opportunities.

Mbembe (2003) accounts for seven ways that necropolitics are locatable/localized within the state. (1) State terror: The state exerts power, persecutes, and eliminates certain populations for the sake of reducing political and social contentions towards the state. (2) The common use of violence: In many cases, the state has no willfully shared monopoly on violence, but shares it with other actors (e.g., policymakers, military, police, the criminal justice system, private and public investments). (3) The “link of enmity”: enmity normalizes the idea that power can be acquired and exercised at the price of another’s life with the use of legal and political tools to expand and exert power and punishment over others, through rationalizations of nationalism, homonationalism (Puar, 2007), and assimilation into neoliberal practices that result into violence. (4) War: the production and persistence of a military market such as engagement on war and occupation. (5) Predation of natural resources by adopting methods to displace and eliminate popula-
tions through cooperative efforts with state, public and private entities, in higher education. (6) Differential killing modes include mass killing, drone strikes, and denial of asylum seekers’ entry, the invalidation of and lack of effort put behind supporting those on the margins. (7) Differential moral justification: rationalized through ideas and notions of eradicating deviance or corruption, and in this contemporary moment materialism and consumerism through expansion projects such as gentrification.

Along with mass killings and exterminations, Mbembe argues necropolitics implies surveillance on individuals beyond the notion of discipline to extract maximum utility. Mbembe (2003) calls “small doses” and the exposure to death in daily interactions many marginalized individuals have with “unbounded social, economic, and symbolic violence” that destroys their bodies and social existence. Daily humiliations perpetrated by public forces on certain populations, the strategy of “small massacres” (p. 38-39) inflicted day by day, and the absence of basic social goods (e.g., housing, money, food, education, validation of existence). Necropolitics thus persists in the power to manufacture an entire crowd of people who live at the margins within society, where people for whom living means continually standing up to face death in their everyday lived realities.

Framing and naming higher education as a necropolitical institution helps us understand how higher education investments in neoliberal practices center white supremacy, death, and violence. It underscores how higher education claims that Black, Indigenous peoples, People of Color (BIPOC) are disposable, while whites and property are not. Perhaps the most compelling reason to understand higher education as necropolitical is to raise awareness of how the white supremacist global economy shapes it. Exposing higher education as a necropolitical institution marks a moment in which intersectional analyses of power, race, gender, policing, and private property reveal how higher education actors appear to consign death and violence. Centering the practices of gentrification, the expansion of the carceral state, and the neglect to center student needs on college campuses I can situate these investments in actions as functioning through a necropolitical lens.

Positionality Statement

One of my central beliefs is to eliminate objectivity, because it allows me to connect with the love of my work. Removing objectivity allows me to be intentional and explicit in centering and describing how, as a researcher, my
positionality influences my motivation and care for the work I engage with in higher education. I draw on my experience as a first-generation, Queer, Latinx person who was raised and still lives in the New York City projects.

I am aware of my power in higher education and struggle with the privileges granted to me by fighting my way into and through higher education. I understand how the institution stares at me as I enter their spaces (either as a disruptor of norms or diversity ticket). I have felt and continue to feel the violence through racism and homophobia from actors within the institution. I am physically placed in a war of contradiction. In the U.S. and for those most marginalized, education, particularly higher education, is an escape from the reality of death in our daily lives. Higher education has always been spoken of as a promise for better life chances. However, my body and my experience say otherwise. I entered the institution because it was a survival opportunity that promised me an escape from death and violence, while I am also aware that I am entering an institution that exacerbates the death and violence of my community.

Gentrification

Gentrification is a dynamic and multi-layered process in which various actors’ roles, including postsecondary institutions and components, change over time (Mathema, 2013). The CDC defines gentrification as a housing, economic, and health issue that affects a community’s history and culture, reducing social capital. Davidson and Lee (2005) define gentrification with four major components: gentrification is occupied in the reinvestment of capital; social upgrading of the locale by incoming high-income groups; landscape change; and the direct or indirect displacement of low-income groups. The focus on postsecondary institutions’ complicity is increasingly important, as they act as quasi-state bodies and play in local neighborhoods’ transition (Moose et al., 2019).

Urban scholars (Atkinson, 2000; Betancur, 2002; Ley, 1981, 1994; Manialansan, 2005; Smith, 1979; Spruce, 2020; Zuk et al., 2015) write of the economic justification and impact on marginalized communities when the state, public, and private interest invest in gentrification. The impact of gentrification leads to several negative outcomes in urban areas. Atkinson (2002, 2004) summarized several negative impacts of gentrification, including displacement through the increase of rent prices, community resentment and conflict, loss of affordable housing, increased policing, and displacement.
into poorer and higher crime areas. Displacement can lead to health issues, including stress and depression (Desmond & Kimbo, 2015). Jelleyman and Spender (2008) found an expensive list of negative health impacts on youth, including behavioral and emotional problems and reduced healthcare use. Chetty and Hendern (2018) highlight the impact of living in high poverty, under-resourced neighborhoods on lower test scores and future earnings.

Higher education is both responsible for and a beneficiary of gentrification in urban cities. Urban colleges, including New York University, Columbia University, the University of Chicago, to name a few, typically boast of their expansion and the benefits they bring to urban cities. These benefits include local community work, generation of revenue, and employment. However, rarely do higher education actors take ownership of gentrification’s negative impact on the surrounding community. Actors of the institutions must realize the distress and burden they put on local communities. They must focus on the financial burden they put upon existing community members’ livelihood.

For example, the housing market entails higher education’s role in displacing residence. The expansion of universities in urban cities plays a role in increasing rental prices near its main campus. Consequently, landlords capitalize on supporting the increase of the student population and its burden on housing. Therefore, as prices rise to meet temporal students’ needs, those who have had a long history within the community face uncontrollably high rents that forces displacement. Bry (2020) highlights the impact colleges and universities like Boston University have had and the housing market its 47,000 students have contributed to the increased rents in the surrounding area. As higher education looks at expanding itself in urban cities through gentrification processes, they must acknowledge their contribution to violence and death through displacement modes. Displacement is deadly and negatively impacts community members’ health and well-being by straining them financially, impacting educational opportunities, and increase chances of criminalization.

As Mbembe (2003 & 2019) defines as necropolitics with concerning itself with social and political power to dictate who and how populations should live or die. Higher educational actors who invest in campus expansions projects in urban cities have a direct link, intentional or not to contributing to death and violence on bodies because necropolitics is more than the sov-
ereign’s power to kill but to expose other people, even the sovereign’s citizens, to death. The exertion of power can take actual control over biological existence or social death, which involves exile or systematic exclusion from opportunities. As gentrification projects in urban cities continues, higher education actors must reconcile the deadly impact and results these practices of expansion may have on communities they are forcing their way into.

Carceral State

Scholars have addressed the impact of the increase of presence of carceral state has on student perceptions of hostility by race. Allen and Jaqcues (2018) examined the negative impact of discrimination Black male students had with municipal police and their trust in the community. Brooks and colleagues (2016) found three emerging themes Black males raised when talking about police enforcement and presence: anger, fear, and resentment. Iverson and Jaggers (2015) examined how higher education institutions contribute to racial profiling through daily interactions with Black students and the negative impacts it had on Black students. In May 2018, a white woman called the police on two Native American brothers visiting Colorado State University because she “believed they were not part of the group” (Jaschik, 2018; Keene & Tachine, 2018). Consequently, the two brothers who saved up all the money they could to visit the campus were pulled from the tour, patted down, and questioned about their presence on the tour. In April 2019, a Black student at Barnard College was physically stopped from entering the library by campus police. The student was racially profiled despite them being a student and were restrained and forced to turn away. In July 2015, Samuel Dubose, an unarmed Black man, was shot by a white University of Cincinnati police officer; in September 2017, Scout Schultz, a bisexual nonbinary Georgia Institute of Technology student, was killed by police after suffering a mental crisis. In April 2018, Charles Thomas was a University of Chicago student shot and killed by campus police while also suffering a mental health crisis. These events, although not comprehensive, are illustrative of how white supremacy, death, and violence are executed by higher education.

Reflection on the summer of 2020 both George Floyd’s and Breonna Taylor’s marches have left a lasting impression for people within the U.S. Colleges and universities and as a result college presidents have come forward to name their commitment to anti-racism. While these statements from uni-
University leaders openly acknowledge racial inequities embedded within the United States legal system and their disavowal of injustices faced by BIPOC community members, their acknowledgments and commitment to anti-racism fall short of actual change from a system of death and violence because higher education institutions continue to have a deep commitment and working relationships with police. The US Department of Justice (2015) special report on campus law enforcement found about 68% of more than 900 U.S. four-year colleges and universities used sworn police officers to provide law enforcement services on their campuses. It is startling that 92% of public institutions use sworn officers and 91% of all public campuses use armed officers. Schuck’s (2016) study on the impact of violence on and near campus at 1,250 public and private university campuses resulted in lower four-year graduation rates. Iverson and Jagger’s (2015) study on policing within the context of higher education found that Black male students were subject to surveillance by both police and residential life staff, and its impact led to being looked down upon, disproportionate surveillance and documentation, and dissatisfaction and trust issues with the institution. Bondi’s (2012) interview of white students found how students and institutions protect whiteness through approaches not inclusive of marginalized people. Solis, Portillos, and Bruson (2009) explored Latino/a/x youth perceptions of police and their fears of becoming victims of crimes due to police’s unfavorable perceptions, furthermore the report demonstrates the policing of youths in their own neighborhoods because their Spanish decent, resulted in routine stop and frisk activities by police (Solis, Porillos & Burson, 2009). These scholars highlight ways BIPOC youth and students are impacted by the increase in police and carceral state. These incidents were not extraordinary circumstances but representations of a chilling pattern of deadly encounters between marginalized bodies, power, and institutions.

Higher education must acknowledge their complicity with expanding policing in gentrified neighborhoods, imprisonment, and punishment and its relation to negative impact on BIPOC students. Higher education’s investment in punishment must be observed as modes of interacting with that state’s neoliberal tendencies that focus on the protection and value of wealth and white life. Higher educational actors must participate in critical inquiry that surpasses the logic of punitiveness and considers how higher education is a quasi-state that provides and hoards material resources and sustains social, cultural, and institutional structures of punishment.
To invest in something is to give resources to sustain, expand, for the potential of being strengthened.

To invest is to generate benefits. Lamble (2015) recognized institutional structures of punishment and the role of groups and individuals in maintaining and strengthening institutional structures that facilitate and normalize punitive actions. Thus, it is critical to call attention and identify the sites (i.e., policing on college campuses, urban cities, and off-campus) that are grounded in the carceral state. With the expansion of college campuses, vulnerable communities are displaced through methods that make it unsafe and unsustainable for members of the community to live. Through practices of increasing housing cost, over-policing to protect new property, and insufficient investment in creating positive relationships existing harmful carceral practices, higher education deploys they then are complicit with using deathly modes that impact BIPOC communities.

**Campus Climate**

The hostility students face within higher education concerning their marginalized identity is evident through the institutional response to student activism. In many instances, higher education exerts its power over students to quash momentum for change. The reactions from higher education actors to student activism can be seen as State terror: whereas actors of the institution exert power, persecutes, and eliminates certain populations for the sake of reducing political and social contentions towards themselves. In the act of silencing a student voice, higher education is necropolitical. Linder et al., (2019) find many instances of student activism on college campuses are comprised of students of marginalized identities who take up the labor and engage in activism for the sake of their survival within predominantly white institutions (PWIs) meant for white, cisgender, heterosexual males. Colleges and universities with hostile climates put these minoritized students (QT, BIPOC) in an unfair predicament in which they must choose whether to expend their energy in enduring, resisting, or ignoring hostility (Linder et al., 2019). A decade of research (Hotchkins & Dancy, 2017; Griffin, 2017; Harper & Hurtado, 2007) illustrates how Asian Americans, Black, Latinx, and Native American students experience racism at predominately white institutions. For example, Black students attending PWIs, endure harmful racial microaggressions due to discrimination, cultural isolation, avoidance,
and a lack of belongingness (Hotchkins & Dancy, 2017). Muslim students endure blatant and indirect discrimination that questions their Americanness and religion while navigating college campus culture (Sallee, 2013).

For students in all racial/ethnic groups, negative perceptions of the campus racial climate are linked to reduced student satisfaction and lower academic performance (Lo et al., 2017). Microaggressions impact a student through psychological and physiological ways (Hotchkins & Dancy 2017). Sue (2010) found biological, physical, emotional, cognitive, and behavioral effects of microaggression. Noting individuals could experience increased health issues and trouble focusing and performing, Nadal et al. (2014) found microaggression relates to adverse academic outcomes. They find that if students are stereotyped to be intellectually inferior or exotic, they may internalize feelings of “otherness,” which negatively influence their ability to contribute to the campus community and lower chances in performing well academically. For example, Strayhorn (2009, 2013) found 88% of high achieving Black collegians report experiencing pressure to prove their intellectual ability, despite university scholarship programs’ prior achievements. Johnson et al. (2012) found students of color observations and encounters with racism on campus contribute to academic environment stress and diminished student feelings about the campus environment, affecting commitment to the institution, and ultimately their persistence decisions. Students of color’s experiences with racism and racial microaggression in residential halls contribute to hostile interracial relations and campus climate perceptions (Hardwood et al., 2012).

The work Queer and Trans (QT) student activists put into transforming and confronting the institutions campus environments is an example where the institutional response can be deadly and violent. For example, QT students face obstacles in the navigation of higher education that still upholds itself as a heterogendered institution (Nguyen et al., 2020; Denton & Cain, 2020; Pryor & Hoffman, 2020; Pryor et al., 2016, Preston & Hoffman, 2015). Research consistently illustrates QT students interpreting university housing policies as oppressive because they frequently experience housing assignments that do not align with their gender identity and face judgment, harassment, and stereotypes from peers, resulting in a hostile environment in which they must navigate (Pryor & Hoffman, 2020; Nguyen et al., 2020; Nguyen et al., 2020; Denton & Cain, 2020; BrckaLorenz et al., 2020). (Although student housing policies have made some strides in supporting QT
students, student housing has done little to deconstruct its role in operating as a traditionally heterogender institution (Preston & Hoffman, 2015).

Many of the systems that support QT students are reactionary (Pryor, 2018) and do little to address the structural and hostile attitudes and environments created throughout the years in hegemonic university housing. Insufficient institutional follow-through is pertinent when universities do not address the homophobic and transphobic culture permeating spaces that include fraternity and sorority life and or on-campus recreation spaces (Pryor, 2018). The consistent exposure to heterosexism and microaggressions that target LGBTQ students’ sexual identities hinders their development in a college setting (Pryor & Hoffman, 2020). Greathouse and colleagues (2018) demonstrate that QT students who experience microaggressions report higher rates of academic disengagement and academic impediments related to depression, anxiety, and stress. Thus, the insufficient safety and daily violence QT students face restrict their ability to resolve higher-level needs. For example, a sense of belonging is a specific challenge for QT students and has been linked to adverse outcomes that include higher mental and emotional needs (Greathouse et al., 2018, Pryor & Hoffman, 2020). Thus, the failure to address this system of violence creates an environment of hostility, impacting mental health and emotional health, community belongingness, and academic performance.

Minoritized students frequently work twice as hard as other students to stay engaged in learning, which often distracts their educational pursuits (Linder et al., 2019). The resistance from administrators protecting neoliberal logic for the desire to secure and protect funding and choosing money over students’ livelihood, has fatal and violent consequences. When students face a resistant college environment, that refuse to meet the basic survival needs of students, the resistance of the institution and actors consequently exacerbate detrimental impact on students, that may result in decreased academic performance, and a decline in emotional and physical well-being (Linder et al., 2019).

In a necropolitical lens, higher education actor’s refusal to meet the needs of the students place the bodies of those students in what Mbembe considers the living dead. When higher education actors deploy weapons (campus police) and strategies (creation of policies to silence)/tools, they are deployed in the interest of maximum destruction of persons. As a result, the tools
deployed by higher education actors creates death worlds, where the population (students) are subjected to conditions of life conferring upon the status of living dead.

**Discussion**

Nothing is more evident than higher education acting as a necropolitical institution when accounting for the actions taken during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. In this ongoing pandemic, higher education actors began to realize their processes of re-opening colleges and campuses at full capacity. This act, taken upon colleges, actively started to expose its community members, students, faculty, and staff to death. Additionally, in this contemporary moment of exposure to death, the institutional care prioritizes profit maximization over the livelihood of students, community members, and professionals within the institution.

The fall of 2020 was the time when higher education became a political institution in preparation for a potential pandemic. According to Forbes, 19 of the country’s worst outbreaks occurred in college towns. Around 850 cases of coronavirus were reported during the fall 2020 semester. By March 2021, it has been estimated that a 30% increase in cases has occurred on college campuses. A study conducted by Lu and his colleagues revealed that among the 30 large universities in the US, 18 of them exhibited high infection rates. The researchers also found a link between the local community and the school infections.

**Conclusion**

The importance of higher education leaders to understand their contribution to power, violence, and death that affects various communities within their institution is explored in this writing. It highlights the various ways in which higher education is often viewed as a necropolitical. When institutions agents stop making excuses, they can come to terms with their roles in perpetuating violence and death. This analysis shows how important it is for higher education leaders to reset the institution and make it a public good. Although higher education can’t fix the COVID-19 pandemic, they can begin to consider how their actions in the future may put people at risk of death. For institutions to succeed, they must first address their own deadly practices. Higher education leaders have to ask themselves how they
can best serve the most marginalized members of society without resorting to violence. They must also consider how they can invest in the well-being of their communities instead of focusing on protecting white supremacist environments. Higher education leaders also need to face the fact that these necropolitical ways of working impact their students’ lives on and off campuses. Those who have come forward to show their commitment to anti-racism should also engage in the work of making a system that is killing and wounding communities a better one. Higher education cannot serve as an escape to a better life when it contributes to the development of hostile and violent environments.

**Action**

Below are some suggestions to break the cycle of death within an institution. They can be used to guide students in resisting violence. Sometimes, we become paralyzed with the critical questions we must ask ourselves, which can prevent us from working towards positive change in higher education. Stating action can in one’s understanding on how to lead to change. As Barabara Love (2010) has said, systems do not automatically follow us, and most of us still act based on values and beliefs that were refined through the socialization process. Actions should be stated so that they can be used to spark change. According to Love, systems are created to perpetuate themselves by the actions of people who automatically act based on their socialization. Most of us still act based on what we’ve been taught. To disrupt these violent deadly practices, we must create new modes of actions and solidify them in our daily work and lives. One step that we can take is to engage in constant reflection that is critical of policies and practices that exists in that are implemented in these reflections we must ask ourselves how these policies and practices disproportionately impacts marginalized populations. The second centers on reimagining what community policing may look like and mean on the college campus and one step towards that is disarming campus police. A third action is effectively trained university faculty and staff in inclusive practices that shape how they work with students and colleagues it is after these members are adequately trained then we can start to move on to how they can utilize this knowledge to create changes in the environment around them. And lastly to create the change that we want to see we must build coalitions consisting well wide range of institutional internal and external stakeholders that center uplifting the communities within and outside of the institution.
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