

## **Policing the Fortress City**

### **Armored Personnel Carriers and the Boomerang Effect of Colonization**

Derek S. Denman – MPI-MMG  
Public Law & Spatial Governance: New Frontiers  
Panel: Shifting Borders of Public Law  
DRAFT – Please do not cite or circulate without permission  
07.12.18

An iconic image from Ferguson, Missouri appeared on August 13, 2014, only days after the death of Michael Brown at the hands of police officer Darren Wilson. The photograph captures heavily armed police, wearing military fatigues and ballistic helmets and bearing M4/AR-15 style rifles. The individuals in the picture could easily be mistaken for a military force were it not for the white “POLICE” emblazoned across their chests. Three men press gloved hands to the grips of their rifles, fingers hovering near triggers. One officer, captured in profile, sits atop an armored vehicle, shouldering his rifle in a standing position, sighting down the scope and into the distance. Through the line of heavily armed police, one’s attention is drawn to the looming presence of the armored vehicle parked across a roadway. Sharp, geometric windows peak through heavy steel plate that covers the vehicle. An enormous platform (actually a ramp facilitating access to upper levels of buildings), hangs over the windshield and hood. The words “Tactical Operations,” painted onto the side of the vehicle, are partially occluded by one of the soldier-police’s helmets. Through the image we see that the sheer physicality of the armored vehicle, surrounded by the threat of overwhelming force, has drawn a line through the city. The photograph captured what Black Lives Matter protestors saw as they stood in the roadway to demand justice for Michael Brown. Similar images of columns of armored vehicles directing movement through urban space would appear in the Baltimore, Maryland following the death of Freddie Gray from injuries inflicted by police.



Whitney Curtis/The New York Times<sup>1</sup>

The image tells multiple stories of uneven geography. The centrality of the road alludes to a moment in 1950s US urban planning that utilized redlining in conjunction with suburban design and policies supporting automobility to redraw the map of racial segregation (Rothstein, 2014). Furthermore, this was one amongst many photographs that contributed to a public conversation, driven by the Black Lives Matter then by the Movement for Black Lives, about policing—its role in systemic anti-Black racism and its increased, unaccountable lethality. The image reveals a collapse of warzone and home front, whereby a military-style presence in an American suburb calls to mind images of the US occupation of Iraqi cities. Imperial center and colonial periphery come into focus in a single frame.

Public debate framed this as the “militarization of the police.” While this debate played an integral part in illuminating the heavily armed, lethal power of the police, recent critical work suggests that framing this process in terms of “militarization” elides the historical imbrications of

---

<sup>1</sup> The image was featured in Julie Bosman and Erik Eckholm, “Anonymity in Police Shooting Fuels Anger in Missouri,” *The New York Times*, August 13, 2014, <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/14/us/missouri-teenager-and-officer-scuffled-before-shooting-chief-says.html>.

the police and the military. “Militarization” implies a pre-militarized moment in which categories of military and police remained separate and further suggests that we might simply return to a police order divested of its formative military connections (Howell, 2018). This liberal framework suggests that police exercise legitimate domestic force under the condition that their practices, weapons, and doctrines distinct from those of the military. However, “when we dig, we usually find that those ‘civilian’ things that are claimed to be in danger of ‘militarization’ have much deeper roots in warfare, and that the peaceful ‘domestic’ political order for which we yearn has been fundamentally shaped *from the outset* by warfare and colonial violence” (Howell, 2018: 120). Upon close inspection, we find a history and ongoing exchange of practices, ideas, and material objects between military and police. The concept “martial politics” offers an alternatives to the concept of militarization, and through a study of martial politics we might “describe the process by which war and peace are imbricated” (Seigel, 2018; Howell, 2018: 121). Building on this body of work that sees the police and military as mutually constitutive institutions, I aim to trace the pathways from one to the other and examine the particular circuitries that connect these entities.

My interest in this paper is in the armored vehicle.<sup>2</sup> I wish to follow the tracks of the armored vehicle to see what it can tell us about the particularities of the contemporary fortress city, that is, the hyper-policed, claustrophobia-inducing, alienated, and privatized condition of urban (and increasingly suburban) space. I focus on the spatial dimensions of policing, those controls on movement waged within and through the built environment. This paper is part of a project on how fortification—a concept that first emerges in military architecture—has shaped

---

<sup>2</sup> I will use the terms “armored vehicle” and “armored personnel carrier”/“APC” almost interchangeably, but it should be noted that some of the documents I examine will make distinctions between them. I will also draw on discussion of tanks, even though the agencies and entities facilitating the use of APCs by police would be quick to point out (rather pedantically) that the term “tank” is usually reserved for tracked, as opposed to wheeled, vehicles.

the contours and logics of spatial control in contemporary political life. In particular, the aim is to look not only at the figure of the wall, which approaches fortification as the medieval fortress, but to trace how the operative logics of fortification have inflected other security practices, defensive architectures, and weapons of urban warfare and policing. A study of police armored vehicles helps to illuminate paradoxical power at work in governing and policing the fortress city. Such vehicles take the seemingly immovable, inert power of fortification and transform it into a mobile platform, capable of intervening across the urban fabric. By turning our focus to these material objects, we can trace the circuits by which these tank-like weapons and their accompanying spatial tactics came to be applied to Black communities, particularly those engaged in acts of political assembly and mourning, as in Ferguson and Baltimore. My wager is that the armored vehicle offers a point from which we can begin to trace supply chains and logistics of military-police connections, giving precise form to the martial politics of the police. I should clarify what this paper is not: an ethnography or granular account of policing, which is something of undeniable significance that has been done well by others (Fassin, 2013; Wacquant, 2008). It also is not a political-economic study of the arms trade and the “market for force” (Avant, 2008). Rather, the aim is to begin from the particular *object* of the armored vehicle and ask how it discloses the relations between space and power, focusing on the global circulation of weapons between military and police and the subsequent modes of spatial governance implemented by the police.

## **Material Infrastructures of Policing**

In recent years, the study of urban political life has begun to focus more centrally on the materiality of infrastructure. For instance, Jane Bennett (2010) considers the electricity grid as an assemblage across which agency is distributed. Graham and Thrift (2007) direct attention beyond

infrastructural innovation and to the processes of maintenance that reproduces and sustains urban life. Cowen (2014) adds to this a focus on the logistics of cities, logistics being a concept adopted from military planning. These approaches turn our attention to the physical objects, practices of design, and methods of planning that shape the city. This focus on the materiality of urban infrastructure has largely remained separate from studies of policing, which tends to focus on the distribution of authority within the state. Even critical analyses, considering policing as a mechanism of producing racialized social order (Neocleous, 2000; Fassin, 2013), overlook the material objects utilized by police in the creation of these asymmetric social relations.

The absence of materiality is striking: We need only look as far as the defining metaphor of modern policing—"broken windows"—to find reference to the materiality of the police. Foucault's (2007: 21, 96) writings on security dispositifs (emerging from earlier articulations of the *Polizeiwissenschaft* and the police) further suggest, but do not yet emphasize, "the materiality within which ... [we] live" and the "right disposition of things." Things, here, refer to people, relations, and physical objects, with the last being largely overlooked in the critical study of police power. My approach will involve connecting the materiality of the police to the politics of space. An analysis that focusses on the materiality of police might provide insight into the specificity of processes by which the police have come to resemble a colonial occupation force without de-historicizing martial politics.

My focus here will be on the police acquisitions from the Defense Logistics Agency, a branch of the US military, and the 1033 program, created through the National Defense Authorization Act of 1997 and responsible for the transfer of surplus military equipment to the police. Through the program, states would sign a memorandum of agreement and establish a State Coordinator to maintain records of the transfers and investigate misuse (Else, 2014: 3).

Individual agencies would then submit an application to the Law Enforcement Support Office at the Defense Logistics Agency certifying that they met eligibility requirements and that they would comply with controls on the equipment stipulated under federal law, 10 U.S. Code 2576a (DLA Disposition Services, 2018b). The program transferred \$504 million of equipment in 2017 and \$6.8 billion over the course of its existence (DLA Disposition Services, 2018a). Equipment transferred ranges from office supplies to rifles, aircraft, and armored vehicles. Nominally, priority is given to transfers focused on counter-terrorism and counter-narcotics use, but transferred equipment is not restricted solely to those uses.

These transfers are a sort of open secret: A full list is publicly available through the DLA website and updated quarterly (DLA Law Enforcement Support Offices, 2018). One might approach the list as Marx (1990) reads the reports of factory inspectors in his study of the working day. This interpretive approach involves recognizing the list's function as official, internal documentation while reading it in a particular register, that is, as an account of existing power relations.<sup>3</sup> The DLA document is dizzying in its length. It includes a spreadsheet for each US state and territory, with most spreadsheets containing thousands of entries. Where the document as a whole is voluminous and overwhelming, each entry is terse, even cryptic, by comparison. One finds the name of the item being transferred, the agency to which it was sent, quantity, the value of the items, and ship date, along with information that appears to be a tracking number and record of its "demilitarization."<sup>4</sup> Focusing on Maryland, one first sees an assortment of different items: RIFLE,5.56 MILLIMETER; SIGHT,REFLEX; SURVIVAL KIT,INDIVIDUAL; FIRING

---

<sup>3</sup> I am indebted to William Walters for this insight into Marx's reading of factory reports and the application of this method to contemporary internal documents and reports.

<sup>4</sup> We can see the conceptual problem of militarization here. The "demilitarization" process rests on the assumption that if only weapons and materiel is put through the appropriate procedures it might again be acceptable when used against civilians.

DEVICE,NON-LETHAL. As one continues to scroll the diversity of items disappears and one item name repeats: RIFLE,5.56 MILLIMETER, with 274 in total transferred to the Baltimore County Police Department on July 8, 1999. This is not the total number of assault rifles transferred to the police, simply the longest consecutive list provided early in the document. Similar lists appear for the Maryland State Police, Saint Mary's County Sheriff Department, and other police organizations. The long, consecutive list of small arms transfers is more norm than exception. Each spread sheet entry is at one level too seemingly anodyne to describe what is being transferred and at another level a perfectly blunt statement of the materiality of police power and its imbrications with military and defense industries.

Vehicles are also abundant, with TRUCK,UTILITY appearing frequently as an entry. Certain entries stand out from the vehicles that appear in large numbers: TRUCK,ARMORED; MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE; and ONLY COMPLETE COMBAT/ASSAULT/TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE. Maryland has received a total of fourteen armored vehicles. Missouri has received thirty-two (DLA Law Enforcement Support Offices, 2018; Appendix 1; Appendix 2). Mine resistant vehicles, most valued at over half a million USD each, would be prohibitively expensive for police departments. The Law Enforcement Support Office provides specific guidelines for these vehicles, which are considered "high visibility property" along with small arms and aircraft. The ship date of these items is the telling part of the story. Most were transferred to police in late 2013 or early 2014, as the MRAP (Mine-Resistant Ambush Protected vehicle) program began to wind down. The program, started in 2007 and expanded over the following years, had overseen the acquisition of thousands of vehicles with armored v-shaped hulls resistant to improvised explosive devices. First deployed in greatest numbers to Iraq, mine resistant vehicles were then shifted to Afghanistan around 2010. With the end of the MRAP program in 2012 and the introduction of

new vehicle designs, mine resistant vehicles became available for police through the Defense Logistics Agency (ACLU, 2014: 22). The weapons of imperial war, after an appropriate “demil” process, would be made available for the colonial policing of American cities and suburbs. Not all vehicles were the product of transfers through 1033 programs. The MRAP program also brought with it an expanded industry of assault vehicles, indirectly facilitating the availability of new weapons for police. While the Ferguson Police received Humvees through the military transfer program (which it was subsequently forced by the Obama administration to return), the vehicle from the iconic image was a Lenco BearCat, a smaller armored vehicle that would have been purchased directly by the department (ACLU, 2014: 22). The Lenco website provides assistance with grant writing in order to make these vehicles more readily available to police (Lenco, 2018). In Baltimore, many of the armored vehicles were those deployed by the Maryland National Guard after a state of emergency was declared by Governor Larry Hogan.

With the movement of armored vehicles we see a material circuit of what Césaire (2000: 41) calls the “boomerang effect of colonization.”

[T]hese cities that evaporate at the edge of the sword, are not to be so easily disposed of. They prove that colonization, I repeat, dehumanizes even the most civilized man; that colonial activity, colonial enterprise, colonial conquest, which is based on contempt for the native and justified by that contempt, inevitably tends to change him who undertakes it; that the colonizer, who in order to ease his conscience gets into the habit of seeing the other man as *an animal*, accustoms himself to treating him like an animal, and tends objectively to transform *himself* into an animal.

Césaire’s boomerang has far reaching implications for political thought, locating the origins of escalating violence in the twentieth century within the logic and practice of colonial domination.<sup>5</sup> His emphasis was on the movement of racist ideology, practices of social control, and forms of violence exercised by Europeans in the subjugation and exploitation of colonial populations as

---

<sup>5</sup> Hannah Arendt (1985: 155) echoes this concept when she writes of a “boomerang effect of imperialism upon the homeland” in Germany and Austria through which foreign and domestic policy converged in “the permanent degradation of alien peoples.”



they returned to the metropole, specifically in the form of European fascism and genocide. In an inquiry into the formation of disciplinary society and biopolitics, Michel Foucault (2003: 103) finds such a circulation of spatial controls implicated in the formation of juridical and political structures. Colonialism: “had a considerable boomerang effect on the mechanisms of power in the West, and on the apparatuses, institutions, and techniques of power. A whole series of colonial models was brought back to the West, and the result was that the West could practice something resembling colonization, or an internal colonialism, on itself.” For Foucault, the boomerang effect extends the influence of colonialism deeper than institutional state formation and nationalism. Colonial logics and practices of control become part of a *dispositif*, or apparatus, inflecting practices of securitization across a vast political field. Building on Foucault’s work, Graham (2011: xvi–xvii) has suggested that the proliferation of urban securitization proceeds through such pathways of colonial power:

The new military urbanism feeds on experiments with styles of targeting and technology in colonial war-zones, such as Gaza or Baghdad, or security operations at international sports events or political summits. These operations act as testing grounds for technology and techniques to be sold on through the world’s burgeoning homeland security markets. Through such processes of imitation, explicitly colonial models of pacification, militarization and control, honed on the streets of the global South, are spread to the cities of capitalist heartlands in the North.

The boomerang effect of colonization moves not only techniques and practices, but also technologies and objects through pathways of circulation. It connects war zone and home front through a circuitry that unsettles clear divisions between center and periphery. Focus on boomerang effects of colonialism provides a method of geographic inquiry in which close examination of the practices of control, domination, and exploitation applied through neocolonial war provides insight into the militarized present of the metropole.

Applied to contemporary policing, we find circuits of colonial power flowing from warzones and battlefields in the global South to the hyper-policed spaces of the urban and suburban United States. While much work has focused on the practices and logics formed in the crucible of colonial governance—counterinsurgency doctrine, privatization, imprisonment, shoot-to-kill policies, to name but a few—my focus is on the material objects and technologies that compose the martial politics of the police (Graham, 2011: 258–59; Khalili, 2017; Barder, 2015). By emphasizing the armored vehicle, I follow a line of work interested in the material composition of the international, a political space irreducible to any particular nation-state yet beset by borders, boundaries, and divisions distinct from the implicitly homogeneous space of “the global.” Salter (2015: ix) has led the way in the examination of the material things—objects, flows, and technologies—that compose international politics: “Material objects can serve as catalysts for understanding the entailment of local, global, and planetary scales” (Salter, 2015: x). Through such an approach, Salter (2015: ix) locates mobility at the intersection of space and materiality, asking “how particular technologies and objects facilitate or structure the mobility of individuals, how borders filter passage, and how traffic flows are managed.” As object, the armored vehicle is a commodity, a weapon, and a vehicle. The armored vehicle arises from mobility of a commodity circulating in the global arms trade. Its mobility makes it a desirable weapon of urban policing—it can be rapidly relocated as a material form of obstruction. Yet, the sheer physicality of its weight, metal exterior, and geometry turn it into a barrier of sorts, one implicated in the obstruction of mobilities along roadways and through urban space.

The transfers of armored vehicles by the DLA highlight the military logistics that subtends US policing. While part of the military, the function of the DLA is not immediately about the application of force, but securing the movement of material objects and materiel,

necessary for that application. As the coordinator of logistics, it “manages the global supply chain” for branches of the US military, federal agencies, and allies (DLA, 2018). Recent work on logistics and geopolitics has tracked the ways in which supply chain management traces its origins to military supply lines (Cowen, 2014). We see in the DLA the subsequent return of logistics, transfigured through its adoption of supply chain management, into the organization of state capacity to use force. This convergence of geopolitical and geoeconomic power is evident in references to the Memorandum of Agreement establishing a “business relationship” between the DLA and state and local law enforcement. Here, the relationship between multiple levels of government authorized to use force is envisioned as transactional. Such a relationship goes beyond the suggestion that sovereignty has recently been reconfigured through the outsourcing and marketization of force (Avant, 2008). Markets have long been intertwined with martial politics, specifically the areas of overlap and exchange between military and police. Paul Virilio (and Lotringer, 2008: 20) has compellingly described logistics as the beginning of a war economy, yet what we find in the Defense Logistics Agency is well beyond a beginning. It represents the point at which a war economy, in its enormous productive/generative capacity (to which Virilio has long directed our attention) exceeds the explicitly military form. In the Defense Logistics Agency, the war economy reaches the war by other means of police power. The DLA facilitates the movement of weapons first employed on the frontlines of colonial warfare back to the policing of the metropole. The precise ways in which this policing occurs calls for close attention to the spatial controls enabled by these armored vehicles.

### **The Armored Vehicle in the Fortress City**

In addition to its role in the colonial and martial politics of the police, I want to suggest that the presence of armored vehicles in urban spaces is further significant in terms of its

materiality and capacity for spatial control. Shapiro (2015: 212) has observed that “the tank changed the spatiality of warfare.” As the embodiment of industrialized warfare, the tank was able to cut across trench lines. Any encounter with its physical enormity and tremendous mass left an impression of its mechanized power. Virilio (1994: 42) suggests that the spatial transformations enacted by tanks are even more complex, with vehicles replacing barriers: “The fortification, once an object, tended to become a ‘subject’; moreover, was not the tank a fortification on wheels? With its tens of tons, the tank could be identified as an iron casemate.” Through its materiality the tank could serve as a fortress wall, as both offensive weapon and defensive architecture.

I wish to look at how this change in the space of war filtered into spatial control by the police. The spatial order of the police has remained, at best, a latent part of critical theories of policing. In his critical account of the historical formation of the police, Neocleous (2000: 16–17) writes of the mobilizing and immobilizing dimensions of police power. For Neocleous, the police not only reproduced class power but ushered in the conditions of the money wage. Tasked with monitoring “wastage” and “appropriation,” early police practices were integral to dissolving a workers claim to their products (Neocleous, 2000: 71–74). Such police practices worked by fixing certain social relations in place while transforming others. Immobilization serves to quell revolutionary stirrings among the laboring poor while the mobilizing force seeks to convert “disorderly” populations into a pliable workforce. The metaphor of mobilization and immobilization is illuminating, yet it might be fruitful to consider these terms literally, that is, to look at the ways in which the police impede and enable movement. In doing so we might move from Neocleous’s (2000: xii) idea of the police as a process of the “fabrication of social order” to policing as the fabrication of *spatial* order. Neocleous (2000: 40) further suggests that the police

emerge within liberal order as a control on “mob rule,” where “[m]ob was an abbreviation of the Latin *mobile vulgus*, a term developed by the ruling class in the eighteenth century as a coda for the poor and thus the emergent working class as the lower *order*.” *Mobile vulgus* is, literally, the mobile crowd, a multitude insofar as it is able to move. Conversely, the police represent constraints on the movements of the crowd/multitude/mass/people. Police order is spatial as well as social order.

Mapping this spatial order involves documenting the particular objects, tactics, technologies, and built environments by which movement and space are governed. In early history of policing in Europe, this spatial order took the form of the workhouse (Neocleous, 2000: 19):

Whereas the measures against vagrancy and begging the first stage were largely punitive ... in the second stage they became more actively interventionist and ‘positive,’ seeking to mobilize the resource that the vagabond possessed. Although expulsion and other measures still existed, the general thrust of the policing of the poor was increasingly towards institutions of confinement across Europe.

Whereas earlier forms of policing the poor might have involved spatial exclusion from the city through expulsion, institutions of confinement such as the workhouse in England set “vagrants” and “beggars” to work. In the US, the origins of policing are tied not only to the regulation of vagabondage but also to slave patrols, “whose primary function was to patrol slaves by regulating their movement (including free Blacks) checking documents, enforcing slave codes, guarding against slave revolts and catching runaway slaves” (Durr, 2015: 875). Policing in the US has been intertwined with racialized state violence since its founding, first in the spatial order of the plantation, where patrols suppressed the resistance and revolt of slaves through terror, then in the spatial order of the police (Potter, 2003; Durr, 2015: 876). In the contemporary spatial order of the police, a vast array of seemingly disparate tactics, techniques and material forms

converge: long histories of racialized police violence, legacies of Jim Crow segregation, suburbanization, stop-and-frisk, and “defensive architecture,” to name a few.

The mobile fortress of the armored vehicle numbers amongst the objects and weapons of this spatial order. In Ferguson, where mid-century suburban planning centered on the main road through town, the armored vehicle facilitated the obstruction of the main artery for movement through. The armored vehicle was a barricade that could be rapidly deployed and maneuvered to contain protest. During the Baltimore Uprising that would follow the death and funeral of Freddie Gray, armored police vehicles would control the movement of protestors marching in the city. Protestors would gather at the intersection of Pennsylvania and North Ave, where they would be flanked by police in riot gear to their west. As they began to march north, they would encounter a column of armored police vehicles, parked one behind the next, seemingly pushing them east, or, at the very least building an easily rearranged wall through an already intensely segregated and partitioned city. In both cases the armored served as a mobile wall, drawing lines of division through the city and suddenly making spaces temporarily inaccessible. They represent a kind of qualitative leap in the power of the police barricade. Where bodies, shields, riot gear, and interlocking bikes were utilized to regulate the movement of crowds, armored vehicles now reinforce these lines with the speed and sheer physicality of military-grade weapons.

At their most dangerous, the armored police vehicles enabled a kind of mechanized kettling, using a combination of their materiality, as both maneuverable vehicle and suddenly immovable barrier, with elements of the built environment. Kettling is a police tactics whereby crowds are forced together into such confined space that they might “boil over.” When forced together by police lines on all sides, members of the crowd are not only unable to move but may

begin to feel intense pressure on their body, even making it difficult to breath. As members of the crowd attempt to escape the crushing force imposed upon them, they become easier for police to grab, detain, and arrest. While we have not yet seen protestors crushed under armored vehicles, the lines drawn by the vehicles nonetheless instill initial boundaries across which protestors cannot move. These boundaries are then buttressed by lines of heavily armored police, which may begin to apply further force to crowds. Armored vehicles add to the pressure of the kettle through their materiality but also through their appearance: “they appear threatening and observers do not necessarily have reason to know whether an APC is armed” (ACLU, 2014: 22). While armored vehicles typically have the weapons on their turret removed, they are often recognized by crowds as their “militarized” counterpart. The fear and panic that they may instill does not require further armament.

In the armored vehicle we see mechanized warfare and its attendant transformation of the spatiality of conflict filter into and amplify police power. Through the combination of the mobility of armored vehicles—they are, after all “High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles (HMMWV) & Other Tactical Vehicles”—and the rigidity of their steel reinforced doors and hulls, the vehicles were able to both rapidly move and suddenly obstruct, combining the mobilizing and immobilizing force of the police (DLA Disposition Services, 2018c). From the Green Zones of Iraq to the police barriers of Baltimore, the boomerang effect of colonization had brought these vehicles into a martial politics of urban space. As Abourahme (2018: 108) observes, “[t]he effect is that the old colonial border ... both and at once hardens and is undone—literally fortified in architectures of walling ... but also traversed in that *it begins to produce colonial styles of politics and politicking on both its sides.*” This paradoxical simultaneity is nowhere as evident as in the object of the armored vehicle that circulates between

occupied warzone and hyper-policed homefront, employed as both weapon and wall. It is as if the sharp angles of the bastioned fortress have been transfigured into the rolling fortress of the armored vehicle. The difference being that where the construction of a bastioned fortress in early modern warfare might drain the resources of an imperial power, the numerous armored vehicles of the police are surplus, mere leftovers of enormous military expenditure.

I wish to close with what may be a naïve question: What makes the image of tanks and armored vehicles in cities so unsettling? Noteworthy instances include deployment of the National Guard in the 1960's US (Scott, 2016: 49), the Prague Spring of 1968, Tiananmen Square, Ferguson, and Baltimore. I have undoubtedly missed others. Notably, each of these examples involves a spatial dimension. Tanks blocked streets, served as barricades, demolished buildings, and had their advance temporarily halted by a lone marcher. Tanks and armored vehicles mark a shift in the martial politics of the police from low-intensity ongoing war-like control to the immediacy of war on the populace. Virilio (1994: 19) describes this shift as follows: "the arrival of a new infrastructural-vehicular system always revolutionizes a society in overthrowing both its sense of material and its sense of social relationships." New vehicles and infrastructure alter conditions of mobility and spatial order. The presences of tanks in cities offends deeply because it signals the conversion of the proximity offered by the city from a promise of encounter to a condition of control. While we should be careful not to romanticize the city as necessarily egalitarian, cities offer possibilities of just distribution through the gathering of bodies, ideas, energy, resources, and capital. The presence of tanks in cities forecloses this possibility. Through boomerang effects of colonization, subtended by the logistical power of the police, the promise of conviviality is replaced by the maximization of power. As the tank roles across urban space, the affective milieu of place is turned into a plane of terror.





## References

- Abourahme, Nasser. 2018. "Of Monsters and Boomerangs: Colonial Returns in the Late Liberal City." *City* 22(1): 106–115.
- ACLU. 2014. "War Comes Home: The Excessive Militarization of American Police." <https://www.aclu.org/report/war-comes-home-excessive-militarization-american-police>.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1985. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. San Diego: Harcourt.
- Avant, Deborah. 2008. *The Market for Force: The Consequences of Privatizing Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barder, Alexander. 2015. *Empire Within: International hierarchy and Its Imperial Laboratories of Governance*. Routledge: London.
- Beavers, Elizabeth R., and Michael Shank. 2017. "Opinion | Get the Military Off of Main Street." *The New York Times*, December 20, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/15/opinion/ferguson-shows-the-risks-of-militarized-policing.html>.
- Bennet, Jane. 2010. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Césaire, Aimé. 2000. *Discourse on Colonialism*. Trans. Joan Pinkham. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Cowen, Deborah. 2014. *The Deadly Life of Logistics: Mapping Violence in Global Trade*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- DLA. 2018. "At a Glance." <http://www.dla.mil/AtaGlance/>.
- DLA Disposition Services. 2018a. "Law Enforcement Support Office." <http://www.dla.mil/DispositionServices/Offers/Reutilization/LawEnforcement.aspx>.
- DLA Disposition Services. 2018b. "Join the 1033 Program." <http://www.dla.mil/DispositionServices/Offers/Reutilization/LawEnforcement/JoinTheProgram.aspx>.
- DLA Disposition Services. 2018c. "Tactical Vehicles." <http://www.dla.mil/DispositionServices/Offers/Reutilization/LawEnforcement/Vehicles.aspx>.
- DLA Law Enforcement Support Offices. 2018. "LESO Property Transferred to Participating Agencies." June 30.

- [http://www.dla.mil/Portals/104/Documents/DispositionServices/LESO/DISP\\_AllStatesAndTerritories\\_06302018.xlsx](http://www.dla.mil/Portals/104/Documents/DispositionServices/LESO/DISP_AllStatesAndTerritories_06302018.xlsx) (accessed September 3, 2018).
- Durr, Marlese. 2015. "What Is the Difference between Slave Patrols and Modern Day Policing? Institutional Violence in a Community of Color." *Critical Sociology* 41 (6): 873–79.
- Else, Daniel. 2014. *The "1033 Program," Department of Defense Support to Law Enforcement*. Congressional Research Service. August 28. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R43701.pdf>.
- Fassin, Didier. 2013. *Enforcing Order: An Ethnography of Urban Policing*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Foucault, Michel. 2007. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977–1978*. Trans. Graham Burchell. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, Michel. 2003. *"Society Must be Defended": Lectures at the Collège de France 1975–1976*. Trans. David Macey. New York: Picador.
- Graham, Stephen. 2011. *Cities Under Siege: The New Military Urbanism*. New York: Verso.
- Graham, Stephen and Thrift, Nigel. 2007. "Out of Order: Understanding Repair and Maintenance." *Theory, Culture & Society* 24(3): 1–25.
- Howell, Alison. 2018. "Forget 'militarization': race, disability and the 'martial politics' of the police and of the university." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 20(2): 117–136.
- Khalili, Laleh. 2017. "The Infrastructural Power of the Military: The Geoeconomic Role of the US Army Corps of Engineers in the Arabian Peninsula." *European Journal of International Relations*. Online First. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066117742955>.
- Lenco. 2018. "Grant Help." <https://www.lencoarmor.com/grant-help/> (accessed October 9, 2018).
- Marx, Karl. 1990. *Capital: Volume I: A Critique of Political Economy*. Translated by Ben Fowkes. London: Penguin Classics.
- Potter, Gary W. 2003. "Police History, United States Chicago, IL: Fitzroy-Dearborn." In *Encyclopedia of Criminology*, edited by Richard Wright and J. Mitchell Miller. Vol. 2. Chicago: Fitzroy-Dearborn.
- Rothstein, Richard. 2014. "The Making of Ferguson: Public Policies at the Root of its Troubles" *Economic Policy Institute*. October 15. <https://www.epi.org/files/2014/making-of-ferguson-final.pdf>.
- Salter, Mark. 2015. "Introduction: Circuits and Motion," in *Making Things International I: Circuits and Motion*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Seigel, Micol. 2018. "Violence Work: Policing and Power." *Race and Class* 59(4): 15–33.
- Scott, Felicity. 2016. *Outlaw Territories: Environments of Insecurity/Architectures of Counterinsurgency*. New York: Zone.
- Shapiro, Michael. "Tanks." In *Making Things International 1: Circuits and Motion*. Mark Salter. 212–221. Ed. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Virilio, Paul. 1994. *Bunker Archeology*. G. Collins. Trans. Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Virilio, Paul and Lotringer, Sylvère. 2008. *Pure War*. Trans. Mark Polizzotti. Cambridge, Mass: Semiotext(e).
- Wacquant, Loïc. 2008. "The Militarization of Urban Marginality: Lessons from the Brazilian Metropolis." *International Political Sociology* 2(1): 56–74.

## Appendix 1: Maryland Transfers – Armored & Mine Resistant Vehicles

State	Station Name (LEA)	NSN	Item Name	Quantity	UI	Acquisition Value	DEMIL Code	DEMIL IC	Ship Date
-------	--------------------	-----	-----------	----------	----	-------------------	------------	----------	-----------

### Armored Vehicles

MD	MD STATE POLICE	2320-01-074-7642	TRUCK,ARMORED	1	Each	\$65,070.00	C	1	Jun 26, 2015 12:00:00 AM
MD	FREDERICK POLICE DEPT	2320-01-074-7642	TRUCK,ARMORED	1	Each	\$65,070.00	C	1	Apr 6, 2007 12:00:00 AM
MD	FRUITLAND POLICE DEPT	2320-01-074-7642	TRUCK,ARMORED	1	Each	\$65,070.00	C	1	Apr 3, 2012 12:00:00 AM
MD	GARRETT COUNTY SHERIFF DEPT	2320-01-074-7642	TRUCK,ARMORED	1	Each	\$65,070.00	C	1	Oct 26, 2005 12:00:00 AM
MD	GREENBELT POLICE DEPT	2320-01-074-7642	TRUCK,ARMORED	1	Each	\$65,070.00	C	1	Mar 28, 2000 12:00:00 AM
MD	OCEAN CITY POLICE	2320-01-074-7642	TRUCK,ARMORED	1	Each	\$65,070.00	C	1	Jul 21, 2005 12:00:00 AM
MD	SALISBURY POLICE DEPT	2320-01-074-7642	TRUCK,ARMORED	1	Each	\$65,070.00	C	1	Mar 12, 2013 12:00:00 AM
MD	UNIV OF MD COLLEGE PARK PD HI_ED	2320-01-074-7642	TRUCK,ARMORED	1	Each	\$65,070.00	C	1	Nov 2, 2005 12:00:00 AM

### Mine Resistant & Assault Vehicles

MD	MONTGOMERY COUNTY POLICE DEPT	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	Apr 21, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MD	QUEEN ANNES COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE	2355-01-555-0908	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$412,000.00	C	1	Oct 17, 2013 12:00:00 AM
MD	WICOMICO COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICE	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	Apr 21, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MD	CUMBERLAND POLICE DEPT	2355-01-602-3357	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$865,000.00	C	1	Oct 12, 2016 12:00:00 AM
MD	DORCHESTER COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE	2355-20-001-9922	CAR,ARMORED,MINE DISPOSAL	1	Each	\$460,000.00	C	1	May 23, 2017 12:00:00 AM
MD	LAUREL POLICE DEPT	2355-DS-COM-BTV2	ONLY COMPLETE COMBAT/ASSAULT/TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES	1	Each	\$138,000.00	D		Nov 30, 2012 12:00:00 AM

## Appendix 2: Missouri Transfers – Armored & Mine Resistant

State	Station Name (LEA)	NSN	Item Name	Quantity	UI	Acquisition Value	DEMIL Code	DEMIL IC	Ship Date
-------	--------------------	-----	-----------	----------	----	-------------------	------------	----------	-----------

### Armored Vehicles

MO	BATES COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICE	2320-01-074-7642	TRUCK,ARMORED	1	Each	\$65,070.00	C	1	Apr 30, 2013 12:00:00 AM
MO	BELTON POLICE DEPARTMENT	2320-01-074-7642	TRUCK,ARMORED	1	Each	\$65,070.00	C	1	Jun 4, 1996 12:00:00 AM
MO	CAMDEN COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICE	2320-01-074-7642	TRUCK,ARMORED	1	Each	\$65,070.00	C	1	May 4, 1996 12:00:00 AM
MO	COLE COUNTY SHERIFF DEPT	2320-01-074-7642	TRUCK,ARMORED	1	Each	\$65,070.00	C	1	May 27, 2010 12:00:00 AM
MO	GLADSTONE DEPT OF PUBLIC SAFETY	2355-00-168-2620	CAR,ARMORED	1	Each	\$33,707.00	D	1	Mar 26, 2012 12:00:00 AM
MO	JOHNSON COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE	2320-01-074-7642	TRUCK,ARMORED	1	Each	\$65,070.00	C	1	Jun 18, 2009 12:00:00 AM
MO	MILLER COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE	2320-01-074-7642	TRUCK,ARMORED	1	Each	\$65,070.00	C	1	Apr 25, 2006 12:00:00 AM
MO	SPRINGFIELD POLICE DEPT	2320-01-074-7642	TRUCK,ARMORED	1	Each	\$65,070.00	C	1	Oct 31, 1994 12:00:00 AM

### Mine Resistant & Assault Vehicles

MO	BATES COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICE	2355-01-553-4634	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$658,000.00	C	1	Nov 5, 2013 12:00:00 AM
MO	BLUE SPRINGS POLICE DEPT	2355-DS-COM-BTV2	ONLY COMPLETE COMBAT/ASSAULT/TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES	1	Each	\$380,000.00	D		Nov 2, 2011 12:00:00 AM
MO	BUCHANAN COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICE	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	Mar 6, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MO	CAPE GIRARDEAU COUNTY SHERIFF	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	Feb 13, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MO	CASS COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	Feb 13, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MO	CLAY COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICE	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	Mar 6, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MO	FRANKLIN COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICE	2355-01-555-0908	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$412,000.00	C	1	Sep 25, 2013 12:00:00 AM
MO	GREENE COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	Apr 14, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MO	JACKSON COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICE	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	Apr 21, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MO	JACKSON COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICE	2355-DS-COM-BTV2	ONLY COMPLETE COMBAT/ASSAULT/TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES	1	Each	\$195,650.00	D		Mar 1, 2011 12:00:00 AM
MO	JEFFERSON COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	May 1, 2014 12:00:00 AM

MO	JOPLIN POLICE DEPT	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	Feb 13, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MO	KENNETT POLICE DEPT	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	Feb 13, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MO	MCDONALD COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	Apr 14, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MO	MONETT POLICE DEPT	2355-01-562-6146	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$689,000.00	C	1	Mar 28, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MO	NEWTON COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICE	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	Feb 13, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MO	NIXA POLICE DEPT	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	Apr 14, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MO	PLATTE COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICE	2355-01-561-0281	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$689,000.00	C	1	May 23, 2016 12:00:00 AM
MO	PULASKI COUNTY SHERIFF DEPT	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	Apr 14, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MO	ROLLA POLICE DEPT	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	Apr 21, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MO	SAINT GENEVIEVE CTY SHERIFF OFFICE	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	Apr 21, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MO	ST. CHARLES COUNTY POLICE DEPT	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	May 1, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MO	ST. CLAIR COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICE	2355-01-590-1660	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$733,000.00	C	1	Apr 21, 2014 12:00:00 AM
MO	WEBSTER COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICE	2355-01-553-4634	MINE RESISTANT VEHICLE	1	Each	\$658,000.00	C	1	Feb 27, 2017 12:00:00 AM