In the shadow of the conflict areas and urban warfare in the Middle East, American cities such as Washington DC and New York City – NYC – are as well transformed in militarized urban environments. In these cases there is often a stealthy military strategy applied on the urban planning and design at any scale level of NYC and its surrounding environment. In this essay those different military strategies, which are applied on NYC, will be appointed and where it is possible approached from a spatial perspective. All of these military measurements are taken to ‘prevent’ New Yorkers from being attacked by terrorists. In this essay I will try to give an answer on the question of what military strategies are being used to secure and defend the urban environment of NYC and what are the direct and indirect effects and consequences of this militarization on NYC?

Yet, to get answers on the questions of what strategies are being used and what effects and consequences those strategies have on the city itself there should be a clear definition of what militarization of the city means. In this essay the militarization of the city is considered as the way in which a global power – in this case the US government – works to inscribe military strategies, which could be as well defensive as attacking into the planning and design of cities. Thus, militarization of the city does not only include applying military strategies on an urban level or even higher level, but can as well have its influence on the architecture of the city. Considering this as the definition of militarization of cities, and taking, in most cases, its stealthy character in account, it becomes obvious that finding these new urban fragments of militarization and mapping these strategies is difficult in a city like NYC.

NEW YORK CITY AS DOMESTIC FRONT

NYC can be seen as one of the domestic fronts in the war on terror. A city defended and secured by Homeland Security, a government organization which is there to protect its homeland citizens against threats that are coming form inside the US itself. Every day it needs to value the threat attack threat – at public spaces in cities and its users and translate that threat level in a number of colors. So the US government created a domestic front with far reaching consequences in the city of New York and other American cities. Those cities that are being militarized are often taking an important position on an economical or political level and function as arrival port for immigrants and visitors to the US.

Cities like NY suffer as well under the ‘war on terror’ and its strategy that ‘involves deepening state surveillance and violence against those seen to harbor ‘terrorist threats.’ Combined with radically increased efforts to ensure the effective filtering power of national and infrastructural borders, NYC has always been one of the most important arrival ports and takes now leading positions on both political and economical level, so it is obvious that NYC is influenced by the ‘war on terror’. What happens is that “in both in political debates and policy practice, borders are very much back in style.”

In NYC a city where this process of creating new and reinforcing the existing borders is clearly visible, slightly helped by its geographical position: a couple of islands and peninsulas which lead to a much more clearer network and numbers of entrances to the city itself. For now this reinforcing of existing borders and creation of new ones has its influence on the quantity and quality of the public space in NYC. Where for example the –public– space around the headquarters of the NYPD is completely controlled by checkpoints and heavily armed Police forces and space which used to be considered as public space now acts as neutral zone between the city and the NYPD building.

This neutral zone is empty. Cities like NY try to create more of these clearly organized urban spaces with closely controlled, visible and invisible surveillance borders.

Clariing the urban space

From the military perspective clarifying the environment, or in the case of NYC the urban space, is seen as something extremely important to be able to defend and control a city in a efficient way. US Homeland Security is therefore also attempting to redesign the basic everyday systems and urban spaces in New York City. “Even if this is sometimes a stealthy and invisible process. As result, urban public life is being saturated by -intelligent- surveillance systems, checkpoints, -defense- urban design and planning and intensifying security.”

Homeland security has its influence on the physical planning of NYC, its management of traffic, its migration and design of public space itself. Most visible are those influences at so-called soft targets in the city of New York. For example, the -public– space in and around Wall Street and the Stock Exchange building is completely barricaded by concrete blocks, steel fences, highly secured checkpoints, surveillance camera’s, a traffic flow plan around the NYSE and other, more stealthy measurements to monitor any kind of terrorist attack.
threat. The militarization of NYC on a larger urban scale is even steelier and harder to map or define. This is because a lot of these measurements are sold to the public under other purposes. For example, the proposal of a charging zone for cars in Manhattan seems just another proposal to decrease the number of cars, but on the other hand it is an ideal way to control and check every car that goes in and out of Manhattan. In fact, it is again the creation of another border. Besides all the recent taken measurements, we should not forget that fifty years ago in the Cold War period there were military strategies as well that had its influence on designing the city of NY. As first example, the construction of highways in those years was presented to the public as a need for fast transportation of military forces across and between cities and the threat of a nuclear war influenced the designs of urban environments. Secondly, New York and especially Manhattan played an important role in the development of the atomic bomb, or better know as the Manhattan Project. In the NY Times "Dr. Norris writes about the Manhattan Project’s Manhattan locations. He says the borough had at least 10 sites, all but one still standing. They include warehouses that held uranium, laboratories that split the atom, and the project’s first headquarters - a skyscraper hidden in plain sight right across from City Hall, already at that time something like the cold war had its influence on and in the middle of Manhattan. New and existing buildings and infrastructure were re-designed and used by the military and took place without anyone knowing. Simply by presenting the public something else than what actually was really going on.

"The very term ‘Homeland Security’, in fact, serves to rework the imaginative geographies of contemporary US urbanism in important ways. It shifts the emphasis away from complex and mobile diasporic social formations, sustaining large metropolitan areas, towards a much clearer mapping which demarcates clear, essentialized geographies of entitlement and threat. At many scales—from small neighborhoods, through cities and nations to the international—this separation works to define those citizens who are deemed threatening as real or potential sources of ‘terrorism’…” In this case New York city is an exception. The goal to clarify NYC, a city with a hundred different nationalities and cultures, at the level of it’s urban complexity is an important input on the future existence of the city and can be compared with a form of urbicide, the destroying of multi-ethnic communities. This -clarifying- strategy can eventually lead towards a NY metropolitan area with actual enclaves and their secured borders separating them from each other. This happens already in a more complex way and smaller scale than we have seen before in cities like Berlin before the destroying of the wall or in more recent urban warfare in the former Yugoslavia Republic. Internal city borders will be further reinforced and forming local enclaves scattered across the NYC. No longer it are only continuous lines that separate different ethnic, cultural or social people but by fragmented lines, point-based security checkpoints or systems which filter for example at the entrance of public buildings, offices or transportation infrastructure and separates people.

IN A STATE OF FEAR

Where New York’s public spaces used to transmit the sense of security among strangers, the same spaces are now eroded by new and old threats, such as terrorism and increasing growth of social disorder. At those places, such as the WTC terrain or Wall Street, fear dominates the public space and by contrast, the militarization of its space is presented under the purpose to give people a secured feeling but on the other hand it is feeding the amount of fear. The US government and thus Homeland Security as executant reinforces this fear. "...Homeland Security drive is the production of permanent anxiety around every day urban spaces, systems, and events that were previously banalized, taken for granted or ignored in US urban life (...) The ‘Homeland’ is thus cast in terms of a constant ‘state of emergency’. " In the case of this NY this means that at many public spaces the militarization tries to be constantly visible to confront citizens with their fear. This is a contradiction; based on the fact the many measurements that are taken to control and defend the urban space should be invisible for any potential terrorists. At last, this fear makes it also possible to take vast military measurements in urban spaces, something, which is the most important aspect for the US government from the perspective of controlling and surveilling a whole city.

DEFENDING NEW YORK

Besides the strategy to defend and militarize NYC by the strategy of Homeland Security there is also the perspective of the army itself and their strategies to defend a city like NY. By taking a closer look at these strategies it is clear that the strategies of Homeland Security are based on these military tactics to defend a city in the best possible way.
This military report "Field Manual FM 90-10 Military Operations on Urbanized Terrain (MOUT), chapter 03; defense" starts with "In all cases, the elements of urban sprawl must be analyzed in conjunction with natural terrain in order to determine how to enhance weapons effectiveness to slow, block, and destroy the enemy in terms of defending NYC it means to use its natural features, the islands and peninsulas to slow, block and canalize the entire population and visitors of its city itself. Entries of subway stations, highway tollbooths and bridges are the main elements that support this strategy. Already at the edges at the city these measurements are being taken. As well the waterways and airspace in and around NYC are under constant surveillance by the US Coast guard and NORAD (North American Air Defense Command). Also from the perspective of infrastructure, planning, designing and maintenance of main roads and railroads are crucial components to rapidly shift and concentrate army forces. The requirement to shift and concentrate major combat forces and supplies rapidly over an extended battle area may demand the retention of the hubs of main road and railroad networks, which supports the importance of planning crucial infrastructure. Next, there is another clear explanation of the extremely high level of control and defense structures around public buildings and its public spaces. "Deny strategic-political objectives. Industrial or economic complexes may be incorporated in the defense for their strategic value, while political-cultural centers may provide psychological-national morale advantages." In this case, the Statue of Liberty is a good example of a building which is completely barricaded because of those reasons. Just by simply blocking the entrance to this building. All these actions are taken to be in-advantage of the enemy. By reading this report, things like urban sprawl mostly seen as something nasty is considered as an advantage in order to defend the city of New York well. Urban sprawl adds strength to the active defense by providing covered and concealed positions and restricting the attacker’s mobility and observation.

ISLANDS AND NEUTRALITY

NYC is built on a number of islands and peninsulas. First of all, under the influence of the militarization of the city there will arise more islands, in this case invisible artificial ones. As already mentioned before under the influences of military strategies the will arise more and more enclaves scattered around the city which functions as an island.

These new islands are "spaces of strategic implant (...) and extraterritorial". This phenomenon itself comes from the seventeenth century in Europe where the church was the clearest example as a place beyond the reach of the political order and something that is extraterritorial. Nowadays there are many more examples of islands through the militarization of NYC the raise of more islands are not far away and in some cases already occurring. Secondly, the clarifying strategy will eventually lead towards a New York metropolitan area constructed out of internal city borders forming local enclaves scattered across the city of NY looking a bit like camps. These camps are not to be taken as a literal as modern examples such as the US Army base on Guantánamo bay, Cuba, where suspected terrorist are in captivity. Under the militarization of NY segregation of people, the control of public space and the huge amount of (in-)visible borders are making urban fragments look more like a camp then they did ever before.

Thirdly, there is another interesting and distressing aspect that occurs as well in NYC through the militarization of (public) space is the in-between space or better said, the neutral space; a space, which is as well a sort of island in a militarized urban environment. Modern examples of neutral spaces are often in-between spaces on the border between two or more conflict areas, barricaded, only accessible through highly secured and controlled checkpoints. In the future some of New York’s public spaces will as well act as a sort of neutral space from this spatial perspective. Already there are thousand of public spaces such as NYC subway stations where there is a sort of neutral condition after entering the station itself and getting checked, moving through the subway tunnel and leaving the system at another place. But there are also more literal examples where Federal buildings like the City Hall or US Courthouse are being protected by constructing neutral spaces between the city and the building itself. Under the militarization regime this event will only intensify in the future with as one of the newest examples the Offices of Emergency Management (OEM) in New York City, the (OEM) in NYC is built in a small park in Brooklyn near the Williamsburg Bridge. Here the park itself functions as the neutral space. The park space around this building not accessible for people and is highly controlled and secured.

In other designs this neutral space is intergraded in the building itself. In the recent built WTC tower 7 by SOM and the new Freedom Tower by D. Childs and D. Libeskind the building itself contains a neutral space. At least the first 40 meters of both towers are filled with...
technical installations and are entirely made of concrete with a neutral space—void between the concrete and the facade. This facade is as well designed to resist any terrorist bomb attack. There is no longer an overlap between a ‘possible terrorist target’ building and the city.

Neutral spaces and its consequence of separated or fragmented spaces are more or less described by L. de Cauter in his book ‘The Capsular Civilization’20 where such spaces are seen as capsules. These spaces can be seen as controlled public spaces but as well as spaces inside buildings where inside those capsules the owner (the state or private companies) is seen as responsible for our security. You will see the capsular spaces already scattered all over NYC in or around almost any public building or space. The use of the space is determent by its owner and controlled by surveillance technology and ‘no acceptable’ behavior will lead to exclusion of such a capsular space. In this search for maximum security we hand in our freedom.

FROM CONTINUOUS LINES TO FRAGMENTATION AND POINTS

In the same country and at the same time as where hundreds of kilometers of fences are being planned trying to construct a complete militarized border between the US and Mexico there is also a change in understanding the border only as a continuous line. At the lower scale level of the urban environment and in the city like NYC, not continuous lines but fragmented and more point-based borders are securing and controlling the city. All those fragmented line-borders and points together a scattered all around the city and only intensive more and more by the political influence of military allied agencies such as the US Homeland Security or even private (armed) forces. As already mentioned before, these spaces can be considered as capsules. Those point-base borders and fragmented line-borders are strongly related to the different layers of networks in NYC. Therefore there is a strong relation between those —infrastructural— networks and military strategies in this period where NYC seems to have and dangerous and mostly invisible enemy who is capable to attack the city at its most important and vulnerable places at any time. These new borders are feeding the creation of new islands within the city itself.

Thus, it is be clear that Homeland Security and its military strategies have their influence into the planning and design of NYC. By creating and maintaining fear under its citizens makes it possible to apply a —clarifying— strategy on the city’s future planning and design. At many public spaces the militarization tries to be constantly visible to confront citizens with their fear where in other cases the militarization is much more stealthier applies on the urban environment. In a spatial way the creation of neutral zones around possible terrorist targets influences many public spaces in a negative way. There is the loss of the amount of public space and a qualitatively poorer space left over. With the shrinking freedom of movement, behavior and a de-connection between buildings and the public space itself the public space is threatened by military strategies and its consequences. In most cases those military strategies have a stealthier character and therefore they are harder to define and map. At last there is a new understanding of borders in NYC. Not continuous lines but fragmented and more point-based borders are now securing and controlling the city. All those fragmented line-borders and points together a scattered all around the city and only intensive more and more by the political influence of military allied agencies such as the US Homeland Security. The consequence of these fragmented spaces are more or less described by L. de Cauter in his book ‘The Capsular Civilization’21 where such spaces are seen as capsules; highly secured spaces controlled by surveillance technology and borders.

For the consequences in the near future I can only speculate about different scenarios that will take place, but eventually terrorist targets will be secured and defended in the most efficient way possible. As result public space and urban complexity will lose in quality and quantity. All those scenarios contain a way to secure and defend a building, space or even network. Hardening the target, decentralize or relocated, diffusion and camouflage are all possible scenarios in the case of militarization of NYC to defend itself against terror attacks. However, these scenarios cannot provide complete security. Terrorists will always look for the weakest point in the defense of a specific target or in society itself and to be clear, there is always a weak point; from corruption to a small gap in a fence. New York’s architecture and urbanism is going into the direction of maximum-security and militarized spaces with the smallest chance of a gap or failure. Consequences are that the urban complexity and —public—spaces in NYC is under immense pressure.

20 Cauter de, Lieven. The Capsular Civilization: The City in the Age of Fear. Reflex no. 3. Rotterdam. NAi publishers. 2005
21 See footnote 20.
From continuous lines to more fragmented and point-based borders. Militarization of NYC is a stealthy phenomenon. It only becomes visible through mapping.
A continuous militarized border.
Total length: 30,600 km
166 Military facilities along the US East coast.
Scattered all over New York City; stealthy and fragmented militarized public space.
Manhattan is occupied and militarized.
Aerial photo mapping the NYPD headquarter
Aerial photo mapping the NYSE
Wall street
Unfolding: Spatial defensive strategy.

- **WALL**
- **SOUTHWEST FOLD LINE**
- **SOUTHEAST FOLD LINE**
- **NYPD HQ BUILDING OUTLINE**
- **POSSIBLE ENTRANCE**
- **CHECKPOINT**
- **ROAD BLOCK**
- **NORTHWEST FOLD LINE**

**UNFOLDING THE SOFT TARGET NYPD HQ**

- **WEST FOLD LINE**
- **SOUTH FOLD LINE**
- **EAST FOLD LINE**
- **NORTH FOLD LINE**

**UNFOLDING THE SOFT TARGET NYSE WALL STREET**
Tension.
Public vs. militarized.
Neutral space.
Void, Tunnel, Capsular spaces. The same spatial characteristics return at every militarized public space.
Different urban environments emphasises different spatial characteristics.

Controlling the environment related to the urban situation (left and right with the same strategy):

**Soft Target:** Soft target completely controlled and secured by CCTV surveillance and armed checkpoints.

**Militarized Space:** Fragmented surveillance at entry points and other strategic points, such as corners.

Neutralizing the environment related to the urban situation:

**Non Physical Militarized Space**

Left: An urban space with large open areas needs more barricade structures.

Right: Dense urban tissue can use its surrounding buildings and less barricading structures.

3D (Non) Physical Militarized Space
Sections of militarized space.
A new approach to architectural design based on an opposition to the dominance of orthogonal and vertical forms.
Blurring the borders between divine curiosity and divine terror.
A legal black hole, a non-physical place. Terror suspects are held at extraterritorial camps.
Design concept.

NEW SPATIAL SECTIONS OF MILITARIZED SPACE

SECTIONS OF MILITARIZED SPACE ARE PLACED ON TOP OF EACH OTHER LEAVING SPACE FOR THE PUBLIC AND IT OCCUPIES NO LONGER THE PUBLIC SPACE

POSSIBLE SECTIONS

INTEGRATION OF SPATIAL CHARACTERISTICS AND ATMOSPHERE
Design concept.

Connecting the ground sections with each other: creating a public and disturbing landscape.
Context

Sections from the mapping will be placed on these lines creating confusion about the outlines of the whole complex.

Volumes moving away from each other.

Underlayer for building complex and landscape.
Oblique floors.
Bringing people in relation to the building and at the same time provoke and destabilize them.
Program.

- **Public Free**
  - Public Space
  - Terrorism Tourism

- **Public**
  - Lobby
  - Information Desk
  - Cafeteria
  - Restrooms
  - Public Waiting Room
  - Restrooms

- **Restricted**
  - Court Employees Office
  - Library Room
  - Archive
  - Judge Chambers
  - Grand Jury Room
  - Meeting Room
  - Restrooms

- **Journalist Work, Waiting-Relax Space**
  - Press Room
  - Restrooms

- **Highly Secured**
  - Cell Complex
  - Outside Space
  - US Marshals Office
  - Overhearing Ispeak Rooms
  - Restrooms
  - Shower Area

- **Secured Entry by Vehicle**
- **Secured Parking for Judges**
### Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Free</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism Tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Lobby, Information Desk, Cafeteria, Restrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Court Employees Office, Library Room, Archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judge Chambers, Grand Jury Room, Meeting Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Secured</td>
<td>Cell Complex, Outside Space, US Marshals Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overhearing, JSpeaker Rooms, Restrooms, Shower Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalist Work, Waiting-Relax Space</td>
<td>Courtroom, Public Tribune, Press Tribune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured Entry by Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured Parking for Judges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building form.

FRAMEWORK DERIVED FROM VIEWLINES FROM SECURITY CHECKPOINTS

3 CONCRETE LEGS SUPPORT THE GRID OF CONTINUOUS WALLS

OBlique . INCLINED FLOORS DERIVED FORM MAPPING
The presence of fear plays an essential role in the design of the US Terror Tribune. Blurring the boundaries/borders between divine enchantment/curiosity and divine terror, I designed The US Terror Tribunal Complex introducing blurring borders between the in- and outside, above and underground and a safe and 'unsafe' feeling; introducing the unknown resulting in fear.
Camouflage

SIGHT FROM A VIEWPOINT

VIEWPOINT

3D elements in landscape are camouflaged through a geometrical pattern creating a disturbing effect.

Based on military ideas of optical camouflage this project attempts to create an invisible architecture that uses camouflage patterns to create a disturbance in the visual field of the urban environment.
Elevations.
Decay of concrete.
Atmosphere.
Atmosphere.