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Creating an environment that is both physically and psychologically safe is one of the biggest challenges of the 21st century. Our contemporary society have become to be known as the “fear society”, in which fear and anxiety occupies a growing part from our lives then ever been seen before, we fear from the “other”, fear from epidemics, fear from godless, fear from crime and terrorism etc. Not every fear is common to all, while some fears are built in and are universal, others are the result of the culture that we live in and exist in a specific region or time. Another important difference to mention is between the private fear and the political one. The political fear is emerging from the society or have implications on the society while the private fear is concerning the person that is experiencing the fear. It is easier to control and lead a group that is shearing the same fears. Those in society who inform us must be committed to maintaining a perspective based on realistic assessments of risk, rather than an agenda based on politics or profit.

My investigation of fear stretched from the human relations to the living environment, our urban planning and houses, to our everyday surrounding and products. I was looking for the connection between our fears and the products that being design and invented and study the field of design for safety. As the city, the urban spaces became a center of violence in the last decades, the discussions on the connection between the urban environment and planing to prevent violence started in the 20th century in their physical context, behavioural context and processive context. To began with the theory Defensible Space in 1972, with an emphasis on the natural surveillance, territorial concerns and access control in the neighbourhood, to the “Broken Windows” theory which argues that vandalism and negligent in the city can encourage the “violation” of other norms of behaviour. And from the urban environment and the secure space of the private home to the use of product that surround us in our everyday lives, indoors and out. There I have found designers that give us practical solution for future safety and others that are offering us objects that will help us feel secure. Unfortunately, it is still not possible to protect us from all kind of crime or criminal. The good news is that design can help in making us feel secure and keeping us safe in mind. We definitely need the illusion of safety, so that we can live in a healthy way.
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01 Research Question

Can design create a safer environment in reaction to the incline in the feeling of fear in our contemporary society?

Creating an environment that is both physically and psychologically safe is one of the biggest challenges of the 21st century. In our times the public is exposed, in most big cities, on a day to day basis to an increasing visually and verbally scenes of violence, and fear. One of the most influential event on urban safety planing was the September 11th terrorist attacks upon the United States in 2001, that created a safety panic attack in the crowd and a demand to guarantee the public safety. The American government and also other countries were under a lot of public pressure to find a fast solution to prevent similar future situations. These feeling of an urgent need led to legislation of several problematic laws that had narrow the human freedom in the United State,in other western countries governments and the public reaction were also intense in facing what they believe was an actual threat.

Moreover, our contemporary society have become to be known as the “fear society”, in which fear and anxiety occupies a growing part from our lives then ever been seen before, we fear from the “other”, fear from epidemics, fear from godless, fear from crime and terrorism etc. Living under constant fear has a major effect on our mental health and in extreme cases our physical health (anxiety attack, phobias etc.) In this thesis I wish to find out how did we get to the unbalance situation with fear, our fear instinct suppose to act when facing danger, but it seems by now, to be working overtime. There for I will begin from collecting knowledge about fear as a starting point, and from there I plan to continue and investigate the forces that are involved in generating today society condition as a fear society. I am also interested in the ways in which we are trying to cope with those growing feelings of fear.
There are various theories that were written on issue: we can go to therapy in many forms, we can start to believe in some kind of god, we can buy all the safety and precaution gear available in the market, we can try not to hear the news every day. Other theories are dealing with creating an environment that mentally and physically is safer for humans by preventing the crime from being committed. This investigation will stretch from the human relations to the living environment, our urban planning and houses, to our everyday surrounding products. I will look for the connection between our fears and the products that being design and invented and study the field of design for safety. I intend to search for products that had being develop with the help of designers, scientist, professionals and the advanced technologies, in wish to achieve safety against real or imagined dangers.

**Questions to be ask:**

Why do we fear? How does fear physically effects our body? What is the psychological implication of living in fear? Are we still afraid from the same things as before? Does a universal fear exists? What is the roll of safety in the human motivations for life? Who benefits from our fears? Why did the city became a centre of violence? Can design and architecture create a more comforting environment for us? What can we learn about our society through the security products that we produced and consume? Does designs and architecture are answering our real or imagined fears? What is the part of design in reacting to the need of safety and reducing fear situations?
Why We Experience Fear

The reason to why we experience fear, is actually for our own sake, even though this is not a pleasant feeling and as such it is one that we will easily give up for free if someone was asking us. It is in fact essential to our survival. If we couldn’t feel frightened or scared we wouldn’t try to escape danger or avoid threats. We’d be crossing the road without checking for cars and go jogging alone in the park at night time. The initial intention of fear both for human being and animals has to do with the ambition to ensure their continuation. In the progress of the human evolution it was necessary to fear certain things in order to be able to carry on their genes. By transmitting on through their genes, the emotion of fear and the quick reaction to it, there was a natural selection made as to which qualities are valuable to the human race. (see Layton)

In spite of the fact that we have developed in many ways since the time we had to hide from predators in a cave, still fear is an important and some time crucial instinct in our lives. It has similar goal in our time as it did before when we might be bite by a snake while trying to peak berries in the field. The difference now is that we have other kind of dangers and our environment has changed as well from the forest to the urban field. But the decision not to jog in night time in the park is rooted in a logical fear that supports our survival. Today the surrounding and the cause of fear has changed but still we have things we need to be afraid of just as much, and not more, as we had thousand of years ago, and also the reason to be afraid had not changed and is still for promoting our survival.(see Layton)

Similar to all other emotions, the fear and anxiety are sings for us to take in consideration. If the danger we are facing is close and critical we will feel it strongly in our body and vice versa, this how our subconscious mind is pointing us to be on grade.(see Siegel 2005:15) For example we can look at pain as signal from our body that we need to step aside from the cause of the pain. We frequently connect danger in our mind to conditions and circumstances that we can’t keep from happening, restraint or instruct them. In order to get our attention to the unfamiliar, fear is a reasonable and typical response. It is only natural to have this defence mechanism in us when we are facing a dangerous and risky environment. Most of us will try to stay away from feeling pain and will try to keep a safe distance from its cause, no matter what.(Friedemann 2008)

Unfortunately or fortunately (it can varied), for us humans, we have some other elements connected to the fear reaction which is outside of the instinct response. For example
anticipation, and we anticipate horrible things that might happen some time with a logical reason behind them and sometimes without any reason then it is all in our heads. We are getting expose through the news TV and Internet to an enormous amount of crimes disasters and all sorts of terrible things. Most of us have never got robbed or assaulted but it dose not mean that we will not be afraid when crossing a dark alley. Anticipating a bad thing that might happen can create as strong reaction of fear as the actual danger. But of course Anticipation can also be explained as part of the human steps in evolution as in the case of the ancient men predicting that a heavy rain will soon lead to a storm or a struck of lightning and for that reason there is a need to hide.(see Layton)

Every one had felt the feeling of the fear of danger, this experience is common to all of us and it is part of life. We luck our doors and windows when we leave the house, we stop in a red light and hide our wallet in our bags, we can only try to prevent the feeling of fear and pain. This kind of behaviour is considered to be normal. But for some other people fear is present on a day to day basis which can be exhausting both physically and emotionally. The physical implications are usually weak immune system and a high blood pressure that lead to sickness. The emotional implications are usually avoiding the cause of the fear, which can really disturb normal life routine and the social and everyday activities of this group.(see Layton)
When describing fear there are several terms that we can use, therefore in order to prevent this unclearness about the different terms I will first begin with defining them. Fear is a natural reaction to a realistic threat, most often accompanied by an unpleasant feeling. (Isaac 1987) To feel fear we need to get some signals from our senses that something bad is going to happen, we need to see, hear, smell, taste or feel it in our bodies and then we react according to the danger that is in front of us. In the case of anxiety, even though similar to the fear feeling it is caused by us, those are the things we tell to our selves that are triggering the anxiety, it is not connected to any real threat or danger, it is all in the head. Phobia is an exaggerated fear from some things or situation that are not realistically dangerous and it is also associate with trying to avoid the cause of the unreasonable fear. (Masci 2004) Hysteria usually occurs when fear is consistent and there is a regular danger stimulation but with out an ability for a defensive reaction. (see Siegel 2005:13) Each of the definitions above accompanied by a physical and emotional reactions, I choose to focus on the implications of fear because it seems to be elementary and constance factor in all of the definitions.
In a collaboration between US and Sweden the scientists Ohman & Mineka where looking to check if there is such a thing as Universal fear. Universal fear is a tape of fear that is part of our evolutionary process, it is connected to our survival instincts and as such is common to all humans. Ohman & Mineka were examining the fear reaction to snakes, in people and monkeys and they found out that establishing a conditioning to fear by direct or indirect exposure to snakes was faster then to any other stimulus. In another experiment with humans, the American psychologist Marting Seligman connected the stimulation of a small electric shock to a specific image in a picture. The result from the experiment showed that two to four shocks were sufficient for creating a phobia to pictures of spiders or snakes but for other pictures like of flowers it took much more shocks for establishing
a phobia. (see Gersley) There is a possibility to trigger the fear responds in humans and monkeys with a Pavlovian conditioning (the cat, the bell, the food in various ways), it is possible to notice many different fear responds signalling pain and danger, but the triggers that were connected to reappearing survival dangers had a faster access to our fear conditioning. (Ohman & Mineka 2003)

Another reason for the development of phobias is that we often associate danger to things and situations that we cannot prevent or control, such as lightning strikes during a storm, or the attack of a dangerous animal. (see Gersley)

A Gallup Poll conducted in 2005 reveals the most common fears of teenagers in the United States. Most of these basic fears are carried into adulthood.

**The top 10 list goes like this:**

1. Terrorist attacks
2. Spiders
3. Death
4. Failure
5. War
6. Heights
7. Crime/Violence
8. Being alone
9. The future
10. Nuclear war
We may have some fears that are built in, in our instincts but there are some other fears that are the result of the culture that we live in. Those fears and anxiety are also specific to individuals, communities, regions or even cultures. Someone who grew up in the city probably has a more intense fear of being mugged than someone who has spent most of his life on a farm. People living in South Florida may have a stronger fear of hurricanes than people living in Kansas, and people in Israel probably have a deeper fear of terrorist than do people in Sweden. What we fear says a lot about our life experience and circumstance. (see Layton)

Altheide claim in his book Creating Fear that social fears can be related to personal fears in complex ways. Finding out the relationships of a particular fear is a professional task for psychoanalytical analyses. The fear of crime may be a result or a cause to some specific compulsive behaviours, paranoia, and so on for example, locking doors, double-checking windows, avoiding strangers. but these behaviours are now considered by the authorities as reasonable and sensible in action and thought, or even as smart pro-cautions. And even though you can find in therapy the origin of those behaviours most people do not care about where it began. (see Altheide 2002:2)

If we take a closer look in our society today, in search for a similar fear power, as god use to have a few hundred of years ago, we will find that it had shifted to the spirit of ‘the terrorist’. The fear from a terrorist attack is equal to the fear in the plague times or the Satan and witches in religion. We will always fear death the only thing that will change is what is causing and stimulating these fears. We try to deal with the fear of the terrorist attacks with raising the amount of surveillance systems, with controlling immigration and the so called urgent need for a pre-intelligence strikes. Those are just a few examples of the result of the terrorist panic. (see Bourke 2005:4)
Other broader aspects of fear can be found in its political implication on our society. Robin write in his recent book: fear a history of a political idea the definition to a political fear, which happens when people feel concern that some harm can happen to their collective safety such as the fear from terrorism, panic over crime, anxiety from epidemic or when people lives in constant fear that is enforced on them by governments or groups. Moreover, Robin elaborate on the difference between the private fear and the, political one. The political fear is emerging from the society or have implications on the society. The private fear is usually concerning only the person that is experiencing the fear, his psychology and the interpretation he has for the danger situation, like my fear of flying or your fear from spiders. The political fear, in opposite is emanating from disagreement or conflicts among the societies and in them. By trying to react to a political fear we can raise new group in to power and delete other groups away from the political arena, in some situations new rule can be establish while other can be eliminate totally. In a state of a political fear it is the most easy timing to enforce public polices on society. Take for example the Cold War and the fear of Communism in the west.(see Robin 2004:3)

This is a global phenomenon of contemporary advanced societies. especially in the Western countries there is an increase in the feeling of emergency since the September 11 attack on the United States twin towers. For example those spreading feeling of fear from terrorism in the United States have resulted in a series of laws restrictions call "Patriot Act" in 2001. The initials stands for: Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act. After the legislation of the act it became possible and easier to the law authorities to search the telephone, e-mail communications, medical, financial, and other records; adjustment of the limitations on foreign intelligence within the United States; expands the authority ability to regulate financial transactions, especially those concerning foreigners; and to allow the discretion of law and immigration authorities in arresting and deporting immigrants suspected of terrorism-related acts.

Slavoj Žižek the Slovenian philosopher describes today society as dominated by a paranoid fear, Fear which politics uses as its best activator: fear of immigrants, fear of crime, fear of godless, fear of ecological catastrophes. Such a post-politics always depends on the manipulation of a paranoid “the frightening rallying of frightened men”.( Žižek 2003)

Altheide argue that every society-especially from the modern time had absorb the fear from the “other”. Feeding from fear by the authorities and by the media, has been giving
all sorts of legitimizing reasons that in some extreme situations led for violent attacks and even genocidal actions, all in claim of an urgent need to deal with the evil other. In exchange of attacking we get promises of safety, compensation, public health and more. Those attitudes can easily promote narrow agendas, revenge and social control that can interfere and damage our human rights, the freedom of privacy, travel, speech etc. (see Altheide 2002:195). In Marc Siegel’s book “False Alarm” he analyzes the creation of the fear society with focusing on the mass media part. According to Siegel, the mass media tend to magnify the latest crime events, epidemics or terrorism acts and broadcast it to millions of people at once. This has the effect of raising an issue to grand scale and provoking panic way out proportion to the risk. (see Siegel 2005:17)

If we would think of the enormous exposure we get to danger reports on the net, TV and newspapers, we can start to understand why do we fear so much. In addition, after reviewing statistics, the writer points out that there is no evidence that ongoing terror alerts correlate with the actual risk of a potential attack and that government officials and politicians employ the media megaphone to promote the idea that they are keeping the population safe.

To get an even deeper understanding of the politics of fear we need to know that a political fear is often associated with government acts, but this is not always the case and even though that in some situations it is not easy to identify it as such, political fear is...
profoundly existing in our society. Take for example the fear of a woman has of her abusive husband, it look at first like a personal fear but this is entirely a political fear. Behind the husband abuse of his wife, we can find hundreds of years of laws giving him authority over her and by that allowing the abuse to happen.(Robin 2004)
The Safety Need - Human Needs

An important aspect of the role of fear and safety in the human lives, we can find in the work of the American psychologist A. H. Maslow and his theory the Hierarchy of Needs, that was developed in 1943. His theory is formulating the motivation that a human has in a life time. Classifying those needs, starting with the wide basis of the physiological needs, as food and shelter and up to the upper needs of respect and self esteem which leads to the top of the pyramid, to the self actualization. There are at least five levels of needs which we can be called the basic needs: physiological, safety, love, esteem, and self-actualization. Our motivation is based on the wish to get and keep those needs. (Huitt 2007)

When ever we achieve the physiological needs and we feel they are satisfied then we can move to the next set of needs, the safety needs. Every thing that is right for the physiological needs is true also for the safety needs but in lesser degree. With both needs the human can be totally controlled by them in a way which guides the human behaviour. it can use all of the human energy in order to satisfy those needs. We then can claim that a human is a safety seeking mechanism. In some cases when its extreme and constant, a human can be described as living for safety.

In his paper Green is clarifying the basic needs theory in adults by analysing observation of children which have according to him have a much more simple and obvious needs. Green generalizing the child behaviour and claims that in his observations most of the times in seek for safe, orderly, predictable, organized world the child had preferred situations and people that he can rely on, with out changes and unpredictable events which interpreted as scary situations. Even in his worse scenario, a child has his parents as his source of comfort and protection. In an idealized society in which everything is functioning well and running smoothly we should be able to feel safe. There will be no predators to hunt us, no drastic climate struggle, no crime and terrorism to fear from and no dictatorship, etc. Following the hierarchy of needs, when all of that had being fulfilled, only then the person can climb to the next level of love and belonging. (Green 2000)

If we will look at safety in a wider context then in the immediate physical implications on our bodies, then we could find that in trying to get to a stable environment we will prefer things that are known and familiar rather then the opposite. The need for order, routine and even a belief is related to our need to feel safe, just as Green mention in his observation on children. This need had motivated (along said with other needs) the developments in science, philosophy, religion and even in political ideologies.
Another study case that we can analysis through the safety need, is the compulsive-obsessive neurosis. In this case of this abnormal behaviour, the Compulsive-Obsessives are always trying to achieve perfect control in the order, a mission that is impossible to reach. Random, unthoughtful, surprising and unfamiliar event will keep happening but for Compulsive-Obsessives it is a situation they can not deal with. They try to have rituals and ceremonials, to have strict borders and rules in hope of preventing all unexpected scenarios. In a situation that something brakes their rules and mess up their order they get a panic attack as if this unfamiliar is a real danger to fear from and is perceived as a life and death situation. (Green 2000)

Maslow’s theory was an important development from the former theories of human needs, but today there is little agreement about it among different scholars. Wahba and Bridgewell where criticizing Maslow’s pyramids and claimed that it is almost not existing in its hierarchy state. Moreover we can see in Manfred Max-Neef theory that was developed in 1987 and published as a book, Human Scale Development: an Option for the Future. As Max-Neef perceive of the human needs, it is not about different levels of needs that you need to climb from one to the other, but if a parallel and simultaneously development in trying to achieve our basic needs. He is not contradicting the existence of such needs but he is suggesting more categories of needs. Also for other researches, the categories of the needs are different then in maslow's theory. (see Neef 1991)

For example, Ryan & Deci (2000) also suggest three needs: the need for autonomy, the need for capability, and the need for belonging. Thompson, Grace and Cohen (2001) suggests that the most fundamental needs for children are connection, recognition, and power. Nohria, Lawrence, and Wilson (2001) provide evidence from a sociobiology theory of motivation that humans have four basic needs. But Even with all the critic for Maslow’s theory it is still used psychology as a common base for human motivation studies. (Huitt 2007)

This exploration will continue with reviewing the connections between fear, safety, security and their implications in the design fields. In the next section I will refer to the part of the city life and the urban planing in preventing crime and I will also focus on the development in architecture and product design for safety.
The connection between violence and the city is not a new subject. The city as a center of infrastructure was always vulnerable and exposed to violence. The city is a commercial, economic and social center, a tool for the groups in power. In the modernization process they even gain political power as the cities became a center of population and industry. According to the anthropologist Appadurai the violence and the new war are a new stage in the formation of the city lives, the density, availability of weapon and the ethnic tension are producing a fertile ground to the development of fighting methods. Dr Hatuka examines in her book the connection between urban spaces and violent in Tel-Aviv. According to her we are now in a period which can be called “the post colonial” and it brought to an end the polar political systems and released the restrained tensions between ethnic groups. Those stresses are developed from the strengthening of city alienation, raising of religious and political groups, arming of city gangs, corruption exposure, all of this along side to the strengthening of the legal system, decline in the social polarity and resources, population growth all those tensions are translated in their extreme to violence such as in Los Angeles in 1992, France 2005, Israel 2000. If it is an historical phenomena or a new one there is no doubt that city violence is present on a daily basis in the 21st century.(see Hatuka 2008:17-18)

Discussions on the connection between the urban environment and planning to prevent violence existed in the 20t century in their physical context, behavioural context and processive context. Dr Htuka describes the three context as such:

*The behavioural context emphasis the interrelations, between the human society and it surrounding. Those researches are checking the connection between aggressions and violence to a large number of variables including the physical surrounding. However in opposite to the physical context that is based on observation on urban surrounding, the behavioural research is based on questionnaire, behavioural examination of individuals, and from that gets the conclusion that have a collective social implications on the urban space.

*Processive context puts the emphasis on the social political power relation as a trigger or as an expression to violent events and spacial changes. These discourses are dealing with questions of suppression, control, power and memory.

*Physical context it emphasis the behaviour influence of the physical surrounding on the social behaviour. According to those researches the physical surrounding can use as a
trigger to violent and fear. These discussions are dealing with the ways that urban planning and architecture design are arousing violence and suggest ways to prevent and change those situations. The critics of this approach see it as a deterministic idea, and do not agree to the idea that every action gets a linear direct reaction.
Along side to the technological approach we could notice a development in sociological theories on crime prevention in urban spaces (Jacobs 1961), (Newman 1972), (Kelling and Coles 1996) and (Crowe 2000). Those theories are part of the physical context and were created already in the late 20th century, they got tested in reality in several cities around the globe. Most of those theories were established in the US in response to the increase in urban crime rates and the process of urban decay that occurred in the US.

Although those theories were intended to solve the crime problems in the US their principles were adopted also by other countries and cities around the world which were handling with similar problems in crime prevention. Criminologists usually uses a comprehensive system that includes social management, activity support and law enforcement strategies in order to achieve the maximal effect in crime prevention. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) is one part in the total set of measures for an effective crime prevention and control.
Early interest in CPTED began with the research of Jane Jacobs. Her book, The Death and Life of Great American Cities, published in 1961, displays many studies about the different connections between the urban design and crime. Jacobs was also examining the effect of the society behaviour in the urban space and how it can change a certain place from a lively to deserted, according to her we humans have created an environment that don’t comfort us and this leads to a feeling of alienation. Much of her research was concerning the public spaces in the city and especially the sidewalks as a case study.

Based on her studies the first thing to understand is that the public space the sidewalk and street space of cities is not kept mostly by the police. It is kept primarily by an complicated network of voluntary controls and standards among the people themselves, and enforced by the people themselves. Jacobs claims that no amount of policing can enforce civilization where the normal, casual enforcement of it has broken down.(see Jacobs 1961:32) A well-used city street is suitable to be a safe street. A deserted city street will turn to be unsafe. But how does this work, really? And what makes a city street well used or ignored and empty. A city street equipped to handle strangers, and to make safety into an advantage, in itself, out of the presence of strangers, as the streets of successful city neighbourhoods by Jacobs must have three main qualities:

• First, there must be a clear division between what is public space and what is private space. Public space and private spaces cannot bleed into each other as they do typically in suburban settings or in projects.

• Second, there must be eyes upon the street, eyes belonging to those we might call the natural owner of the street. The buildings on a street equipped to handle strangers and to insure the safety of both residents and strangers, must be oriented to the street. They cannot turn their back or blank sides on it and leave it blind. behaviour to the number of effective eyes on the street and to induce the people in buildings along the street to watch the sidewalks in sufficient numbers. Nobody enjoys sitting or looking out a window at an empty street.

• Thirdly in order to reach natural surveillance is essential to have a large amount of stores and other public places sprinkled along the sidewalks of a district. Projects and public places that are used by evening and night must be among them especially stores, bars and restaurants, as the chief examples, work in several different and complex ways to assist
sidewalk safety. (see Jacobs 1961:35)

The establishment of the theory Defensible Space: Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design happened with the appearance of Oscar Newman’s book, Defensible Space in 1972, there he puts an emphasis on the natural surveillance, territorial concerns and access control in the effort to prevent crime. According to Newman the purpose of his study is to find out what are the effects of the physical planing in residential environments on the criminal vulnerability of its citizens. More broadly, it examines one aspect of how environment affects behaviour. Newman claims that the lose of the moral code that use to frame the small urban and country side villages have despaired. and that this is major part of the reason why we have become more vulnerable to criminal behaviour than we have ever been before. After studying for three years the nature pattern and location of crime in urban areas across NY Newman’s conclusion was that the new physical form of urban environment is responsible of making it easier for the criminals to achieve their offensive plans. Furthermore the design of buildings and their arrangement can either discourage or encourage people to take an active part in defending their area while they go about their daily business.

The CPTED is suggesting a way to prevent crime through sharing the responsibility with each citizen and by doing that to ensure the functioning of the community (Crowe 2000). And that both society and physical elements are parts of a successful defensible space. For example it is possible to design a multi-family housing complex in which as low a number of units as possible share a common entry off street. Designers can position units, windows, and entries, and build paths of movement and areas of activity so as to provide inhabitants with continuous natural surveillance of the street and project grounds. The street comes under surveillance from the building. The building entries and lobby under the surveillance street. As with the fortress, this design also provide security. But instead of hand over the responsibility to others, it is survey by residents in the natural flow of their everyday activities. According to Newman’s CPTED there are four categories for the discussion of defensible space which enables to control crime by environmental design. (see Newman 1972:115)

1. The ability of the physical environment to create noticed zones of influence: systems for the subdivision of urban environment intended to increase citizens ability to take on areal claims.
2. The ability of the physical design to provide surveillance opportunities for residents: systems for improving the ability of residents to casually survey the non private areas of their living environment, indoor and out.
3. The ability of design to influence the perception of a project’s uniqueness, isolation, and stigma: systems which can cancel the stigma of the form of housing projects, reducing the image of isolation, and the apparent vulnerability of the citizens.
4. The influence of geographical connotation with “safe zones” on the security in urban areas: systems of contact-the effect of location of urban environment within a particular urban setting to a “safe” or “unsafe” activity area.

From Newman’s book: “CPTED see this as the only long-term measure of consequence in the battle for the maintenance of a sane urban society. Short-term measures involving flights to suburbia or additional police manpower and equipment are only a consolation”. (see Newman 1972:14)
_11 Broken Windows

Dr Kelling, a former probation officer in NY wrote in 1982 an article titled “Broken Windows” and in the late 1980s initiated what became a campaign to remove graffiti from New York City’s subway system.(see Murray 2002:7) This idea also supported the “zero tolerance” which Rudy Giuliani subsequently brought to the city’s streets when he became the mayor of NY. In 1996 Kelling published the book “Fixing Broken Windows: Restoring Order and Reducing Crime in Our Communities ”. Kelling’s theory takes its name from the observation that a few broken windows in an empty building quickly lead to more vandalism and eventually to break-ins.(Kelling and Coles 1996) Further then that Kelling claims that the tendency for people to behave in a particular way can be strengthened or weakened depending on what they observe others to be doing. This does not necessarily mean that people will copy bad behaviour exactly, reaching for a spray can when they see graffiti, rather it can encourage the “violation” of other norms of behaviour. Although Kelling’s theory is not directly with design, it does emphasis the major role that the visual environmental conditions in the cities have on the attempt to reduce crime.
Designing Out Crime - Western Australia Case Study

Paul Cozens, of the WA crime prevention office have gathered together a number of surveys that had a range of theoretical criticisms to the Defensible Space theory. (see Cozens 2005:2)

Cozens gives as examples Adams, 1973; Hillier, 1973; Kaplan, 1973; Bottoms, 1974; Mawby, 1977; Mayhew, 1979; Booth, 1981; Poyner, 1983. According to Cozens analysis of those critics, one of the most important critic was the lack of consideration for socio-economics within the studies methodology. Cozens review in his paper from 2002 the evidence and argues that although the CPTED impact remains uncertain and that there is a criticisms concerning the lack of evidence to support CPTED approach, there is a large body of research, which supports Designing Out Crime as a pragmatic and effective crime prevention approach. The paper discusses the approach adopted in Western Australia, which was seeking to embed Designing Out Crime within the State’s planning process and public policy frameworks.

The WA project is an example to the use in a comprehensive system that its application are based on different aspect for crime control(see Cozens 2005:4)

- Supporting families, children and young people;
- Strengthening communities and revitalising neighbourhoods;
- Targeting priority offences;
- Reducing repeat offending; and;
- Designing out crime and using technology.

The design and the CPTED does play role in the effort of the authorities in keeping us protected in our urban environment and in preventing criminal behaviour. How big is that role and its effectiveness is still unsure and unproven, for me and for the professionals in the filled. The fact is that there is still no systematic approach to reducing opportunities for crime using the design and management of space and because there is no one set of steps that residents or authorities can go by them it keeps the theories in their experimental stage, waiting to the final test result of the statistics. Because there are many different parameters, that can also change very fast, when academic professional are trying to examine the socio-economic-crime structure of each neighbourhood and analyse their experiments results, they run into a problem of getting a pure result that they can later on apply in other urban crime prevention situations. Moreover one can also claim that CPTED is merely a common sense and not a theory, for example putting up street light in a dark ally.
In order to get a better understanding on the impact of the safety issues on the structures of our contemporary society, I wish to look further into our protected homes, not only the city planning, but also the individual design of the private home. These can provide knowledge on our fears today. A great analysis of our homes’ conditions could be found in the MOMA, NY exhibition called Safe: Design Takes On Risk from 2005, where the curator Paola Antonelli used the city armour and the fortress as metaphors for human response in the age of crime and terrorism. In the exhibition catalogue there is a text by Susan Yelavich on the different types of home, as a womb, a bunker, a sanctuary, an escape, a fortress, a isolated, sheltered window on the world “For in the realm of the interior, even the risk is made safe, protected by the membrane of the house, no matter how transparent the walls, they still retain the powerful memory of defence against threat.” (see Yelavich 2005:17)
Yelavich is referring in her text the new organic architecture style, showing a fascination to the arc of the dome and the curves of the walls, this style is developing faster in the last years thanks to the new computer capabilities, she argues that in the design culture there is a strong liking between the fantastical and the avant-garde in their preoccupation with organic morphologies. They contains the charm of disorientation, and both can be traced to what we think of as the safest place of all, the womb, which according to Yelavich is our first piece of real estate. (see Yelavich 2005:19) In other cases we can find the architects planing houses in extreme locations like on cliffs over the water. These is our versions of the castle in the mountains, suggesting that the entrance is difficult, but the fortress is secure. From Frank Lloyd wright's 1939 "Fallingwater" to Pierre Koenig's 1960 "Stahl House" and in Harry Siedler's 1999 "Berman House", built on the Australian countryside with balcony hanging out over a canyon. (see Yelavich 2005:21)
Another interesting feature of urban modernity that Yelavich is mentioning is that we have become skilful at creating private spaces with exposed settings as in cases of glass architecture. From Ludwig Mies van der Rohe’s 1951 “Farnsworth House” to Shigeru Ban’s 1995 “Curtain Wall House”. Despite their claims to transparency they where depended on the isolation of their sits for basic privacy. The risk of exposure is actually quite minimal in those remote sits. Safety rooms were already popular with celebrities, producers, directors of software companies and politicians but after September 11 there has been a rash of panic rooms since then cussing a dramatic raise in room sales and security systems, as well as in requests for upgraded the air-filtration systems stemming from the anthrax scare.

But in some countries what most people consider an emergency is instead an every day occurrence. In Israel every house has a security room by law, with a door lined with rubber and reinforce concrete walls and also in Switzerland with their 261,418 bomb shelters. A more progressive response to the suffocation of home is Frank Gehry’s 1978 Santa Monica House. Chin-link fences is woven inside and outside, its security signal muted by its decorative diamond pattern. The asphalt floor of the kitchen bleeds out into the driveway and in perhaps the most pointed symbolic merge of public and private. (see Yelavich 2005:24)
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“Farnsworth House”, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe’s, 1951
From the secure space of the private home to the use of product that surround us in our everyday lives, in doors and out. There is a sub discipline in product design that deals with the different options of using technologies and designs in a practical way, that its aim is to help in reducing crime, mostly: theft, fraud and vandalism. (Lester 2001) In most cases the design and the innovative technology are going hand in hand and it is not easy to separate them and check only the impact of the design part. In addition Lester claim that in an indirect way if you can’t still a car then you also can’t rob a bank, and in a more general way if the possibility to commit a small crime is reduce then it can have an indirect influence on a more sever criminal behaviour.

Crime Reduction through Product Design (CRTPD) is arguably part of Designing Out Crime. This “involves integrating protective features into products in order to reduce their potential to become targets of criminal activity (such as theft, fraud and damage), as well as preventing their use as instruments of crime” (see Lester 2001:1-2). This part of CRPD is largely connected to offences against property, as such it also offers designs that their aim is in reducing the attractiveness of items which may indirectly avoid violent confrontations such as in robbery or home invasions. If we wish to get a reduction in CRAVED according to lester we need to consider many designs in terms of the initials “CRAVED”. This means that some items are attractive as targets of theft because they are Concealable, Removable, Available, Valuable, Enjoyable and Disposable.

BODYsafe carrying capacity: Mobile Phone, Credit Card, Drivers License and Keys, UK
Most of the time we think only of high-end technologies that are connected to security but this is not always the case. For some products, protective designs don’t need to be sophisticated to reduce theft. One example is a bicycle in which the frame itself the locking mechanism that would need to be cut for the bicycle to be stolen, therefore lowering the bicycle value (Cyclic Systems 1995). Another example is a screw design that can only be removed using special tools (Design News 1997b) and has a range of applications in preventing theft, tampering and other deliberate damage. Design can be also get sport from the graphic design field, in one case its to prevent forgery on cheques in cases of attempts at physically swapping characters’ positions. a pattern is add in the background, this pattern is usually geometric and its hard to cut it apart and assemble it again.(see Lester 2001:4)

A good example to CRTPD process is occurring in The Design Against Crime initiative, which is government institute in the UK. Their strategy is to deal with the causes of crime at the earliest stage of manufacturing. Most of the time, design improvements are made after a crime has happened. DAC are working with the Department of Trade and Industry and design bodies, looking to encourage companies to think through the crime-resistance of their designs and systems before launching them on to the market. they wish to be a step a head and not a step late.

Another interesting initiative on this matter can be found in Design Against Crime Research Centre, which is a socially responsive, practice-led research centre located at Central Saint Martins College of Art and Design, London. Their current Projects include: Bike Off! Bike Parking Research

self-locking bike

Bikeoff Secure Bike Parking Stands
Stop Thief - anti theft furniture, Grippa - anti theft clips, Design Against Drug Related Retail Crime and many other projects. According to them designers need to be far more creative than criminals. The design dilemma is HOW to design objects, services, and environments that address both users and abusers, without making them look 'criminal'. CRPD designers also need to consider the user acceptance of protected products as part of the success of their project. From my experience there is an increasing amount of dissatisfaction from the different products that can damage our privacy, especially in the surveillance field. People are not always willing to participate or perches and install those counter measures, like CCTV or hidden cameras.
The examples above are providing real answers to real threats, but sometimes it is not enough. This category of product design can be understood as both a shelter from danger and as an amulet against its unknown destiny. A huge effort goes into trying to make people feel secure. However, do high-end technologies can remove all risks? Bruce Schneier, security expert, explores how humans evaluate danger in order to feel safe. Schneier argues that with the global economic crash, increasing crime rates and terrorist threats, security has become a buzzword. Crime prevention has evolved from building a fence and a wall to something more advanced. Modern security solutions feature biometric access control, border patrol through IR and thermal cameras and video analyses, all integrated to protect our assets. From fires built outside of the caves to today’s multi billion-dollar electronic security industry, security measures have changed over time, but the need for security remains the same. (Schneier 2003) Schneier, suggests that security is both a feeling and a reality and only when security solutions fit reality can people feel truly secure. So what is the role of design in all this?

Some good answers to that I found, once again, in the MOMA exhibition - Safe, which had on display a variety of products that were dealing with the theme of safety. Antonelli did an intriguing job in raising the discussion on safety as a physical need but also as a
state of mind, we will feel safe if we will think we are protected. This probable the reason why Antonelli chose also some products that don’t exactly answer our definition of safety or even on the contrary, they ask us back questions on what is safety for us. Antonelli refer to a universal feeling of fear, one that is in common to all humans that it is part of our basic instinct, that is a need that we have to have in order to fulfil ourselves in life. Antonelli acknowledges in this exhibition that safety is a basic human need, even though that this definition, certainly, always changing in response to environmental and social context. (Antonelli 2005)
Safety can be an everyday wish, as well as a more urgent need when unusual and sudden dangers occur. The range of objects in the exhibition shows the ways in which designers can approach our different fears—both based on a realistic ground and on an imagined one. The designers are trying to achieve their aim by combining the technologies, innovative solution and designs and are trying to adjust them to their users. Some products dealing with realistic fears and dangers such as inflatable shelters, water-collection device help point intercom and rescue board to products that ask questions on our fear society such as: hide away furniture, a ballistic rose brooch, hidden wealth—gold and silver nails and a felt handbag with an impressed knife image.
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Anthony Dunne, Fiona Raby and Michael Anastassiades
Hide Away Furniture, from the Design for Fragile Personalities in Anxious Times 2004
Fear is a strong emotion which is common to us all. It has the same goal in the 21st century as it did before, we are afraid from death, and the “fight or flight” fear reactions is built in our body, which is trying to protect itself from danger. This mechanism is a basic survival instinct for all humans. Further more Maslow claims that the feeling of safety, in all humans, has a major part in life motivation, on the way to self actualization, and that we will all try to get the safety needs to be satisfied. However, not every fear is common to all, while some fears are built in and are universal, others are the result of the culture that we live in and exist in a specific region or time. For instance, in today’s western society the fear from a terrorist attack is equal to the fear in the plague times or the Satan and witches in religion. Another important difference to mention is between the private fear and the political one. The political fear is emerging from the society or have implications on the society while the private fear is concerning the person that is experiencing the fear.

Perhaps our greatest immunity against fear has always come from going to people in charge of our safety: the policemen, fire-fighters, and emergency medical teams. But these comforting presence are not trusted in the post-modern society as much as they were in the past. As we saw on the cold war or the war against terrorism. But it is definitely easier to control and lead a group that is shearing the same fears and the authorities and politicians knows that well. Actually, in the post modern society the political fear is one of the only thing that can change us from isolated men and women into a united group. This thought can be understood from the French writer Michel de Montaigne who said, “The thing I fear most is fear” and since then other scholars has gone further with the idea that fear is the great evil of civilization. In reality fear is responsible in causing inequality, hurting human
rights and undermining liberalism in the world. Those in society who inform us and who care for us must be committed to maintaining a perspective based on realistic assessments of risk, rather than an agenda based on politics or profit. They are unwilling to tell the public to accept that there are no easy answers and no absolute protection. They have to be seen as doing something or finding who to blame.

The city, the urban spaces became a center of violence in the last decades. The strengthening of city alienation, raising of religious and political groups, arming of city gangs, corruption exposure, along side to the strengthening of the legal system, decline in the social polarity and resources and population growth, all of those tensions are translated in their extreme to violence. Discussions on the connection between the urban environment and planing to prevent violence existed in the 20th century in their physical context, behavioural context and processive context. From the Defensible Space in 1972, with an emphasis on the natural surveillance, territorial concerns and access control in the neighbourhood, to the “Broken Windows” theory which argues that vandalism and negligent in the city can encourage the “violation” of other norms of behaviour. This theory highlights the part of the visual environmental conditions in the attempt to reduce crime. Another indicator to the contemporary condition of our society is in the design of our private home. We are now living in a city of armour and fortress, our homes have become a type of womb, bunker, sanctuary or a place to escape to. From the secure space of the private home to the use of product that surround us in our everyday lives, indoors and out. There we can find designers that give us practical solution for future safety and others that are offering us objects that will help us feel secure.

All though that in the Physical context of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design and Crime Reduction Through Product Design there is a sincere effort in trying to create an environments in which we can be safe. Unfortunately, it is still not possible to protect us from all kind of crime or criminal. Security and safety is something that is never 100% guaranteed due to the unpredictable human nature, there for design or technology can not find a solution to every danger it can only do its best. the good news is that design can help in making us feel secure and keeping us safe in mind. We definitely need the illusion of safety, so that we can live in a healthy way.
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