

BSA

The British Sociological Association is publishing a series of books to review the state of the discipline at the beginning of the millennium. New Horizons in Sociology also seeks to locate the contribution of British scholarship to the wider development of sociology. Sociology is taught in all the major institutions of higher education in the United Kingdom as well as throughout North America and the Europe of the former western bloc. Sociology is now establishing itself in the former eastern bloc. But it was only in the second half of the twentieth century that sociology moved from the fringes of UK academic life into the mainstream. British sociology has also provided a home for movements that have renewed and challenged the discipline; the revival of academic Marxism, the renaissance in feminist theory, the rise of cultural studies, for example. Some of these developments have become sub-disciplines whilst yet others have challenged the very basis of the sociological enterprise. Each has left their mark. Now therefore is a good time both to take stock and to scan the horizon, looking back and looking forward.

Series Editor: Bridget Fowler, *University of Glasgow*

Published titles include:

Nationalism and Social Theory
Gerard Delanty and Patrick O'Mahoney

Interactionism
Paul Atkinson and William Housley

Feminist Sociology
Sara Delamont

The New Sociology of Economic Behaviour
Ralph Fevre

The Sociology of Religion
Grace Davie

Space and Social Theory

Andrzej Zieleniec

 SAGE

Los Angeles • London • New Delhi • Singapore

contents

Preface	viii
Acknowledgements	xviii
Chapter 1 Karl Marx: the implicit spatiality of historical materialism	1
Chapter 2 Georg Simmel: the space of formal sociology	34
Chapter 3 Henri Lefebvre: the production of space	60
Chapter 4 David Harvey: the political economy of space	98
Chapter 5 Michel Foucault: space, knowledge and power	125
Chapter 6 Legacies and prospects: spatialising contemporary modernity	150
Bibliography	182
Index	197

6 This is a point that Gray emphasises in his analysis of the links between the local state and an increasingly dominant bourgeois public sphere. In this, for Gray, ruling class intellectuals were

[p]articularly concerned with the administrative and ideological organisation of society, they were to be found as members of statistical societies and Royal Commissions, writers and readers of the quarterly press, organisers of charity and social discipline... They played a crucial role in the organisation of hegemony... The industrial bourgeoisie constituted the *hegemonic fraction* within the power bloc – whose interests preponderate in the exercise of state power, and whose particular social relations figure in dominant ideological representations... Various overlapping intellectual and literary cadres strongly committed to utilitarianism and free trade, staffed key new branches of the State apparatus. Moreover 'divinity and economics' ran together and the laws of political economy were closely entangled with moral, and often religiously sanctioned, norms of 'rational conduct'. (Gray, 1981: 237, 239)

7 Ely stresses Habermas was at pains to recognise this point:

It is important to acknowledge the existence of competing publics not just later in the nineteenth century... but at every stage in the history of the public sphere and, indeed, from the very beginning... The emergence of the bourgeois public was never defined solely by the struggle against absolutism and traditional authority. Also, it necessarily addressed the problem of popular containment as well... Consequently, the public sphere makes more sense as the structured setting where cultural and ideological contest or negotiation among the variety of publics takes place, rather than as the spontaneous and class-specific achievement of the bourgeoisie in some sufficient sense. (Ely, 1992: 306)

8 As Habermas writes:

Laws passed under the 'pressure of the street' could hardly be understood any longer as embodying the reasonable consensus of publicly debating private persons... The competitive order no longer lent sufficient credibility to its promise that, along with the alleged equality of opportunity to accumulate private property, it also maintained open access to the public sphere in the political realm. The principle of the latter, rather, demanded the direct admittance of the labouring classes, of the uneducated masses without property – precisely through the extension of equal political rights. Electoral reform was the topic of the nineteenth century: no longer the principle of publicity as such, as had been true in the eighteenth century, but of the enlargement of the public. (Habermas, 1992, 132–3)

9 See Chapter 3 in Harvey (1985) and also Harvey (2003), Paris: capital of modernity, for a detailed study of the redevelopment of the space of Paris as a means to organise and control the population as well as represent the national prestige and imperial status of the capital and of France.

five

Michel Foucault: space, knowledge and power

Michel Foucault did not propose a general theory of space or of power. However, his well-known proposition of the emergence through a number of interrelated professions and activities in the nineteenth century of a 'disciplinary society', provides the opportunity for investigating both his use of the concept of power/knowledge and the importance of the spatial dimension in his understanding of social relations. What will be explored and given particular emphasis here are those 'disciplinary discourses' that illuminate the dispersed practices of power operative and inherent in representations of forms of space that are an integral part of Foucault's social theory. These discourses are pertinent to an appreciation of the historical origins and development of modern, predominantly urban society, in which 'disciplinary spaces' are created through the application of knowledge/power for the cultivation, instillation and propagation of 'civilised', bourgeois values. They are an important feature of Foucault's analysis of modern socio-spatial forms and the social relations of power. In particular, Foucault's assertion of the role of the medical professions as 'the first specialists of space' will be analysed to investigate the power of disciplinary discourses in the production, representation and use of space in the development of a planned, managed, policed urban society. In this, the role of space and spatial forms will be considered in relation to Foucault's understanding of what he terms the two aspects of 'bio-power': the creation of 'docile bodies' and the policing of the 'species body'. The following necessarily selective usage of Foucault's array of concepts and works is one that heeds Foucault's own advice for the treatment of 'original' thinkers:

The only valid tribute to thought such as Nietzsche's is precisely to use it, to deform it, to make it groan and protest. And if commentators then say that I am being unfaithful to Nietzsche, that is of absolutely no interest to me. (Foucault, 1980: 53–4)

The following then is my attempt not to make Foucault (or the reader) groan and protest but to illuminate the spatiality of Foucault's analysis

of modern disciplinary society. What will be considered then is how Foucault understood the role and importance of space in understanding the historical development of the spaces and practices of modern society.

POWER, KNOWLEDGE AND SPACE

'Power-knowledge' is an essential concept in Foucault's work. It is an attempt to embody the inextricably linked dynamic relationship between power and knowledge as a process. For Foucault, power is distributed through and in the construction and application of knowledge in particular and localised arenas. Concomitantly, power is established, maintained and presupposed by knowledge. As Foucault states:

it is not the activity of the subject of knowledge that produces a corpus of knowledge, useful or resistant to power, but power-knowledge, the processes and struggles that traverse it and of which it is made up, that determines the forms and possible domains of knowledge. (Foucault, 1977: 28)

This is a point that Armstrong reiterates as crucial to Foucault's analysis:

126

Power assumes a relationship based on some knowledge which creates and sustains it; conversely, power establishes a particular regime of truth in which certain knowledge becomes admissible or possible. (Armstrong, 1983: 10)

There is, for Foucault, a whole range of endeavours and practices in which the acquisition of knowledge and the exercise of power are inextricably and intimately interlinked. He identifies what is considered as a fundamental historical transformation in the exercise of power that was intimately related to forms of knowledge, and technologies of understanding, that were based upon the discernment of local, 'micro-terrains' of power. Power is effective through its penetration and knowledge of a variety of relationships, from the most personal and intimate to the most public and professional. How these micro-powers are constructed and effective in a number of local fields, domains or territories is essential for understanding the very existence and operation of large, centralised or global power concentrations and institutionalised arrangements.

Once knowledge can be analysed in terms of region (a fiscal administrative, military notion), domain (juridico-political notion), implantation, displacement (what displaces itself is an army, a squadron, a population), transposition, one is able to capture the process by which knowledge functions as a form of power and disseminates the effects of power. There is an administration of knowledge,

a politics of knowledge, relations of power which pass via knowledge and which, if one tries to transcribe them, lead one to consider forms of domination designated by such notions of field (an economico-juridical notion), region (fiscal, administrative, military notion) and territory (juridico-political notion, the area controlled by a certain kind of power). And the politico-strategic term is an indication of how the military and the administration actually comes to inscribe themselves both on a material soil and within forms of discourse. (Foucault, 1980: 69)

Foucault's analysis of power then may be said to be primarily concerned with understanding how power is exercised in different historical periods, provinces, domains and spheres, and thus has a certain relevance to understanding its operation in and through space. Rather than asking what is power, who holds it and what is its source, for Foucault it is the relation of forces in the operation and exercise of power that is the focus of investigation. For Foucault, power is understood as dispersed throughout society as a heterogeneous ensemble of strategies and techniques, an open-ended 'cluster of relations' that exist in its exercise.¹ Power, is thus not the possession (legitimated in juridical relations of contracts, codes and laws) of any particular group, class or institution. Since power is presented as having many forms it cannot be derived solely from the spheres of circulation or of production, and it is not confined to key institutions such as the state. Foucault's focus is instead upon how 'micro-powers' invade our everyday lives and relationships and constitute the conditions and means of power not only for the state and its apparatus but also in a myriad of ways and forms that is not necessarily best understood in Marx's dichotomy of class conflict in which one class holds sway over another. As he states:

127

I believe that anything can be deduced from the general phenomenon of the domination of the bourgeois class. What needs to be done is something quite different. One needs to investigate historically, and beginning at the lowest level, how mechanisms of power have been able to function... We must escape from the limited field of juridical sovereignty and state institutions, and instead base our analysis of power on the study of the tactics and techniques of domination... What makes power hold good... is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourses. (Foucault, 1980: 100, 102, 119)

This is a point that Foucault emphasised elsewhere:

We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms, power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production. (Foucault, 1977: 194)

The exercise of power then, for Foucault, occurs in a variety of places, through a number of individuals, institutions and organisations at different times and places and in a number of forms. Therefore, despite space being seemingly relegated in importance to time in conventional social analysis, it is a crucial factor in the social, economic and political operation and organisation of society. As Foucault famously put it:

Space was treated as the dead, the fixed, the undialectical, the immobile. Time on the contrary, was richness, fecundity, life, dialectic... [which led to it being]... either dismissed as belonging to 'nature' – that is, the given, the basic conditions, 'physical geography', in other words a sort of 'prehistoric' stratum; or else it was conceived as the residential site or field of expansion of peoples, of a culture, a language or a State. (Foucault, 1980: 70, 149)

This is a point on which Foucault is categorical: "Space is fundamental in any form of community life; space is fundamental in any exercise of power" (Foucault, 1986: 252).² In other words, Foucault is suspicious of 'total' explanations that sought to resolve the complexity of the social world into a single 'spirit' or 'principle', theory or ideology. He rejected any idea of general or totalising theories of power. He writes that

Nothing is fundamental. That is what is interesting in the analysis of society. That is why nothing irritates me as much as these inquiries – which are by definition metaphysical – on the foundations of power is a society or the self-institution of society, etc. These are not fundamental phenomena. There are only reciprocal relations, and the perpetual gaps between intentions in relation to one another. (Foucault, 1982: 18)

Thus Foucault is critical of theories, such as Marxist conceptions of power, that give it an 'epiphenomenal' status, that consider power as unitary, sovereign or centralised, belonging to one group or class, institution or body. That is, as only immanent in class relations. However, Foucault does not dismiss entirely the contribution of Marx's work in understanding historical processes for the operation of power in modern societies. Indeed, Foucault clearly states that:

It is impossible at the present time to write history without using a whole range of concepts directly or indirectly linked to Marx's thought and situating oneself in a horizon of thought which has been defined and described by Marx. (Foucault, 1980: 53)³

Therefore, the understanding that Foucault presents of the diffusion and dispersion of power throughout society by economically dominant class

interests, as analysed by Marx, is one that serves their own interests. That is:

The bourgeoisie is perfectly well aware that a new constitution or legislature will not suffice to assure its hegemony; it realises that it has to invent a new technology ensuring the irrigation by effects of power of the whole social body down to its smallest particles. And it was by such means that the bourgeoisie not only made a revolution but succeeded in establishing a social hegemony which it has never relinquished. (Foucault, 1980: 156)

Foucault's proposition is of a dispersed system of spatial sciences that emerged in eighteenth-century Europe as part of a general system of knowledge based on medical and administrative necessity as providing an explanation of the means by which this hegemony was established and maintained. What was established, according to Foucault, was

a type of power which is constantly exercised by means of surveillance rather than in a discontinuous manner...it presupposes a tightly knit grid of material coercions...one of the great inventions of bourgeois society. (Foucault, 1980: 105)

It is an analysis that puts knowledge of, and command over space at the centre of techniques and practices for instructing individuals and populations, in institutional settings and in wider social arrangements, at work and at rest and play. It is an analysis that seeks to understand and represent the processes by which moral consent as well as methods of physical control and subservience were constructed and maintained. It is therefore an approach that provides an important understanding of how and by whom and to what end particular forms and representations of space are constructed and promulgated.

The development in the eighteenth century of an awareness and understanding of spatial forms was, for Foucault, an expression of how power came to be articulated and exercised. For example he states that

Architecture begins, at the end of the [eighteenth] century, to become involved in problems of population, health and the urban question...[it] becomes a question of using the disposition of space for economico-political ends. (Foucault, 1980: 148)

It is in such assemblages, in their distribution and arrangement, of activities and people, in and around the architecture and environment of the city that the spatial dimension of the operation of power becomes concretised. Space, for Foucault, is where discourses about power and

knowledge become actual relations of power rather than merely residing in abstract notions and ideologies. Foucault argues that

in the eighteenth century one sees the development of reflection upon architecture as a function of the aims and techniques of the government of societies. One begins to see a form of political literature that addresses what the order of a society should be, what a city should be, given the requirements of the maintenance of order; given that one should avoid epidemics, avoid revolts, permit a decent and moral life, and so on...from the eighteenth century on, every discussion of politics as the art of the government of men necessarily includes a chapter or a series of chapter on urbanism, on collective facilities, on hygiene, and on private architecture...The city was no longer perceived as a place of privilege, as an exception in a territory of fields, forests, and roads. The cities were no longer islands beyond the common law. Instead, the cities, with the problems that they raised, and the particular forms that they took, served as the models for the governmental rationality that was to apply to the whole territory. (Foucault, 1986: 239, 240, 241)

Foucault echoes many early investigators of the shadow side of urban life when he states that behind these interventions lay a concern about the consequences for civilised society of the onrush of urbanisation and industrialisation.

130

A fear haunted the latter half of the eighteenth century: the fear of darkened spaces, of the pall of gloom which prevents the full visibility of things, men and truths. It sought to break up the patches of darkness that blocked the light, eliminate the shadowy areas of society, demolish the unlit chambers where arbitrary political acts, monarchical caprice, religious superstitions, tyrannical and priestly plots, epidemics and the illusions of ignorance were fomented... The new political order could not be established until these places were eradicated. (Foucault, 1980: 153)

The control and division of space and of time thus became a fundamental means by which knowledge and power came to be exercised increasingly over all spheres of society.

Once knowledge can be analysed in terms of regions, domains, implantation, displacements, transposition, one is able to capture the process by which knowledge functions as a form of power...[one can]...decipher discourse through the use of spatial, strategic metaphors [that] enables one to grasp precisely the points at which discourses are transformed in, through and on the basis of relations of power. (Foucault, 1980: 69, 70)

Knowledge and power thus became operative in and through a number of diverse and interlinked 'disciplines', what Foucault defined as forms of practice – "small acts of cunning endowed with a great power of diffusion" (Foucault, 1977: 139) – not as institutional structures.

For Foucault space needs to be related to the functional requirements of power; thus, what is conceptualised is the emergence of a new set of specifically spatial practices and procedures that is closely linked to the development of the city and what he terms 'governmentality'. Put simply, governmentality is the extraordinary expansion in the scope of government begun in the mid-eighteenth century and continuing to grow till today. This includes all those activities and spheres of human activity, whether as individuals or as collectivities which need to be structured, manipulated or controlled. As Foucault himself writes:

This word [government] must be allowed the very broad meaning which it had in the sixteenth century. 'Government' did not refer only to political structures or the management of states; rather it designates the way in which the conduct of individuals or states might be directed: the government of children, of souls, of communities, of families, of the sick. It did not cover only the legitimately constituted forms of political or economic subjection, but also modes of action, more or less considered, which were designed to act upon the possibilities of action of other people. To govern, in this sense, is to structure the possible field of action of others. (Foucault, 1982: 221)

The need to create, define, manage, organise and control space for particular functions (e.g. as sites for the medical supervision of diseases, or of the education of children, or the keeping of peace and order) became inseparable from a whole series of other military and 'police' duties. It is necessary to be explicit here concerning what Foucault defines, what he means by 'police'.

131

At the outset, the notion of police applied only to the set of regulations that were to assure the tranquillity of a city, but at that moment the police became the very type for the government of the whole territory... In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, 'police' signified a program of government rationality. This can be characterised as a project to create a system of regulation of the general conduct of individuals whereby everything would be controlled to the point of self-sustenance, without the need for intervention. (Foucault, 1986: 241)⁴

Thus it is possible to see that for Foucault what developed was the creation and representation of spaces as well as their partitioning and manipulation as the product of specific knowledge applied to meet functional and desirable ends.

Particular places were defined not only by the need to supervise, to break dangerous communications, but also to create a useful space... Hence the need to distribute and partition off space in a rigorous manner... Gradually, an administrative and political space was articulated upon therapeutic space; it tended to individualise bodies, diseases, symptoms, lives and deaths; it

constituted a real table of juxtaposed and carefully distinct singularities. Out of discipline a medically useful space was born. (Foucault, 1977: 143–4)

It is then in the development of such 'disciplinary discourses' applied to the developing space of modernity that Foucault proposes how and in what ways space came to be known and thus rendered useful to power.

DISCIPLINARY DISCOURSES OF SPACE

What arose from the early experience of the consequences of industrialisation and urbanisation is the perception of the need for the development of new ways and means for understanding and thus controlling and organising space and, concomitantly, the individuals and groups that inhabit it. Foucault describes how this was achieved in different ways. First, discipline begins from the organisation of individuals in space in which several techniques are applied, and which he terms 'the art of distinctions'. Sometimes space needed to be enclosed to specify that it is a place of discipline, for example in the barracks, the school, the prison or the factory. Sometimes space must be partitioned with the aim of knowing, mastering and using space so that each individual can be assigned and know their place within the enclosed order of the institution or disciplinary sphere. As Foucault puts it,

Disciplinary space tends to be divided into as many sections as there are bodies or elements to be distributed. One must eliminate the effects of imprecise distributions, the uncontrolled disappearance of individuals, their diffuse circulation, their unusable and dangerous coagulation; it was a tactic of anti-desertion, anti-vagabondage, anti-concentration. Its aim was to establish presences and absences, to know where and how to locate individuals, to set up useful communications, to interrupt others, to be able at each moment to supervise the conduct of each individual, to assess it, to judge it, to calculate its qualities or merits. It was a procedure, therefore, aimed at knowing, mastering and using. Discipline organises an analytical space. (Foucault, 1977: 143)

The means of supervision of correct training could, it was argued, be most efficiently organised and administered so that "the perfect disciplinary apparatus would make it possible for a single gaze to see everything constantly" (Foucault, 1977: 173). Thus, Jeremy Bentham's design of the Panopticon for the architecture of the prison was considered the ideal apparatus for the most efficient organisation of disciplinary space. However, as Foucault makes clear, 'panopticism' represented a general diagram for the dissemination of disciplinary technologies throughout wider society. The panoptic schema as applied to the prison

could and it was argued, by Bentham should, be adapted and adopted to other spheres and spaces.

The panoptic schema, without disappearing as such or losing any of its properties, was destined to spread throughout the whole social body; its vocation was to become a generalised function. The plague-stricken town provided an exceptional disciplinary model: perfect, but absolutely violent; to the disease that brought death; life inside it was reduced to its simplest expression; it was, against the power of death, the meticulous exercise of the right of the sword. The panopticon, on the other hand, has a role in amplification; although it arranges power, although it is intended to make it more economic and more effective, it does not do so for power itself, nor for the immediate salvation of a threatened society: its aim is to strengthen the social forces – to increase production, to develop the economy, spread education, raise the level of public morality, to increase and multiply. (Foucault, 1977: 207–8)⁵

The disciplinary gaze, the 'system of surveillance', the 'Eye of Power' epitomised by the architecture of the Panopticon, thus became an essential and fundamental part of the machinery of production, a specific mechanism for the exercise of power as the division of labour increased in developing industrialised economies. It was also adopted and applied by professional experts and by bureaucratic officials to monitor and regulate all sorts of private and public spaces, behaviours and activities. Bureaucracy is the dominant mode of operation of the state and of the economy, but as with Foucault's concept of power, it is neither a class in itself nor is it the power of the state. It can serve any organisation, scheme or plan as the most efficient means of applying operative procedures for the goals and ends that are specified as useful, fortuitous or beneficial.⁶ Regulation and instruction was to be achieved without recourse to physical domination:

There is no need for arms, physical violence, material constraints. Just a gaze. An inspecting gaze, a gaze which each individual under its weight will end by interiorising to the point that he is his own overseer, each individual thus exercising this surveillance over and against himself. (Foucault, 1980: 155)

Foucault's analysis of power/knowledge described how "massive, compact disciplines are broken down into flexible methods of control which may be transferred and adapted" (Foucault, 1977: 211). Thus, disciplinary knowledge and techniques could be applied in the industrial era to a range of activities, people and circumstances. As Foucault puts it:

In reality, power in its exercise goes much further, passes through much finer channels, and is much more ambiguous, since each individual has at his disposal a certain power, and for that very reason can also act as the vehicle for

transmitting a wider power. The reproduction of the relations of production is not the only function served by power... The individual, with his identity and characteristics, is the product of a relation of power exercised over bodies, multiplicities, movements, desires, forces. (Foucault, 1980: 72, 74)

In addition to the control of space, disciplinary techniques also required the control of the individual in time. For example, the instigation of the timetable from the practices of religious institutions such as the monastery and convent, and the army, could be adopted, transferred and adapted to the school, the prison, the workhouse and the factory. Thus Foucault argues that:

The new disciplines had no difficulty in taking up their place in the old forms; the schools and poorhouses extended the life and regularity of the monastic communities to which they were often attached. The rigours of the industrial period retained a religious air. (Foucault, 1977: 149)

Thus, working, learning and paying one's dues for transgression were all regulated by and associated with the passage, monitoring and articulation of time in supervised space. In this respect, Foucault explored the concept of the 'docile-body' as the subject of the power, authority and practices of a number of disciplines that constructed an '*anatopolitics of the body*' as a means of knowing and thus of controlling bodies in space.

The historical moment of the disciplines was the moment when an art of the human body was born, which was directed not only at the growth of its skills, nor at the intensification of its subjection, but at the formation of a relation that in the mechanism itself makes it more obedient as it becomes more useful, and conversely. Thus discipline produces subjected and practised bodies, 'docile' bodies. Discipline increases the forces of the body (in economic terms of utility) and diminishes these same forces (in terms of obedience)... If economic exploitation separates the force and the product of labour, let us say that disciplinary coercion establishes in the body the constricting link between an increased aptitude and an increased domination. (Foucault, 1980: 137-8)⁷

What Foucault emphasises, despite acknowledging the historical precedents⁸ is that the aim of disciplinary technology, wherever and in whatever form it operates, as being the moulding of a "docile body that may be subjected to, used, transformed and improved to meet a desired end" (Foucault, 1980: 198). That is, power is administered and applied in and through a variety of disciplinary technologies, that are themselves the result of knowledge, its accumulation and dispersal. This is to ensure that

power relations can materially penetrate the body in depth, without depending even on the mediation of the subject's own representations. If power takes hold

on the body, this isn't through its having first to be interiorised in people's consciousness... (Foucault, 1980: 186)⁹

The body was thus to be exercised, drilled, trained and manipulated in time and through space by the application of disciplinary power. The movements, gestures and activities that made up the working day were correlated to a strict time-keeping which aimed to create socially, economically and politically useful, docile, orderly, punctual, responsible, obedient, fit, healthy, educated, temperate, pious and thrifty productive bodies.¹⁰ What was created was a new 'moral geography' replete with all those 'civilising' virtues and good habits deemed appropriate for the maximisation of economic potential and for the defence of the state. Foucault's analysis goes further in that the diffusion of disciplinary discourses from institutional settings of work, punishment, schooling, the military, etc. to all social spheres and arenas identifies the means by which bourgeois hegemony tried to construct and manipulate moral consent as well as methods of physical control and subservience for its own ends. The imposition of the 'Eye of Power' to the spatial entity of the urban is, for Foucault, one of the first and most explicit examples of the operation of disciplinary discourses of space.

THE FIRST SPECIALISTS OF SPACE – THE MEDICAL DISCOURSE

Foucault is unequivocal in stressing the role of doctors from the end of the eighteenth century as being fundamentally involved in the analysis and organisation of space. The operation of medical disciplinary discourses illustrates and emphasises the exercise of knowledge and power in creating not only representations of space but useful and beneficial space. Foucault describes how doctors

at that time were among other things the first specialists of space. They posed four fundamental problems. That of local conditions (regional climates, soil, humidity and dryness): under the term 'constitution', they studied these combinations of local determinants and seasonal variations which at a given moment favour a particular sort of disease; that of co-existences (either between men, questions of density and proximity, or between men and things, the question of water, sewage, ventilation, or between men and animals, the question of stables and abattoirs, or between men and the dead, the question of cemeteries); that of residences (the environment, urban problems); that of displacements (the migration of men, the propagation of diseases.) Doctors were, along with the military, the first managers of collective space. But the military were chiefly concerned to think the space of 'campaigns' (and thus of 'passages') and that of fortresses, whereas the doctors were concerned to think the space of habitations and towns. (Foucault, 1980: 150-1)

What Foucault is proposing is that from the eighteenth century onwards medicine and politics came to be interlinked in the consideration of and necessity for action in the increasingly, populous cities. Medicine as a discipline came to be involved in processes, techniques and interventions that were closely related to political developments, aims and objectives. As Foucault writes:

What the eighteenth century shows, in any case, is a double-sided process... in short, the progressive emplacement of what was to become the great medical edifice of the nineteenth century, cannot be divorced from the concurrent organisation of a politics of health, the consideration of disease as a political and economic problem for social collectivities which they must seek to resolve as a matter of overall policy. (Foucault, 1980: 166)

Foucault's proposition is that doctors were at the forefront of the diagnosis and treatment of the perceived problems of industrial society. New methods of surveillance for collecting information on populations came to be developed out of the need to produce, understand and control the spaces and populations of the newly industrialised and urbanising towns and cities. It cultivated new ways of seeing, the 'Eye of Power', and of calculating and ordering the social, economic and political existence of society. That is:

The great eighteenth century demographic upswing in western Europe, the necessity for co-ordinating and integrating it into the apparatus of production and the urgency of controlling it with finer and more adequate power mechanisms causes 'population', with its numerical variables of space and chronology, longevity and health, to emerge not only as a problem but as an object of surveillance, analysis, intervention, modification, etc. ... Within this set of problems, the 'body' – the body of individuals and the body of populations – appears as the bearer of new variables, not merely as between the scarce and the numerous, the submissive and the restive, rich and poor, health and sick, strong and weak, but also between the more or less utilisable, more or less amenable to profitable investment, those with greater or lesser prospects of survival, death and illness, and with more or less capacity for being usefully trained. (Foucault, 1980: 171, 172)

Medical disciplinary discourses may be said to be concerned with how knowledge, techniques and practices, of populations and individuals, involved medical personnel and institutions in the development of a modern form of government in which political authorities (the local and national state) worked in alliance with experts in order to administer a variety of perceived problems. The medical profession was thus implicated in the operation of power and the exercise of political initiatives within the context of the development of a new understanding of the problems faced by the growth of cities, new technologies and the movement and behaviour of populations. That is, urbanisation and

industrialisation brought with them problems and consequences that needed to be addressed not only by the state but also by the development of new techniques and methods of analysis formulated and applied by professional disciplines and charitable public bodies and organisations. This was especially true in the development of the medical disciplines and in their self-perceived roles and activities. The aim was to promote public health and private well-being within a realm that was considered inherently social as a means whereby knowledge about the population could be used to construct a more healthy, fit and able, efficient, obedient and docile population. As Foucault puts it:

A 'medico-administrative' knowledge begins to develop concerning society, its health and sickness, its conditions of life, housing and habits, which serves as the basic core for the 'social economy' and sociology of the 19th century. And there is likewise constituted a politico-medical hold on a population hedged in by a whole series of prescriptions relating not only to disease but to general forms of existence and behaviours (food and drink, sexuality and fecundity, clothing and the layout of living space). (Foucault, 1980: 176)

Rose identifies in Foucault's various analyses of medical discourses five great apparatus of health – the medical administration of public space, the hygienic regulation of domestic life, the curative clinic, the medical staffing of the population, the instrumental mitigation of suffering – as being involved in different relations between experts and those subject to their intervention. The medicalisation of public space evolved in tandem with the intervention of medical personnel in the private life and space of the family. The social body was to be reconstructed through the intervention of town planning that would invade those areas long perceived as being the worst examples of disease, immorality and ill health with the purifying object of introducing light, air and education (both moral and hygienic). As Rose stresses, this was a concerted application of knowledge being applied to the problem of public space.

This medico-administrative government of public space was not merely a matter of medical officers of health, sanitary reformers and the policing of food and drink. It also entailed the development of spatial technologies of health, in the form of a new set of relations between medicine and architecture. In the schemes of planning space, at the macro-level of the towns and the micro-level of the design of buildings – prisons, asylums, schools, homes, bathrooms, kitchens – one sees the desire to make space healthy. Architects and planners seek to enact a medical vocation organising the relations between persons, functions, objects, effluents, activities, in order to minimise all that would encourage disease and to maximise all that would promote health. The dream of the healthy body – the healthy city, the healthy home – has, perhaps done more than most to embody the medical aspiration within the territories upon which we manage our individual lives. (Rose, 1994: 64)

Foucault singles out the role of the 'medical police' as being fundamental in the construction of a social model of society and of positivist social science in just such practices as were developed and applied by the medical profession in the nineteenth century. This has for Foucault direct relevance for the development of the social sciences and particularly sociology.

Sociological knowledge (*savoir*) is formed rather in practices like those of the doctors... In fact if the intervention of the doctors was of capital importance at this period, this was because it was demanded by a whole new range of political and economic problems, highlighting the importance of the facts of the population. (Foucault, 1980: 151)

Certainly, there is ample historical evidence for the fundamental role that medical personnel have played in collecting information on populations that was instrumental in advising social policy and political strategies for ameliorating urban 'problems', conditions and experiences.¹¹ As Foucault puts it, "the doctor becomes the great advisor and expert, if not in the art of governing, at least in that of observing, correcting and improving the social 'body' and maintaining it in a permanent state of health" (Foucault, 1980: 177).

138

In this period of the nineteenth century anatomical models were an attractive basis for social theorists, and for the formation of social policy for the new urban environment, in that they provided a familiar epistemology as well as empirical means and statistical evidence. Society was given as an organic form and thought of in medical terms: that is as a social body afflicted by illness and needing to be restored to health. Thus, medical personnel become involved with other authorities, such as the state and voluntary bodies, in relations whose concern is with issues of individual and population's health, sickness and the development of techniques for surveillance, segregation and discipline.¹² This was allied with the miasmatic conception of epidemics, of which there were many in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, that is that stagnant air breeds disease and was primarily concerned with the spatialisation of diseases. They were understood as occurring around and circulating in certain types of social spaces and came to afflict those of certain characters, habits and behaviours who inhabited them. Thus a geographic disposition of disease could be constructed that could be applied to and analysed in relation to the geography of the town or city and the rate and level of infection could be equated with certain areas and classes. The analogy of the human body and social organisation was, in the nineteenth century, adapted and adopted to suit the new conditions that were emerging in the industrial towns and cities. The role of scientific

medicine in the apparent objective, minute investigation of the urban environment is a theme that Foucault credits to the medical profession's concern with spatialisation. The investigation of the urban population became an essential part of the disciplinary programme for social policy.¹³ The image of the 'social body' was a defence against representations of humans as machines and, like other anatomical models, represented society as a unified whole with groups and individuals characterised by having specialised functions. But public health was not only a matter of sanitation, it involved the moral and physical regulation of public spaces and private behaviours.¹⁴

For some the solution was to surgically remove the afflicted parts by increasingly sub-dividing the city's districts so as to more minutely observe, on a street and house basis, and thus make more manageable the knowledge that is acquired of them for the purposes of control and regulation. The collection, for example, of official statistics on birth, death, marriage, etc. was part of the process whereby the population came to be subject to surveillance, analysis and intervention. Strategies were varied and depended on the group or population (children, adults, parents, workers, patients, criminals, etc.) that was targeted and the specific goals that were aimed at. That is, whether the object of study and concern was a national, local or regional population; a prison or school population; the dangerous classes or the labouring classes as a whole. There was in all this the development of disciplinary social practices devised and practised by medical personnel to scrutinise, police and discipline the urban population, for their own good. Damer (2000) argues that just such practices were actively employed by the municipal housing authorities in Glasgow from the late nineteenth century to the beginning of World War Two. Through surveillance and relentless patrolling, public health officials acted as 'social hygienists' constantly supervising the moral and physical 'cleanliness' of the poor. Damer is unequivocal in his opinion that:

139

The discourse of Public Health was a well-worked out exercise of hegemonic power in the class struggle, or in Foucaultian terms, 'a technology of control', or a 'mechanism of subjection'. It was indeed all about surveillance and control, but surveillance and control in the interests of one class as against another. (Damer, 2000: 18)

BIO-POWER AND SPACE

Foucault's concept of 'bio-power' illustrate how techniques of power were constructed around the medico-administrative necessity of the

government of space and was concerned with the exercise and effect of relations of power on humans, as individuals and as aggregates. That is, how people could be managed, controlled and maintained to enhance their capabilities and capacities for specific purposes. Thus,

When Foucault mentions the problems of populations, health and cities, it is clear that he is referring to our modern form of power, what he calls 'bio-power'... under regimes of 'bio-power' political intervention takes place at the level of the species as a natural population to be known and controlled. This manipulation is exercised through an ever-expanding complex of social institutions, and thereby in a widening number of building types: hospitals, prisons, workplaces, schools, street plans, housing and so forth. (Wright and Rabinow, 1982: 14)

This notion of bio-power reflects an interest in the accumulation of knowledge of individuals and populations that has a specific purpose: to maximise the health (moral and physical) of individuals and populations to ensure their maximum efficiency and productivity, to minimise the negative consequences from the development of new industrial techniques in the economy, and to limit the threat from potentially revolutionary conditions through the surveillance, management and control of individual and communal activities. Thus knowledge of individuals and populations and of the spaces they occupy and inhabit was a crucial element of the application of disciplinary discourses in the development and structuring of modern society.

The first aspect, the 'docile body', has already been alluded to. The medical professions were directly involved in developing new forms of architecture. Architecture was thus one disciplinary discourse in which knowledge of space produced spatial forms that served to concretise power relations. The sanatorium, for example, was an institution by which the beneficial and health-giving properties of fresh air and sunlight could be maximised by the construction of specific designs of buildings for those suffering from the debilitating effects of respiratory diseases such as TB. There was almost inevitably a class element to the form, design and decoration of such buildings.¹⁵

The treatment of working-class patients in gorgeous palaces was not only wasteful, but confusing to the patients, for they would come to regard their cure in some way associated with the facilities and luxuries enjoyed in the institution, and return home feeling that it was impossible to keep well. Thus the architecture should be "of the simplest kind capable of being imitated in all essentials in the average home of the industrial classes"... The likely success of sanatorium treatment (for the working classes) was therefore 'inversely proportional to the magnificence of the buildings and surroundings'. (Kelynack, 'The Tuberculosis Yearbook', 1913-14: 227 in Bryder, 1988: 52)

In other spaces such as the prison, factory, hospital, workhouse and school, the individual movements, gestures and actions of the body were studied and controlled to produce 'better' more efficient and obedient workers, prisoners, students, patients, etc. Thus creating forms of space designed to inculcate and instruct was a fundamental feature of Foucault's thesis of the development of the 'disciplinary society'. However, concern was not only expressed or directed at the physical problems associated with urban living, such as overcrowding, poor sanitation, dirt and disease, but also with the moral impact on the working classes of poor urban environments. Children were a prime target for moral and physical training and one held up as a symbol for a future, more civilised city and society.¹⁵ The principle of bodily discipline as a means of moral training is epitomised by official attitudes that came to prominence in the late nineteenth century of the benefits of structured rational recreation and education. The formation and operation of schools thus became a principle arena for the training, disciplining and inculcation of appropriate bodily practices for the enhancement of children's physical and moral health.¹⁶ The emphasis was to combine the practical instruction and education of institutionalised techniques with the proselytising efforts of religious and charitable institutions in schemes that would improve not only the physical environment of the city, but also the habits, behaviours and morals of future generations. Thus, in schools the emphasis

... must be thoroughly religious, in which the heart may be addressed as well as the head – the kindly feelings brought into play – suitable air and exercise afforded in-doors and out-doors – habits of cleanliness, and obedience cultivated, and not simply kept from the street 'out of harms way', and from corrupting influence, but enabled for several hours-a-day to breathe a moral atmosphere. (Stow, 1833: 17)

The second aspect of bio-power concerns the study, control and manipulation of the 'species body', that is for Foucault, populations as aggregates of individuals. This intervention represented the increasing colonisation by power into more areas and spheres of social life and activity. The expansion of the medical disciplines and their prominent role in managing the nation's health gave them a leading role in attempts to understand and organise industrial labour and industrial society as a whole and thus influence the aims and direction of government policy. As Foucault states:

Urban space has its own dangers: disease, such as the epidemics of cholera in Europe from 1830 to about 1880, and revolution, such as the series of urban

revolts that shook all of Europe during the same period. These spatial problems, which were perhaps not new, took on a new importance... The major problems of space, from the nineteenth century on, were indeed of a different type. Which is not to say that problems of an architectural nature were forgotten. (Foucault, 1982: 17)

Sturdy and Cooter (1998) in an explicitly, if unacknowledged Foucaultian analysis, examine how medicine, both as an institutional organisation and as a profession, was transformed through the expansion of medical disciplines and the invention, dissemination and increasing prominence of scientific procedures, techniques and skills. There was an increasing professionalism in the administration of hospital services, which saw the management of hospitals less philanthropically organised with the importation of new managers from industry and finance to promote the efficient management of hospital resources. This has a certain resonance with the contemporary National Health Service being increasingly run to meet efficiency targets as well as having to meet other 'success' parameters.

However, nineteenth century public health was primarily concerned with administrative discipline and efficiency and as such it was closely linked with the growth of local and national government intervention in the surveillance and management of the health of the populations, as opposed to individuals. A medico-administrative knowledge of national and local populations was constructed through the observation and collection of information and statistics on the population, on areas, households, etc. Dangerous classes and dangerous locations were identified as needing some form of remedial action. New techniques and practices developed and were employed by the growth of institutions and practices to ensure that a fit and healthy working class would be sufficiently able to satisfy the requirements of the nation's armed services as well as the needs of the (industrial) economy. This entailed a number of interventions by the local and national state, and by charitable and voluntary organisations, that sought to understand the population, in order to regulate and control it in the most efficient and beneficial manner.

This aspect of the government of whole populations is a complex task in which issues of national policy and political power are interconnected with individual sexual, reproductive, physical and moral behaviours and attitudes. The role of Medical Officers of Health was especially effective in promoting and achieving a number of important changes in sanitary organisation, disease prevention and treatment. Similarly, they played a vital role in the organisation and provision of a whole host of services that sought to improve the vitality and health of the urban environment

and its populations. The practice and organisation of medicine and the institutions that delivered it became oriented around the goal of creating, managing and maintaining a fit, healthy and efficient industrial population.¹⁷

Foucault's analysis of knowledge, power and space illustrates how disciplinary discourses and techniques were developed, diffused and applied in the context of the origins and expansion of increasingly urbanised and industrialised societies. Foucault is concerned to present the operation of power not merely as intrinsically repressive, negative, prohibitive or universally dominating. Disciplinary techniques could act as a positive force in the creation, shaping or moulding of subjects through the creation, organisation and policing of particular forms of space. What is clear is that the express intention was not to exact punishment for its own sake, but to create a reflective subject who would internalise the knowledge, norms and values of bourgeois society promulgated through education and training to create more useful, orderly and civilised productive individuals and populations. Knowledge of space, and command over it, was a primary and fundamental means by which it was analysed, designed and used for the purposes of maximum functional efficiency to ensure the regulated movement and accumulation of wealth, in the burgeoning urban and industrial economy of nineteenth-century capitalist society. Thus, architecture and design were employed in an attempt to instil a sense of self-discipline, the internalisation of 'normalising values' not only in miscreants and deviants (the criminal, the undeserving poor, the delinquent, etc.), but also in the general population, and in particular the working classes. Similar to Lefebvre's analysis of planning as an ideology Foucault prioritises the development of a medical discourse, as an inherently spatial analysis for the identification of the individual body, and the body of populations as the object of study, illustrates both the power of disciplinary knowledge and its diffusion throughout society. Social discipline became a technique for the control of space and time in all spheres of society through a network of interrelated disciplines. Thus, charities, reform organisations, religious and temperance movements, housing and health organisations, as well as local and national government, were all implicated and active in this movement of disciplinary diffusion. The disciplines and their discourses invaded and colonised the private as well as the public sphere. Attempts were made to control, manage and promote the most effective, that is the most 'beneficial', use of leisure and recreation time and space, as well as that of work, prison, school, etc. Rest, purposeful distraction and exercise, of the mind and body, ensures that the worker and the family unit that maintains and

sustains the reproduction of the next generation of labour, is fit, willing and able to resume their economic and social duties and responsibilities. Foucault's account of disciplinary discourses is an analysis of the power inherent in dominant representations and practices of power/knowledge in and over people in produced forms of space in modern society.

CONCLUSION

Foucault's analysis of the space of the modern era emphasises how particular spaces are produced, designed, constructed, controlled and regulated by disciplinary discourses and technologies of power/knowledge. They have specific functional aims whose general goal was/is the creation and manipulation of docile bodies, whether as individuals or as agglomerations of people, as populations. Foucault's analysis of the development of a modern disciplinary society then is one in which power, knowledge and space are interlinked in the development of physical landscapes and in which architecture is a prominent means to structure relations. Dominant discourses inscribe meanings and values that seek to delimit and delineate the functional and efficient use of space for particular purposes and for identified populations and activities. However, everyday activities, of both individuals and groups, can conflict and contest the values, norms and meanings of this 'lived space' precisely because they are arenas of creative social and cultural interaction. What is deemed as appropriate activities within particular produced spaces, what these spaces mean to different people and groups at different times and how some come to represent ideals of culture and of society, is the result of processes of contestation, conflict and transgression that can undermine the authority of ordered and disciplined space. This dynamic relationship between space as a cultural and material product, between popular meanings and values and elite representations, and between everyday practices and intended uses, reinforces Lefebvre's assertion of the need to consider the lived, imaginative use of space as a fundamental element for knowledge of the role of space in modern capitalist society.

The distinction between what people actually do and the designed intentions of planners or of medical specialists of space reflects the conflict between cultural and political elites, with their dominant ideological and hegemonic influence over the use of public spaces versus vernacular traditions and the popular cultures. Foucault traces the creation and imposition of disciplinary practices and a disciplinary society as embedded in spatial practices in which control and manipulation are

intrinsic to their operation. Thus space, knowledge and power are important for understanding the development of what some have come to call the development of a surveillance society in which new means and methods to monitor and police space is fundamental. Therefore, the permission and restriction given to certain political, social, leisure and recreational practices as well as some social groups over others make space a potentially contested arena where normalising values pursued through the disciplining, ordering and regulation of space against the exuberance of many popular practices and pursuits becomes a new forum for social struggle. Form, structure and function are intimately related in that social (public) spaces represent everyday and universal arenas where the production of space involves relations of power, materially inscribed on the landscape but which is subject to conflicting values, meanings and uses. In this, Foucault provides essential insights of historical and contemporary relevance for the analysis of how space is produced, moulded, shaped, designed, regulated and policed by disciplinary discourses in which representations of space reflect the operation of power in, through and over space and the activities that occur there.

NOTES

1 Matless stresses that:

Power for Foucault is enabling, exercised rather than possessed, relational and immanent, neither institution nor structure nor strength but 'a complex strategical situation' (Foucault, 1981: 92) which is constantly and locally shifting. (Matless, 1992: 46)

2 This aspect of Foucault's analysis, of the importance of space for the critical analysis of social relations and of power is emphasised particularly in human geographical analysis. For example,

relations of power are really, crucially and unavoidably spun out across and through the material spaces of the world. It is within such spaces that assemblages of people, activities, technologies, institutions, ideas and dreams all come together, circulate, convene and reconvene. (Sharp et al., 2000: 24)

3 Driver succinctly makes the point that:

Put simply, *Discipline and Punish* is about the advent of a new 'economy of power'. It is quite unthinkable without some account of the social, economic, and technical development of capitalism. (Driver, 1985: 436)

4 In similar vein, Foucault elsewhere writes of what 'police' meant in other times:

Down to the end of the *ancien regime*, the term 'police' does not simply signify, at least not exclusively, the institution of police in the modern sense; 'police' is the ensemble of mechanisms serving to ensure order, the properly channelled growth of wealth and the conditions of preservation of health 'in general'. (Foucault, 1980: 170)

5 Indeed, Foucault quotes Bentham to highlight the universal applicability of the panopticism:

Morals reformed – health preserved – industry invigorated – instruction diffused – public burthens lightened – Economy seated as it were, upon a rock, – the gordian knot of the Poor-Laws not cut, but untied – all by the simple idea in architecture. (Bentham, 'Works', 1843: 39, in Foucault, 1977: 207)

6 O'Neill presents an interesting account of how Foucault's studies of the disciplinary spaces of the prison, hospital or school complements Weber's analysis of the processes by which bureaucratic techniques for the organisation and administration of society came to be diffused and established throughout society, by presenting an analysis of the rational accounting of the body, subjectivity and behaviour. He writes:

146 It is not far fetched to consider Weber as an archaeologist of the power man exerts over himself, and thus to see him as a precursor of Foucault's conception of the disciplinary society... Modern society makes itself rich, knowledgeable and powerful but at the expense of substantive reason and freedom. (O'Neill, 1986: 43)

7 See also Bale and Philo (1998) for a discussion of the creation of docile bodies.

8 The classical age discovered the body as object and target of power. It is easy enough to find signs of the attention then paid to the body – to the body that is manipulated, shaped, trained, which obeys, responds, becomes skilful and increases its forces (Foucault, 1978: 136).

9 Foucault describes in *Discipline and Punish* how the body in its every act, gesture and movement must make the best, most and efficient use of time:

The act is broken down into its elements; the position of the body, limbs, articulation is defined; to each movement are assigned a direction, an aptitude, a duration; their order of succession is prescribed. Time penetrates the body and with it all the meticulous controls of power... In the correct use of the body, which makes possible a correct use of time, nothing must remain idle or useless; everything must be called upon to form the support of the act required... A disciplined body is the prerequisite of an efficient gesture... The principle that underlay the time-table in its traditional form was essentially negative: it was the principle of non-idleness; it was forbidden to waste time, which was counted by God and paid for by men; the time-table was to eliminate the danger of wasting it – a moral offence and economic dishonesty. Discipline on the other hand, arranges a positive economy; it poses the principle of a theoretically

ever-growing use of time: exhaustion rather than use; it is a question of extracting, from time, ever more available moments and, from each moment, ever more useful forces... In becoming the target of new mechanisms of power, the body is offered up to new forms of knowledge. It is the body of exercise, rather than of speculative physics; a body manipulated by authority, rather than imbued with animal spirits; a body of useful training and not of rational mechanics, but one in which, by virtue of that very fact, a number of natural requirements and functional constraints are beginning to emerge. (Foucault, 1977: 152, 154–5)

10 E. P. Thomson identifies in the mode of production and the relations of production similar attempts at regulating the time and activities of the new urban working class.

all these ways – by the division of labour; the supervision of labour; fines, bells and clocks; money incentives; preaching and schoolings; the suppression of fairs and sports – new labour habits were formed, and a new time discipline was imposed. (Thompson, 1978: 90)

11 In Glasgow, for example, there were a number of medical personnel involved in just such a process of monitoring and surveillance of the rapidly expanding urban population: Dr Cleland in the early nineteenth century and the evangelical J. B. Russell, Medical Officer of Health for the city, in the latter decades who built upon his work. See Chalmers (1930), Cleland (1836), Russell (1886, 1895, 1905).

12 As Rose puts it:

medical thought and medical activity, through the rationalities that unified the inhabitants of geographical space as a social body, through the compilation of statistics of birth, death, rates and types of morbidity, through the charting of social and moral topographies of bodies and their relations with one another, played a key role in 'making-up' the social body and in locating individuals in relation to this dense field of relations bearing upon the individual body. Medicine, that is to say, has played a formative role in the *invention of the social*. Medicine was to engage itself with one of the most fundamental sets of questions that troubled and provoked governmental thought during the nineteenth century and which inspired the invention of the basic administrative knowledge and techniques of modernity. This set of questions concerned the regulation of life in towns. Over the first half of the nineteenth century, the role of the medical police was to problematise the life of populations in towns in terms of health, and to devise a whole variety of schemes for its improvement. The diversity of tactics adopted ranged from grand schemes of architectural renewal of public space in the name of health and civility to a host of more mundane projects of social hygiene, sanitary reform and sewage arrangements, pure air and pure water, paving of streets and controls on the burial of the dead. (Rose, 1994: 55–6)

13 Poovey and Driver credit J. P. Kay with a pioneering role in this development in Britain. *The Moral and Physical Condition of the Working Classes* was a detailed investigation of urban space that combined eyewitness reports and statistical tables to represent strategies for understanding the urban population and for suggesting

remedies. Kay's analysis of the social body emphasised the significance of the 'good' parts rather than focusing explicitly on the diseased areas – those aggregations of the poor and impoverished who were already spatialised.

The dense masses of the habitations of the poor, which streets and their arms, as though to grasp and enclose the dwellings of the noble and wealthy, in the metropolis, and in our huge provincial cities, have heretofore been regarded as mighty wilderness of building in which the incurable ills of society rankled, beyond the reach of sanative interference. (Kay, 1832/1969: 11)

14 This is a point that Kay makes explicit:

There is ... a licentiousness capable of corrupting the whole body of society, like an insidious disease, which eludes observation, yet is equally fatal in its effects. Criminal acts may be statistically classed – the victims of the law may be enumerated – but the number of those affected with the moral leprosy of vice cannot be exhibited with mathematical precision. ... The social body cannot be constructed like a machine, on abstract principles which merely include physical motions, and their numerical results in the production of wealth. The mutual relations of men is not merely dynamical, nor can the composition of their forces be subjected to a purely mathematical calculation. Political economy, though its object is to ascertain the means of increasing the wealth of nations, cannot accomplish its design, without at the same time regarding their happiness, and as its largest ingredient the cultivation of religion and morality. (Kay, 1832/1969: 62, 63–4)

15 Maver details how children became the subject of not only the local states operatives and institutions, but also religious reformers and charitable organisations:

Children became polemical devices in the crusade to create a purer environment, because they could represent such a potential metaphor for urban deprivation. ... While urbanisation and industrialisation drastically cut across the integrity of this idealised and intrinsically rural society, evangelical Presbyterianism was wholly positive in the conviction that it could be restored, and that the most unsavoury city centres could be rendered wholesome and healthy. The quest for purity thus took on a deeper meaning, because it represented the spiritual as well as the physical cleansing process that was deemed so vital for reversing the vitiating tendencies of urban life. (Maver, 1997: 802–3)

16 Driver also demonstrates how children were the focus of techniques and practices that led them to be isolated and removed from the spaces and institutions that were identified as having negative effects. Indeed, what is emphasised is the strict control and regulation of children's bodies in space to provide education and instruction only in what were considered positively beneficial actions and behaviours:

It was the disciplines themselves, the techniques for division rather than association and contagion. Children were a prime target for training. They were to be rescued not only from the city streets, those crucibles of crime and

pauperism, but also from other 'inappropriate' institutions, such as prisons and workhouses, where they could inevitably be in contact with adults and irredeemably 'immoral' elements. Registers of conduct, systems of rewards, careful allocation of times and spaces would accomplish all that forceful confinement could, and more. The ultimate aim was self-control and self-regulation. (Driver, 1985: 434)

17 Indeed, this aim was explicitly made in 1921 in a report by the Industrial Fatigue Research Board commenting that "the word 'efficiency' is not to be interpreted as equivalent merely to productive efficiency, but as the physiological quality that results from favourable conditions of work. The word is in fact almost equivalent to 'fitness'" ('Industrial Fatigue Research Board', Annual Report, II, 1921, p. 17, cited in Sturdy and Cooter, 1998: 448).

six

legacies and prospects: spatialising contemporary modernity

The book aims to demonstrate the importance of understanding space for the analysis of the development of modern (particularly urban) social formations, practices and experience. A detailed exegesis of a number of social theories of space has been presented to demonstrate that space needs to be taken seriously as a fundamental element for understanding social reality. That is, to consider how space is perceived, conceived, represented and ultimately used and experienced is of necessity a crucial concern for sociology as well as other social sciences. Space is a determining factor in the framing of social relations and is also reciprocally interconnected in the making of space by those very social interactions that occur in space. There is then a necessity to consider the spatial dimension in the investigation of social relations, of institutions, of how power operates in and through space and how it is challenged through conflict and contestation in and over how space is or should be used, and how differences and divisions are expressed and experienced in and through space.

The implicit spatiality of Marx's critique of capitalism provided the initial foundations (in this as it could be said of all social theory) for the later development of other more explicit attempts at theorising space. Marx's influence on social theory in general and on the development of spatial analysis is I hope obvious and continues to be an inspiration to those social theorists concerned with spatialising capital in an era of global (uneven) development. Whilst it has been argued that Marx did not explicitly theorise space in his voluminous critique of capitalism, there contains within it a recognition of the importance of space for understanding social relations under capitalism in general but also specific aspects of the experience and structuring of labour, of production and reproduction, of circulation and of the expansion of capitalism on a global scale. In this, Marx's influence can clearly be seen in the seminal theory of space produced by Henri Lefebvre and David Harvey's emphasis on creating a historico-geographical materialism. Both emphasise in

different ways the need to take space seriously as a factor and condition in the development, perpetuation and survival of capitalism.

Georg Simmel's inclusion as a significant and early sociological analysis of space and indeed much of Simmel's work contains within it a keen awareness of the inter-relationship between forms of sociation and the spatiality that is expressed within and through those 'webs of interaction' that constitute, for Simmel, society. Simmel provides a number of considered distinctions and categorisation of key 'aspects of space' that are to be found within later social theories and analyses. In this we can point to that of mobility (global flows and migrations), boundedness (nation states, new urban formations such as walled enclaves), fixity, proximity and distance (integration, segregation, access to services, employment, etc.) as areas in which Simmel was a sociological pioneer of space, despite his contribution being until recently relatively ignored.

Lefebvre's influence on spatial theory cannot be underestimated. It has galvanised not only human and cultural geographers in applying a spatial dialectical materialism to the analysis of the relationships between human beings and each other in socially constructed space but also a re-evaluation of our relationship with nature. Lefebvre's contribution to a number of key areas includes not only that of the urban where he may be said to have broadened Marx's concept of production to include spatial production and the role of the state in the production and perpetuation of the historical development and relations of capitalist space. His analysis of the rhythms, times and places of everyday life, of the routines and alienation inherent in the socially produced spaces of leisure and recreation, domestic life as well as those of work and the urban have also been influential for developing research on gendered space and on the spatialising of sexual and ethnic identities. Lefebvre's contribution to spatial analysis is significant not only because it provides a basis for the reinvigoration and reprioritisation of space but also because of his insistence that perceptions, conceptions, representations and uses of space are fundamental for understanding how each society in each epoch is organised, structured and depicted. For Lefebvre, the urban was *the* spatial form of modern capitalism. His analysis and prioritisation of modern capitalism and of space continues to provide inspiration for the development of empirical, substantive and theoretical work on the experience as well as the constitution of an increasingly globalising urban world.

Both Lefebvre and Harvey have in themselves become seminal influences in the reprioritisation of space as fundamental for the analysis of the perpetuation or survival of capitalism. Whilst it might be said that Harvey owes a certain debt to Lefebvre's original analysis of space, he