for José and Renate
Affectionately

CENTER FOR URBANISTIK OG ARKITEKTUR

Michel Foucault: Negotiating Colonial Spaces

GWENDOLYN WRIGHT

ARBEJDSPAPIR 29

ARBEJDSPAPIR. **Center for Urbanitet og Æstetik**
(WORKING PAPERS)

The Working Papers give a presentation of the ongoing research at the center through a series of informal publications of manuscripts written by participants in the research project and visiting professors. The publications include chapters from works in progress, conference papers, newspaper articles, translations, introductions to visiting professors etc.
The Working Papers are free of charge but printed in a limited number.

Editior: Martin Zerlang

ISSN 0909-8437 Copenhagen, October 1998

Research Papers and informations on activities, other publications ect. of the Research Programme of Urbanity and Aesthetics can be obtained from either:

Secretary Nanna Bruun
phone: +45 3532 8230
e-mail: nanna@coco.ihi.ku.dk

or

Director, Associate Professor Martin Zerlang
phone: +45 3532 8208
e-mail: zerlang@coco.ihi.ku.dk

Fax: +45 3296 3092

CENTER FOR URBANITY & AESTHETICS
Dept. of Comparative Literature
University of Copenhagen
80 Njalsgade
DK – 2300 Copenhagen S.

Michel Foucault: Negotiating Colonial Spaces

GWENDOLYN WRIGHT*

Michel Foucault alluded several times to his "spatial obsessions."[1] While his work certainly cannot be explained or deconstructed as an analysis through spaces as well as words, the recurring spatial themes do suggest possibilities for situating his own abstract thought. In their precise specificity analogies such as displacement, field, or the panopticon provide a framework for understanding such elusive, almost metaphysical Foucaultian concepts as the eye of power, the scopic regime, or normalization.

Whether as strategic descriptions or as historical situations these terms take us off the page, so to speak, into the complex realm of experience and sensations where space is apprehended, not as an abstraction, but as something multivalent, flexible and contentious. As Foucault emphasized so eloquently:

---

* Gwendolyn Wright was trained in both architecture and history, and obtained her Ph.D. from the University of California, Berkeley. She is currently professor of architecture and history at Columbia University in New York City. Informed by critical cultural theory, professor Wright's articulation of architectural and historical research resulted in numerous essays and a series of important books. Among the latter should be mentioned *Moralism and the Model Home: Domestic Architecture and Cultural Conflict in Chicago 1873-1913* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980) and *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America* (New York: Pantheon, 1981). In her book *The Politics of Design in French Colonial Urbanism* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991) Gwendolyn Wright addresses the particular issue of colonial space which reappears in the title of the present text "Michel Foucault: Negotiating Colonial Spaces". This essay provides an interpretation of Michel Foucault's seminal reflections "Of Other Spaces" ("Des espaces autres"). It was originally presented by Gwendolyn Wright as the keynote lecture of the conference "French Philosophy and the City in the Humanities II—On Michel Foucault: «Of Other Spaces»", organized by Henrik Reeh and Frederik Tygstrup of the Center for Urbanity & Aesthetics, and held at the University of Copenhagen on May 1, 1997. *Henrik Reeh.*

> We do not live inside a void that could be colored with diverse shades of light, we live inside a set of relations that delineates sites which are irreducible to one another and absolutely not superimposable on one another.[2]

This is by no means to say that Foucault abandoned theorizing in favour of lived experience, only that he continuously sought to place or locate abstract thought. Indeed, his spatial conceptions encompassed far more than mapped and visible sites. Foucault also explored the *emplacement* of ephemeral or neglected intellectual realms. His textual space included that of minor documents; his 'Europe' dared to focus on outcasts usually dismissed by scholars and society alike as 'other' or dangerous.

Like all obsessions, Foucault's was at once tyrannical and pleasurable; both strange and familiar. It cannot take us to the core of his thought, not even to that of the outcasts for whom he sought to speak. Of course no obsession can be resolved; one keeps returning to what is both the same and always different, what can never be captured, despite a desire to possess it fully.

All the same, each incident does convey certain kinds of satisfaction, even if none of them can make everything 'fit into place.' The essay "Des espaces autres" offers a compelling locus for the exploration of the disciplinary space of the humanities and the experiential space of the city. These two parallel paths ought to intersect, crossing each other again and again in the intellectual space of books and universities. Unfortunately most academics tend to keep them quite separate—not least in the disciplines that purport to study cities. On the one hand are the piercing insights of theory, which risk becoming dry and abstract models that bracket out the texture of human experience. On the other hand can be found the immediate realities of daily life—which can easily dissolve into ephemera or tedious and unreflexive routines. One must continually negotiate back and forth between these two realms.

If we turn to Foucault as a guide, he (like any guide) does not simply determine a path and point out significant landmarks along the way. He also steers us away from other routes: away from what is familiar to us, but also away from the places he will keep to himself, places he is not (or not yet) ready to bring

into the public eye. The guide himself thus becomes a subject of investigation, not only a means to a destination. Those who go with him must inevitably try to discern his history and the point-of-view of his narrative.

So what might one learn about Michel Foucault in this little essay? A short, seemingly straightforward, almost casual piece, it was written for a public lecture to a group of architects in March 1967—a year before 'soixante-huit' and Foucault's return to France as chair of philosophy in the new experimental university at Vincennes. At many levels the article stands outside the familiar map of European intellectual terrain, even peripheral to the well-charted cartography of Foucault studies.

First, it took shape outside the hexagon of France, during Foucault's two-year stay in Tunesia. He was teaching, of course, at the University of Tunis.[3] But his life responded to more than transportable texts; it engaged another place, another way of life. This is not to absolve Foucault of his geographical and cultural borders in France, but rather to emphasize his own efforts, inevitably partial and self-serving, to reach beyond those boundaries.

The dislocation of distant travel not only highlights new perceptions; it also casts light on uncanny recognitions of things we 'knew' but hadn't fully realized. The space of distance takes one into unfamiliar territory: unknown cultural domains and strange geographies in which human practices are at once the same and altogether different. It 'brings home' the recognition that this difference is not entirely other or foreign.[4]

Such recognitions would certainly have included the complex, ongoing realities of French colonialism. Tunesia had only gained its independence in 1956 (two years into France's long Algerian War). Of course, Foucault understood power as a force that cannot simply be imposed or withdrawn. His own opportunity to teach in North Africa (funded by the French government) affirmed ongoing postcolonial ties in the Francophone world. He was repoliticized by the Tunesian student strike against Bourguiba's statist regime which began soon after his arrival and the pro-Palestinian demonstrations following Israel's victory in June 1967—though he deplored the accompanying anti-semitic violence.

To speak of Foucault as an individual also brings forward his homosexuality: another outsider status. With this comes his personal delight in exotic surprises and sensual pleasures, including transgressions and dangers. Tunesia provided him, as so many other westerners, with a site of both intense personal sensations and libidinal fantasies about the liberation of mind and body. It would be naively rational to ignore this aspect of Foucault's experience abroad. If Orientalism is certainly a projection, it nonetheless reveals a great deal about the observer's own desires and constraints. (Nor should one dismiss the entire scope of 'Orientalist' interest and knowledge, just because of its biased position.)

At the level of temporal and textual space in Foucault, one should also consider the fact that this piece remained unpublished for so long. It appeared in print only shortly before his death in 1984, and even then appearing in a minor Parisian architectural journal (*Architecture, mouvement, continuité*), far removed from the usual terrain of intellectual discussion.

However Foucault's radio talk of 1966, "Les utopies réelles: lieux et autres lieux," should prevent any facile argument about suppression (whether from legitimate regret or ambivalent confusion). He kept grappling with topics of space, and especially colonial space, until the end of his life. Clearly these themes continued to intrigue him, even if he had not yet formulated what he considered an adequate interpretation. The decision not to write about them does not mean that he considered them unimportant. Ann Stoler's recent book, *Race and the Education of Desire*, takes this one major step further, documenting Foucault's longterm, ultimately unrealized efforts to take on the problem of race: where the discourse and practices of science and pseudo-science, dividing practices and normalization, institutions and bodies, all come together.[5]

Of course 1967 represents a specific historical moment, both individually and culturally. Epistemologically it stands at the threshold between Foucault's archaeology and genealogy, his two conceptions of history. It bridges his early fascination with language and his emerging focus on practices (both discursive and nondiscursive—what he would soon call power/knowledge). No epistemic break has occurred; the shift had already appeared

between the lines of *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1969), with its ambivalent recognition of the limits of abstract structuralist theories about linguistic nominalism.

Intellectually "Des espaces autres" occupies the site where Foucault situates space: moving it from a purely mental domain of metaphors to "real spaces": spaces occupied by bodies, occupied differently according to time, place, group (e.g., race or sexuality or class), and other variables. Space becomes the place of historicized human experience: of pain and pleasure, tedium and experimentation, discipline and resistance.[6]

"Space itself has a history in Western experience," Foucault declared. He went on to suggest a carefully calibrated model, along with an assortment of examples that both situate and disrupt the model's abstract premises: hotels and rooms for passers-by, vacation villages and brothels, cemeteries and gardens, museums and fairgrounds. Unlike the famous Borgesian list from "a certain Chinese encyclopedia," this compendium of places does not seem arbitrary or fantastical. The almost breathless profusion instead evokes the complexity of human experience.

This is not to suggest some key to what Foucault 'really' thought. His kaleidoscopic mind juxtaposed fragments and insights, examples and ideas, in constantly exciting and original ways. There is no deeper theory or method secretly being deployed throughout his writing. The quintessential *bricoleur*, Foucault viewed himself as "more of an 'experimenter' than a theorist," and his books as a "network of scaffolding" that allowed freedom of movement.[7] A person like us all, he continued to work through themes and ideas. He returned to some topics, often seeing them in new ways, and dropped others that he characterized as only marginal successes.

Even the very word 'heterotopia' changed its meaning in the course of his work. The term originally comes from the study of anatomy, used to refer to parts of the body that were either 'out of place,' extra, or (like tumors) alien and potentially malignant. Foucault first extended this concept to explore 'places' of otherness and contrast, places whose existence pose unsettling alternatives to ordinary sites of everyday life.

At this early stage, heterotopias remained a singular

condition, an abstract type of space without site, places that were, as he put it, "impossible to think."[8] In *Les mots et les choses* heterotopias do not exist "in the order of things," but more actively, "in the ordering" of things: in alternative genres like those of Surrealist painters—anticipating those of 18th century Parisian street gangs, prisoners at Attica or Iranian revolutionaries.

However marginal and ephemeral an alternative or outlaw structure in turn facilitates the possibility of new experiences, even new systems, beyond the expectations and intentions of those who might envision them. Both the act of ordering and the possible new orders demand spatial conceptualizations—a process that becomes increasingly specific and diverse, on the one hand, but also explores new spatial techniques for mapping and thinking, on the other. What had been centers become peripheries; margins become hubs; and the meaning of both is blurred. Foucault implies a transgressive terrain of ambiguous boundaries where rules break down and authority is unclear, but his is not an unimaginable vision. The border town was, after all, associated with physical disorder, sexual license, illicit activities, marginal people—all of which fascinated Foucault at this stage in his life. Here both life and scholarship involve a continuous process of creative translation (including the unsettling hybridity of creole languages). This process is spatial as well as linguistic, for everyone must always be ready to shift position, to negotiate between different worlds. ('Border Studies' has recently emerged as a new field in the American humanities, especially prevalent among those who study Latino cultures.)

"Des espaces autres" itself provides a junction, a crossroads, if not a border town per se. This happened in part because the lecture addressed an audience of architects: that is, a different space of reception.

Like so many of us, Foucault was fascinated and frustrated by this discipline. He admired architects' ability to imagine transformations. But he found little to praise in their *savoir*, their system of thought. At this moment in time European architecture, like so many other disciplines, was strongly influenced by the elegance of structuralism and the mechanistic

notion of the 'milieu'—a term borrowed from geography and the social sciences to describe a hyper-orderly system of space and society in which everything fit together neatly; whatever didn't fit could be bracketed out as extraneous or epiphenomenal.

Moreover most architects limited themselves to matters of 'pure form,' ignoring "the three great variables—territory, communication, and speed," left to engineers, surveyors, and bureaucrats.[9] Equally foolishly, they believed too much in the power of representation, whether they sought to represent modernist progress or history's purported order and continuity. Foucault would surely have been amused by today's fashion for a 'deconstructivist' architecture based on representing transgression, destabilization and defamiliarization. All such concepts merely aestheticize difference and commodify social change.

What happens then if one gives serious attention to the themes (and I emphasize the plural) of spatialization that recur in Foucault's oeuvre, reappearing and changing like a chameleon? Despite some contentions this would not privilege architecture as a master discourse, not even as a fundamental strategy for power or resistance. At best it might link space to his notion of problematizing, i.e., "displacing the question" rather than trying to answer dialectically. The nature of Foucault's spatial analogies remains elusive, perhaps intentionally so. Nor can they truly be called urban, for he tended more toward geographical images of exploration and strategy, rather than metropolitan images of fleeting experience and continuous alteration. The cerebral process of visualization seems almost as important as the space itself. (Indeed, Foucault emphasized the spatial role of various types of maps and other illustrations in the constitution of any *savoir*.)

His "spatial obsessions" do provide alternatives to the more familiar metaphors and models of explanation in late-20th-century intellectual life. Vivid metaphors ("the polyhedron of intelligibility," "canalization," "field," "territory," "archipelago," "position") catch the reader's attention even as they describe essential interrelations. Foucault did not seek to present even his most potent spatial examples—notably of course the panopticon—as the essence or archetype of power,

but rather as techniques for exercising power and understanding it: "to capture the process by which knowledge functions as a form of power and disseminates the effects of power."[10]

Again and again Foucault insisted that there can never be an inherently repressive or liberating space. The meaning of space (of any particular space and of the phenomenon in general) only comes to light in its use, in practice. As with language, power is exercised here, but it can never be incarnate. To announce that one has 'socialism' or 'queer space' cannot guarantee these freedoms—as Foucault made clear in his relations with Mitterrand's government. There cannot be an inherently 'disciplinary space,' nor any setting that embodies redemption, liberation or revolutionary transformation. Such meanings only exist in the ongoing course of practice, of space being used.

Spaces thus function as a "grid": sequences of possible intersections where interrelations are always social—and thus always open to change. No underlying essence is more true than actual, day-to-day practices carried out in space. This process prevents any inherent meaning, good or bad, in a place or a concept. Foucault contended that "power is neither given, nor exchanged, nor recovered, but rather exercised, and that it only exists in action."[11] All the same both spaces and discourse do impose certain limitations; their meanings and possibilities are not arbitrary in some postmodern sense. He acquiesced that while a concentration camp "is not an instrument of liberation, ... there always remain the possibilities of resistance."[12] The recent growth of a tourist industry around German and Polish Nazi camps seems to affirm his original point far more sardonically.

As displacing devices, Foucault's spatial images can also cast a new light on his own notoriously difficult systems of thought. Many readers have been confused by statements about "the construction of the self" or "the death of the author," seeing in them a kind of excessive rhetoric or even bad faith. By shifting one's focus, the strategy becomes somewhat clearer. We can understand that no space possesses an essential quality, regardless of time or use. Real places always exist in the plural, within the parameters of time and geography; they vary and change. By extension it becomes easier to acknowledge that

there is no essential author beyond historical specificities: no Nietzsche, Marx or Foucault whose life and writings all fit into a perfectly cohesive, totalizing system.[13]

****

And so, what spaces and spatial techniques does this short essay map out? It begins with a typical Foucaultian challenge: the contention that "contemporary space is perhaps still not entirely desanctified." Criticizing rationalist pretensions is, of course, to doubt his own structuralist credo. And he does so, using the ideas of Gaston Bachelard to question certain binary oppositions that seem inviolable, natural or divinely given: those between public and private space, family and social space, cultural and useful space, spaces for work and others for leisure.

Foucault then disputes the notion of utopias as a privileged intellectual domain, pure spaces of the intellect, unfettered by the intrusions of everyday life. By contrast he emphasizes the power of real spaces and, in doing so, turns to a different word, "heterotopias." He *returns* to the word, of course, but he has changed and so, too, has his subject. He now insists that heterotopias must exist in reality. They are situated in a specific time and space, rather than vague generalities about the human condition. Only as such can they represent, contest, and occasionally invert the culture of that reality.

All the same Foucault cannot resist abstraction, at least not in 1967: he put forth a "systematic description" of "heterotopology," clearly drawn to the "dream" (he would later acquiesce) of such a science.[14] Although his text outlines six principles, the system begins to dissolve into itself by the end, erasing any outline of a theory of practice that had been drawn in the sand.

Heterotopias exist in all cultures yet take varied forms in each. They also fit conveniently into two types. "Crisis heterotopias" provide a magical space outside the routines of daily life: sacred sites, forbidden sanctuaries, secret places for lovers' trysts or clandestine assignations. In contrast the more problematic and increasingly prevalent "heterotopias of

deviation" are imposed upon individuals whose behavior (or whose very existence) challenges the 'reasonable ideas' of the dominant authorities. Such people include criminals, the elderly, the poor, even the dead.

Foucault also considers formal typologies, explaining that heterotopias can exist at seemingly incompatible sites or scales. The text moves through an array of quite dissimilar subjects, from cinema and theatre to gardens and zoos, then down to the micro-scale of carpets. Each could be a microcosm of the world, converting the constraints of time and space into a magical realm of perfection. One might well add that each example can serve other more quotidian purposes; Foucault often seemed excessively cerebral in his analyses of everyday life and human experience.

The text also considers interrelations with time (or "heterochronies," he says, "for the sake of symmetry," as if acknowledging that the elegance of his prose sometimes derives from a certain "pleasure of the text"). Heterotopias respond to history, such that their location or *emplacement* and their very meaning in a society change over the course of time, sometimes gradually if other times in more abrupt or disjunctive ways. Once again he puts forward an elegant binary system (even to the use of different prepositions). "Spaces of the mind" (such as museums and libraries) seek to accumulate time in order to control its effects, while "spaces for the body" (examples include fairgrounds, festivals, and vacation villages) celebrate the fleeting suspension of time.

In various ways Foucault upturns the absolute system he felt drawn to establish, reminding himself and us of fluidity, permeability, and change—though never the Enlightenment illusion of inevitable improvement. For instance, heterotopias always presuppose a system of "opening and closing," which allows them to be at once isolated and penetrable. The text delineates various processes for crossing thresholds and viewing over boundary walls—without suggesting that such acts be hailed as resistance to power.

Yet we are not being given some discontinuous postmodern theory of space. Heterotopias always affect (and are affected by) what seems to exist outside their immediate purview. Either

they create a space of illusion that exposes the fictive quality of seemingly 'real spaces'; or, on the contrary, they create a real space whose seeming perfection and meticulous order reveals the imprecise, ambiguous, disorderly nature of ordinary cities and landscapes.

Thus heterotopias cannot be isolated from either 'reality' or 'intellectual life.' Each domain must constantly challenge the other. Foucault questions the systematization of any theoretical model and terminology: the intellectual should purposefully pursue ideas, yet always remain wary about the illusion that a theory fully explains life. Both theory and life must "diagnostically" expose the limits and the fictions of the other.

At the end of the essay, almost as an afterthought, Foucault brings up the example of the colonies, along with the equally intriguing example of brothels. Perhaps the allure of both called forth a certain discretion: as if to constrain these seductive fantasies he turns to a rather mechanistic image, transportation—obviously another way of evoking space by imagining movement through it. The ship ("the heterotopia par excellence") joins his earlier fascination with the train. Both images represent exciting, yet potentially disruptive opportunities in modern life; they also emphasize the interconnection between economic development and the imagination.

* * *

Several times Foucault would bring the ship to port in colonial cities: their wide boulevards lined with uniform modern buildings equipped with the latest technologies behind allées of trees, the ensemble celebrating the distinctive ornamental pleasures of the exotic location.[15] One cannot but notice that he spoke only of colonized space: that which had been disciplined and ordered, divided and allocated—and also infused with delight. He has little to say about the 'darker' spaces of the colonized themselves. This emphasis accentuates Foucault's displacement of usual arguments about reform. Intellectuals on the left typically speak of colonial space in terms of the visible evidence of exploitation, denigration, and control. Never one to downplay the evidence of power, Foucault also

acknowledged the allure of the exotic. To do so situates colonial space squarely within the realm of daily life in the west.

Intellectuals who criticize class or colonial oppression seldom acknowledge that their personal pleasures, like their class comforts, cannot remain artificially apart from their critiques, as if in two different systems of thought. After all the mass appeal of heterotopian vacation villages like Club Med is not so far from those of an elite alternative tourism in 'authentic places' all around the Mediterranean (including the Tunesian village of Sidi Bou Saïd, a favored spot for French artists and intellectuals since the 1950s, where Foucault resided). Both systems rely on highly codified fantasies of bodies in space: the rediscovery of one's 'primitive self' and a supposed liberation from work, time, and social mores. In order to be 'freed' these desires have to be made visible, codified, and coordinated.

Foucault neither chastized nor celebrated such desires. Anticipating recent postcolonial arguments he realized that western bourgeois norms (and 'alternatives,' too) needed an eroticized, exoticized counterpart in Orientalism. One shouldn't treat this space of desire as irrational or faraway: something to resist, to suppress—or to embrace as the authentic self.

Such observations of course apply to Foucault's various projects about colonizing bodies, minds, and spaces—whether 'Victorian' or contemporary, western or 'non-western.' Power, even the 'benign' power of reform, cannot simply be exercised along one vector, by one group over another. Like bourgeois housing reform or public health, colonial space sought to discipline the European middle class, at least as much as it sought to impose social control over colonized or working-class people. Nor is it an accident that so many plans and schemes remain on paper, unrealized, unimplemented. Housing reform policies resemble colonial (or today's 'Third World') urban reforms: their purpose lies, in large part, simply in being conceptualized and disseminated as expressions of what ought to be.

What then is illuminated by asking about colonial space as another prism through which to look at the complex world of Foucault's subjects, systems, and the experiences he sought to understand? First, the power of language or disciplinary spatial practices cannot be separated from that of the spatial economy.

In colonial settings land is at the heart of space: extracting wealth from the land with cheap labor; buying land, then classifying its ownership and use; the potential value of land becomes the basis for decision-making.

Colonial spaces also emphasize shifts in perspective, first over time and space, then from the subjectivity of one person or group to that of another. Even perspective can be called into question, with its notion of the observer's privileged position; there is no one correct view—not even Foucault's own.

This in turn accentuates the importance of history as a strategy that moves between diverse situations. By this I mean not only "the history of the present," but also Foucault's recognition that historical space and modernized space necessarily coexist, just as metropole and colony form a single analytic field. Colonial space simply makes these interrelations more visible. Alongside modernizing projects (highways, public health, industrial production, and the like) were "spaces of the mind": museums, crafts shops, historic districts, and Potemkin villages of 'local' governmental buildings. In Foucaultian language these images "enframed" the indigenous landscape, focusing on certain details, both appealing and bizarre, bracketing others that didn't fit the appropriate picture.

Colonial space thus came to be a stage set, an alluring evocation: more pure, and hence more intensely representative of both modern global culture and local historicized culture, more than any ordinary reality could be. At the same time foreigners had to feel secure in the midst of this activity. They needed what Timothy Mitchell, drawing from Foucault, calls a "point-of-view," a place from which they could be immersed in the drama, while standing safely outside it.[16] Colonial space politicizes the diversity of sites and strategies that might be used to this effect, stressing relationships of power—but again with Foucault, refusing illusions of an absolute, unchanging system.

This leads to questions of agency and types of knowledge. Who makes decisions? Who enforces them? How do experts claim they can 'know' another culture? Do people necessarily respond as they are supposed to do? If the institutional architecture of colonialism suggests an artificial balance between western improvements and local traditions, one should

not therefore assume that it wins the locals' hearts and minds. In fact, resistance often entails the illegal, subversive reappropriation of such spaces, whether through destroying them, reclaiming them for new uses, or simply demonstrating (as with the bodies at Tiananmin Square) the actuality of real people coming together in a space, as apart from an idealization of 'the people'.

Of course, colonial space also separates populations, as well as their environments. It highlights the nature of Foucault's "dividing practices" as modes of manipulation that combine the mediation of science or pseudo-science with practices of exclusion. Various kinds of tactics might be applied: spatial barriers, social enclaves, and conceptual categories.

Spatial boundaries (though tightly drawn and sometimes dangerously patrolled) must also be permeable, pliant, even fluid. A continuous process subtly alters the initial static mapping. Lines of demarcation shift, whether under official auspices or in response to informal use, in reaction to multiple forces of differentiation rather than a single dividing system like race or income. This complex and necessarily flexible classification of bodies and activities only comes to light if one looks beyond bureaucratic or academic spatial systematizations.

Cities, especially colonial cities, can be neither totally segregated nor, it seems, completely open and integrated. People move back and forth in colonial space—which is not to dispute the reality of divisions, only to emphasize that the lived experience of urban space is inevitably ambiguous, creolized, occasionally even transformative. This is especially true at border areas—defining these not as lines on a map, but as sites of multiple possibilities, as heterotopias.

Métissage is thus closely linked to heterotopia: while the term can signify crude, pseudo-scientific racial categories, it also exposes the fact that such categories break down. Recent fascination with the term *métissage* in many humanistic disciplines celebrates difference, unlike earlier liberal efforts to deny its existence. Foucault would nonetheless caution that academic tropes of liberation through the radical appropriation of such words might resemble architectural evocations of modern progress or neo-traditional community. No such act can

assure tolerance or transformation. In fact it may all too easily impede the exercise of liberty by substituting a likeness—making it look as if "positive effects" have taken place.[17]

***

In closing, I could simply say that we should all take a vacation somewhere 'exotic' to think about our pleasures and our prejudices. That isn't such a bad idea. Yet even without this incentive it might be possible to look at the intellectual and cultural constructions of the humanities from 'outside,' to shift away from the privileged stance of identities such as intellectuals, architects or westerners. "Des espaces autres" does not provide a model so much as it suggests a method or a mechanism to be used in different ways, according to the circumstances.

Foucault's spatial constructs, especially those of colonial space, encourage a critical recognition of hegemonic or disciplinary practices that operate spatially. They also do something equally radical: avowing the heterotopian spaces of imagination, inversion, and covert histories. This domain does not lie outside politics; rather it forces politics to engage emotional issues, including those of exotic and even dangerous pleasures.

Thus colonial space does not *embody* repression—the heterotopias of deviation—despite the clarity with which one sees such power imposed. It also allows access to secret spaces and unconventional creolized domains where it becomes possible to draw from hidden, unforeseen, irregular or hybrid possibilities, within ourselves and outside the bounds of our conventions.

NOTES

1. Michel Foucault, "Questions on Geography" ("Questions à Michel Foucault sur la géographie," in *Hérodote* 1 [1976]), reprinted in Colin Gordon, ed., *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings, 1972-1977, by Michel Foucault* (New York: Pantheon, 1980), p. 69.

2. Michel Foucault, "Des espaces autres," *Architecture, mouvement, continuité* (October 1984), rep. *Dits et écrits, 1954-1988*, v. 4, *1980-1988* (Paris: Gallimard, 1994), p. 753, Eng. tr. by Jay Miskowiec, "Of Other Spaces," *Diacritics* 16 (Spring 1986), p. 23.

3. This accentuated the earlier long-distance commuting as a 'turbo-prof' between Clermand-Ferrand and Paris, as well as his long stints in Germany and Sweden.

4. Foucault suggested that Tunesia "gave my myopic gaze a sense of distance, and may have allowed me to re-establish a better perspective on things" (Gérard Feilous, "Michel Foucault: la philosophie 'structuraliste' permet de diagnostiquer ce qu'est aujourd'hui," *La Presse de Tunis*, 12 April 1967, p. 3, cited in David Macey, *The Lives of Michel Foucault* [London: Hutchinson, 1993], p. 185).

5. Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995).

6. On the ongoing evolution of the word see Georges Teyssot, "Heterotopias and the History of Spaces," *A+U* (October 1980): 90-100, and Mary McLeod, "'Everyday' and Other Spaces," in *Architecture and Feminism*, ed. Debra Coleman, Elizabeth Danze and Carol Henderson (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996), pp. 1-34.

7. Response to the Italian journalist, Duccio Trombadori, who asked Foucault about the relationship between his earlier work and his then recently published volume 1 of *The History of Sexuality*, in Michel Foucault, *Remarks on Marx* (New York: Semiotext(e), 1991), pp. 27, 29, cited in Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire*, p. ix.

8. Michel Foucault, preface to *Les mots et les choses: une archéologie des sciences humaines* (Paris: Gallimard, 1966), p. 7, tr. as *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of Human Sciences* (New York: Vintage Books, 1970), p. xv. He is speaking of course about the "exotic charm" of Borges's taxonomy.

9. Michel Foucault interview with Paul Rabinow, "Space, Knowledge, and Power," originally published in *Skyline* (March 1982), repub. in Paul Rabinow, ed. *The Foucault Reader* (New York: Pantheon, 1984), p. 244.

10. "Questions on Geography," p. 69.

11. "Two Lectures" (January 1976) in Gordon, *Power/Knowledge*, p. 89. These lectures had not appeared in French but were rather transcribed and translated by Alessandro Fontana and Pasquale Pasquino in Michel Foucault, *Microfisicia del Potere* (Turin, 1977).

12. "Space, Knowledge, and Power," p. 245.

13. Foucault once brazenly stated to a group of geographers, "As far as I'm concerned, Marx doesn't exist." He then went on to explain that there was no totalizing intellect called 'Marx,' only a very intelligent man who has to be analyzed in terms of his specific books. Likewise Foucault once greeted two would-be biographers by saying, "Ah, mes assassains," acerbically pointing out that they would inevitably sacrifice the fluid, mercurial person by fixing him as a philosophical and literary persona. And, of course, one should also remember Foucault's considerable collaborative work on hospitals, housing, and streets.

14. The original lecture and its later published version openly resist calling heterotopology a science; however in the radio talk on "Les utopies réelles" Foucault sardonically acknowledges this impossible "dream." I would like to thank Henrik Reeh for first bringing this to my attention.

15. One cannot help remarking on Foucault's descriptions of Sfax and Tunis, with its tree-lined Avenue Bourguiba close by the medina, and the nearby village of Sidi Bou Said with its tantalizing aura of cosmopolitan decadence. Foucault took the train from place to place in Tunesia; he also enjoyed driving a white Cadillac convertible.

16. Timothy Mitchell, *Colonising Egypt* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), esp. pp. 23-28, 44-52.

17. See in particular Foucault's comments that while architecture is unable to solve social problems, it can aggravate them and, at least occasionally, "produce positive effects when the liberating intentions of the architect coincide with the real practice of people in the exercise of their freedom" ("Space, Knowledge, and Power," p. 246).