

Zones of indistinction: bio-political contestations in the urban arena

Matthew Gandy

Department of Geography, University College London

This essay explores the idea of 'bio-politics' in relation to the modern city. The concept is traced through its original Foucauldian formulation to more recent explorations of the relationship between the body and the city. We explore the idea through the emergence of discourses on hygiene, public health and differing conceptions of 'urban order'. We find that the bio-political dynamics of urban space encompass both juridical and dispersed sources of power in modern societies. It is concluded that existing conceptions of power in urban space need to take account of those diffuse sources of power that enable the modern city to function in spite of its contradictory dynamics. We also need to contend with those 'zones of indistinction' which appear to lie outside conventional urban discourse yet reveal much about the hidden dimensions of urban modernity.

The relationship between the body and the city might appear to be a natural focus for urban analysis and debate, yet the 'body-city' nexus has tended to be refracted through a series of theoretical discourses within which the body itself plays only a tangential role. Even within Foucauldian-inspired readings of the 'bio-political' impulse behind modernity, the physicality of the body retains a somewhat ambiguous position within the disciplinary apparatus of the modern state: the emphasis on the discursive production of the body has tended to occlude any clear engagement with the lived experience of space.¹ There is, therefore, a tension running through Foucault's writings between materialist and idealist interpretations of urban change in which the analysis of discursive responses to material developments has tended to take precedence over the physical realm of the body itself. Yet if we are to make sense of the modern city – and its post-industrial, late-modern and post-modern permutations – we need to engage with the body both as a site of corporeal interaction with the physical spaces of the city and as a symbolic field within which different aspects to the legitimation of modern societies are played out.

Recent changes in the structure and characteristics of the modern city demand a rethinking of the spatial conceptualization of power developed by Foucault in his institutional critique of modernity. The influential notion of 'governmentality', for example, needs to be reconsidered in the light of the radical dispersal of power

emerging from new modes of urban governance and the declining role and legitimacy of many institutions associated with the state.² The modern state – that somewhat diffuse arrangement of practices and institutions – has long been a pivotal focus of Foucault's thought, yet 'the State' in all its various manifestations is now undergoing such a far reaching transformation that we need to reassess some of the core elements behind his analysis of power. The historical contrast that Foucault draws between liberal and more authoritarian forms of governmentality, for example, has become less clear in recent years, with a proliferation of spaces that reside 'outside the law' and a growing geographical dislocation between spaces of production and consumption that characterize the post-industrial city. Whilst Foucault identifies a disciplinary apparatus that gradually engulfs the body in the modern era, more recent scholars in this tradition, such as Giorgio Agamben and Zygmunt Bauman, have identified anomalies and contradictions in this conceptualization of power that highlight systematic forms of bodily and spatial exclusion. A focus on the material inscriptions of power in the everyday spaces of the city, for example, involves a consideration of how power can be sustained through architectonic forms that are independent of discursive practices. Similarly, the identification of different spatial manifestations of power – and, crucially, the relationships between these spaces – enables us to explore power relations extending beyond a narrowly European frame of analysis.

This essay explores connections between the body–city nexus and the idea of the 'bio-political' as a characteristic feature of modernity. We begin by sketching an outline of the emergence of bio-political power and its relations with processes of social and spatial exclusion. The idea of the bio-political is extended to include those 'spaces of exception' and conditions of 'bare life' that play a critical role in the ideological and material sustenance of modern societies. We then examine the complexities of power in relation to the development of the physical infrastructure of the modern city with emphasis on discourses surrounding hygiene, public health and different conceptions of urban order. The development of the disciplinary apparatus of the modern state is located within the context of the material exigencies of the industrial city and the bio-political impetus behind new forms of 'governmentality'. In the final section we consider some of the implications for power, urban governance and the bio-political realm engendered by current processes of urban change. It is suggested that a tendency towards the 'bacteriological city' – focused around a distinctive arrangement between bio-political power and the institutions of modern governance – has been partially displaced by a new urban constellation marked by a different kind of interaction between cultural, economic, juridical and other sources of power.

From bio-politics to bare life

The rise of the industrial city necessitated a transformation in relations between the human body and emerging institutions of modern governance. The body became a focal point for a plethora of different concerns ranging from the need for productive labour to anxieties over the control of human behaviour. The body developed into an

increasingly politicized terrain around which the defining aspects of modernity could derive a sense of symbolic unity. The gradual incorporation of the body within an extending web of rules, mechanisms, structures and behavioural codes was not only an inevitable outcome of the practical exigencies of an increasingly urbanized modernity but also reflected a strategic intervention on the part of the state into almost every aspect of everyday life. In the writings of Michel Foucault and of a succession of scholars since the 1970s, this emerging calculus of state power can be characterized as a distinctively 'bio-political' dynamic, so that the field of political strategy and state activity becomes radically extended into areas of life which were previously largely perceived as lying outside the political realm. In the first volume of *The history of sexuality*, for example, Foucault traces the origins of modern bio-politics to two different yet interlinked developments:

One of these poles – the first to be formed, it seems – centered on the body as a machine: its disciplining, the optimisation of capabilities, the extortion of its forces, the parallel increase in its usefulness and its docility, its integration into systems of efficient and economic controls, all this was ensured by the procedures of power that characterized the *disciplines*: an *anatomo-politics of the human body*. The second, formed somewhat later, focused on the species body, the body imbued with the mechanics of life and serving as the basis of the biological processes: propagation, births and mortality, the level of health, life expectancy and longevity, with all the conditions that can cause these to vary. Their supervision was effected through an entire series of interventions and regulatory controls: a bio-politics of the population. The disciplines of the body and the regulations of the population constituted the two poles around which the organization of power over life was deployed.³

The emerging focus of bio-political power is thus centred on individual bodies and populations, so that the regulation of the modern subject becomes connected with the strategic needs of the nation state. We encounter, therefore, a complex interplay between the health of the 'body politic' and the associated discourses of nationalism, militarism and colonialism which became reflected in a nexus of ethological formulations culminating in the socio-biological justification of geo-political power. What remains less certain, however, is how this emerging dynamic between bio-political power and the development of the nation-state originally evolved. It is not clear, in other words, how political manifestations of power first began to gain control over the human body and thereby evolve into the institutional and juridical structures of the modern state. Whereas Foucault's conceptualization of the 'bio-political' focuses on the professional discourses which developed around the body during the modern era, the influential recent writings of the Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben pay closer attention to the historical origins of emergent forms of 'sovereign power' over the body. In *Homo sacer* Agamben traces the bio-political dynamic of modernity to the Greek distinction between *zoē*, meaning 'bare life' or 'natural life', and *bios*, denoting a way of living, incorporating social, political and cultural aspects to human existence:

The Foucauldian thesis will then have to be corrected or, at least, completed, in the sense that what characterizes modern politics is not so much the inclusion of *zoē* in the *polis* – which is, in itself, absolutely ancient – nor simply the fact that life as such becomes a principal object of the projections and calculations of State power. Instead the decisive fact is that, together with the process by which the exception becomes

everywhere the rule, the realm of bare life – which is originally situated at the margins of the political order – gradually begins to coincide with the political realm, and exclusion and inclusion, outside and inside, *bios* and *zoē*, right and fact, enter into a zone of irreducible indistinction.⁴

The bio-political can thus be characterized as the gradual colonization or ‘politicization’ of ‘bare life’ by an increasingly elaborate skein of institutional structures and relationships which find their axiomatic expression in ‘law’ and various manifestations of ‘sovereign power’. Power is in its very essence a question of control over the body, within which the differentiation between different bodies to create a politically defined community forms the originary basis for social exclusion through the operation of the ‘ban’. In this way, the ‘state of exception’ takes on the form of a distinctive ‘space of exception’, whether reflected in the huddled communities beyond the walls of a medieval city or the marginalized belts of deprivation in the contemporary metropolis. This emphasis on the spatialization of the political exception in the writings of Agamben moves beyond the ‘interior landscapes’ of Foucault to build a conceptual schema that can connect between the peculiarities of urban planning and architectural design to encompass broader processes of metropolitan growth and development. By focusing our analysis on the politics of the body we can explore the shifting relationship between the city as a distinctive *polis* or political space and the emerging material characteristics of urban form through successive historical periods. We can observe a subtle movement between the Renaissance ideal of the ‘city-state’ as a space of relative freedom to the closely administered ‘state-city’ of the modern era in which human freedoms are subject to a panoply of different forms of direct or indirect control ranging across different modes of liberal and authoritarian governmentality.⁵ The city emerges, then, as the primary locus for these new strategies of disciplinary control and the development of new interactions between different bodies of professional knowledge and expertise. For both Foucault and Agamben the term ‘bio-politics’ denotes not merely a blurring of the epistemological strategies of the life sciences and the human sciences but a cumulative process by which human life itself becomes incorporated within the aegis of the state. The direct bio-political manipulation of the body finds its ultimate manifestation, however, in eugenic attempts to improve human societies, and its most complex medico-scientific challenges in the shifting definition of death enabled by the cyborgian enhancement of the human body in conditions of severe mental or physical impairment.⁶

Agamben takes Foucault’s argument further by positing the ‘fundamental biopolitical structure of modernity’, so that the increasing control of the body becomes the defining criterion of modernity and in this sense takes precedence over other developments such as the secularization of science, the spread of capitalist labour relations or the growth of the nation state. He argues that Nazi Germany represents the first ‘radically biopolitical state’ through its eugenic programme to merge the biological with the political, whereby ‘the physician and the scientist move in the no-man’s land into which at one point the sovereign alone could penetrate’.⁷ The disciplining of the body becomes ‘the decisive event of modernity’, and reveals the underlying similarity between the ‘modern ideologies seemingly most distant from one another’, so that fascism, for example, is seen as the culmination of a series of incipient trends within

twentieth-century modernity.⁸ Agamben identifies a radical similarity between, for instance, the bio-political impulse behind both 'modern totalitarianism' and contemporary societies 'of mass hedonism and consumerism' that is leading towards a merging of different political systems around a globalized bio-political constellation in response to the 'dissolution' of the nation-state and established forms of sovereign power.⁹ This emphasis on the contemporary emergence of a global bio-political dynamic marks an extension to Foucault's arguments, and takes the intersection between biology and politics to a new level of intensity, whether reflected in genocidal conflict over access to resources or systematic processes of exclusion from medical care for the world's poor.¹⁰ These 'wasted lives', to use Zygmunt Bauman's phrase, represent a literal as well as metaphorical process of permanent and deadly exclusion for the poor, the marginalized and others who have no value within the global economy.¹¹

The merging of different modes of political and ideological incorporation of the body within ostensibly disparate structures of power illuminates a fundamental uncertainty over the origin of sovereign power itself. How, in other words, has 'bare life' become integrated into the governmental apparatus of late modernity although the sources of this bio-power remain unclear? By extending our conception of power from the traditional emphasis on 'juridico-institutional models' to its diffusion into the constitution of the modern self and the micro-geographies of everyday life, we find that power is radically dispersed both in its practical operations and in its disparate sources of legitimacy.¹² These observations reveal not just conflicting forms of individual identity but also tensions between different legacies of both direct and indirect forms of governmentality in an intellectual manoeuvre that renders conventional political science largely redundant. This shift of emphasis also has wide-ranging implications for both the scope and methodology of historical research, not least by a move away from a conception of history as an accretion of legislative change towards an engagement with the everyday spaces of modernity through which power is radically dispersed rather than concentrated in formal agencies and structures.

Through the bio-political impulse to control 'bare life', Agamben posits a radical if largely concealed continuity 'between modern power and the most immemorial of the *arcana imperii*', and in so doing extends the implications of Foucault's insights both historically with his investigations into the pre-modern origins of power and also spatially through his emphasis on the 'camp' as the logical end point of bio-political rationality.¹³ Sovereign power involves a complex set of spatial relations between 'outside and inside, the normal situation and chaos', so that 'chaos' is incorporated into 'the juridical order through the creation of a zone of indistinction between outside and inside'. The intersections between power and space in which 'ordering' and 'localization' (or spatialization) become intertwined are driven by the role of the 'sovereign exception' by which law and power is itself instituted from an abstract 'outside'.¹⁴ In addition to an abstract 'outside' we must also contend with the presence of a tangible 'outside' which manifests as the 'absolute space of exception'.¹⁵ For Agamben this 'absolute space of exception' is exemplified by 'the camp' in which citizens are deprived of their rights and reduced to a state of bare life at the whim of a sovereign power:

The political system no longer orders forms of life and juridical rules in a determinate space, but instead contains at its very center a *dislocating localization* that exceeds it and into which every form of life and every rule can be virtually taken. The camp as dislocating localization is the hidden matrix of the politics in which we are still living, and it is the structure of the camp that we must learn to recognize in all its metamorphoses into the *zones d'attentes* of our airports and certain outskirts of our cities. The camp is the fourth, inseparable element that has now added itself to – and so broken – the old trinity composed of the state, the nation (birth), and land.¹⁶

The 'camp' is for Agamben not only a concrete artefact exemplified by the Nazi death camp but also a zone of radical indistinction in which human communities find themselves cut adrift from the institutional and legal frameworks underpinning modernity – a distinction that allows an explicit connection to be drawn between his philosophical explorations of the origins of bio-political sovereignty and the abandoned or marginal spaces of the contemporary city.¹⁷ These insights also shed light on the seemingly anomalous characteristics of those deprived spaces that are only partially integrated into the global economy. From this perspective, for instance, the stark forms of social stratification associated with the colonial state, which have been so vividly described by Mahmood Mamdani and other scholars, appear not so much as an exception but as an integral dimension to modernity itself, in the sense that the 'exception' or the state of exception is actually fundamental to the operation of the system as a whole. By invoking this coherence of apparent opposites, a radical critique of modernity is instituted in which a shadowy other is revealed that exposes the basis of its own legitimacy in processes of violence, exclusion and elimination. This dual dynamic of space and power is founded on a repeated differentiation between 'citizens' and 'subjects': whilst citizens have the right to participate directly in the political affairs of the state, the rest of the population are relegated to the status of 'subjects', 'guests' or mere 'inhabitants' at the margins of society.¹⁸ The apparent order manifested within modern societies rests on its antinomy, whether located in the run-down *banlieues* of northern Paris or the polluted oil fields of West Africa. In what is popularly referred to as the 'Third World', for example, we find a proliferation of zones of exception in which conditions of 'bare life' are produced by a combination of economic marginalization, resource expropriation and military subjugation. 'At once excluding bare life from and capturing it within the political order,' writes Agamben, 'the state of exception actually constituted, in its very separateness, the hidden foundation on which the entire political system rested.'¹⁹

Power, space and the bacteriological city

How have these spatialities and genealogies of power impacted on the development of the modern city? The modern city is structured around a series of demarcations between 'inside' and 'outside', exemplified by the delineation between 'public space' and 'private space', yet these crude distinctions actually tell us relatively little about the emergence of those 'power geometries' that structure everyday life. We need to consider, for example, how the public realm extends to those 'zones of indistinction'

which reside within the fabric of the city so that disparate elements are bound together in order to produce a functional combination of different spaces. It is immediately clear that the city is a concentration of social and economic activity, yet this is not to argue that the city is little more than a nodal point within a wider system of flows. The city, above all, retains its political salience as a material space because the development of new forms of modern consciousness is inextricably related to the emergence of bio-political forms of governmentality.²⁰

The bio-political dynamic behind the development of the modern city can be illustrated by the example of public health. The origins of modern perspectives on public health are conceived by Foucault as an outcome of new approaches to the control of 'privileged breeding grounds of disease' such as harbours, prisons, *hôpitaux généraux* and other spaces of confinement.²¹ Since the eighteenth century the human body has become progressively incorporated into a nexus of architectural and regulatory structures to produce a new spatial order in the modern city. The politics of public health involved a shift from a preoccupation with death to a focus on life in which 'the health and physical well-being of the population in general' emerges 'as one of the essential objectives in political power'.²² The development of what Foucault terms the 'disciplinary society' involved both the construction of new institutional forms of control and the systematic collection of information about modern societies. The gathering of data on urban populations became gradually incorporated into a complex analytical schema that effectively combined the circulatory insights of the medical sciences with an organicist conception of the modern city.²³

If we take Foucault's term 'medicine' in a more general sense to mean the regulation of the body and its relation to the urban environment then we can trace a link between the development of 'medico-administrative' knowledge and the hygienist preoccupation with the control of urban space.²⁴ The spread of new attitudes towards hygiene and cleanliness involved a transformation in the cultural meaning and 'stigmatization' of the human body as new forms of social distinction emerged. The development of new social formations in the industrial city coincided with the spread of intensified forms of spatial differentiation as transport improvements enabled the middle classes to escape the poverty and congestion of the inner city. In tandem with the newly emerging socio-spatial disparities of the industrial city, we encounter an emphasis on increasingly individualized forms of identity and a growing aversion to the communal sensory realm of the past.²⁵ The handling of human faeces, for example, which had for centuries been an everyday aspect of urban life as night soil collectors delivered human waste to regional agricultural hinterlands, suddenly became caught up in a new set of behavioural, olfactory and scientific discourses.²⁶ Human waste, which had previously enjoyed a sacred role within organic conceptions of urban order, was transformed into an object of disgust. This 'ambiguity of the sacred', to use Émile Durkheim's expression, reveals the way in which the significance of the same object can oscillate between auspicious or inauspicious meanings without changing.²⁷ The body is thus intertwined with shifting topographies of dirt and defilement that reflect wider processes of social and cultural change within the modern city as the mixed, compact and cyclical characteristics of the pre-modern city were superseded by an

increasingly differentiated and sprawling urban form underpinned by the cyclical perturbations of capital rather than the organic demands of a bio-regional economy.

The gradual shift from a cyclical pre-modern city towards the modern 'bacteriological city' reveals that, rather than a clear sequence of changes, there is in fact a phased, overlapping and frequently contradictory set of developments. The term 'bacteriological' in this instance denotes the replacement of the organic city – with its emphasis on cyclical and more narrowly utilitarian conceptions of nature – by a far greater penetration of capital and scientific expertise into the governance of urban space. The plethora of governmental and techno-scientific discourses associated with the first half of the nineteenth century gradually coalesced around the bacteriological city with its emphasis on the technical rationalization of space to counter the public health threats of the past.²⁸ Yet this characteristic urban form emerging out of the governmental dilemmas of the industrial city masks a diversity of different elements, some of which are derived from the persistence of past forms, structures and ideologies, and others that are revealed through the political contestation of social and spatial inequalities emerging within urban space. In a colonial or post-colonial context we find that these 'multiple modernities' are even more apparent through the interweaving of different geometries of power, belief and social stratification in urban space. In modern India, for instance, we can observe the close intersection between conceptions of holiness and uncleanness through the role of scheduled or Dalit castes in the handling of refuse and human wastes (the word *dalit* is derived from the Sanskrit word *dalita* meaning 'oppressed'). The handling of wastes and the complex relationship between 'dirt' and the public sphere reveals the limitations of Habermasian conceptions of a unitary public sphere and the coexistence of multiple and oscillating modernities.²⁹ The shifting contours of dirt and defilement operate at both a symbolic and a structural level, so that everyday practices or encounters provide ritualized contestations of the use and meaning of modern space. The transformation of the meaning of 'dirt' tells us much about fluid interrelationship between modernity, the modern city and the way in which stigma and oppression combine to produce 'marked' or contaminated bodies.

The bio-political dynamics of the modern city originate within an extending nexus of hybridized relations between the body, nature and urban space, so that the structure of the city tends towards a cyborgian synthesis between the physiological needs of the human body and the physical infrastructure of the city.³⁰ The idea of the 'cyborg city' can be invoked in this sense as a technological enhancement of urban life that involves an increasingly elaborate intersection between nature and culture in the urban arena. The provision of basic necessities such as food, water and warmth rests on a web of technological and organizational structures that have facilitated the interaction between the cyclical dynamics of capital and the transformation of nature into exchangeable commodities. In the case of water the rationalization of the modern city involved not just a transformation in the physical structure of the city – often extending far beyond the city boundaries – but also changes in the use and meaning of private and public space. The incorporation of the human body into the physical fabric of the modern city via the circulatory dynamics of water infrastructure illustrates the extent to which

new forms of government or 'governmentality' have impinged on everyday life as communal spaces for washing or bathing became associated with 'sensuality and individual debasement'.³¹ At first these changes were instituted simply by improved access to water, but through time the hydrological dynamics of the modern city were embellished by a plethora of new technologies and advertising campaigns, so that hygienist ideologies became intertwined with popular culture. The modern home became an axiomatic space of liberal governmentality where new codes of behaviour evolved in tandem with a panoply of architectural and technical innovations. The role of women, for example, was transformed into that of 'environmental managers' for the domestic interior, whilst the modern bathroom instilled new standards of bodily hygiene.³² Although the spread of these new technological and architectural interactions with the human body was largely restricted to middle-class homes until the wider diffusion of prosperity in the second half of the twentieth century, the emphasis on water and health extended beyond the private bathroom to include the construction of municipal baths, lidos and other elements in an emerging modernist intersection between water, architectural design and urban culture.³³ By the early decades of the twentieth century the 'domesticated' human body had become fully woven into the social and institutional nexus of modernity, even if the technological transformation of the home had only been partially completed.

The miasmatic conceptions of disease epidemiology in the pre-bacteriological era informed the circulatory dynamics of urban design and provided a powerful focus for institutional architecture. Yet as the spatial problematic of disease became more explicitly an issue of urban governance, the focus began to shift from architectural innovation to institutional reform.³⁴ Advances in epidemiological science provided the basis for a new form of bio-political rationality in which moral discourses could be partially displaced by a technical emphasis on the mechanisms of public health improvement. This rationalizing impetus reaches its acme in the 'bacteriological city' as a distinctive and enduring set of social, cultural, technological and institutional developments, ranging from the development of new financial innovations such as municipal bonds for the 'fixing' of capital in space to the marginalization of landed elites and other political obstacles to urban reform. Yet this emerging synthesis between liberal governmentality and 'scientific management' rested on a fragile set of foundations most strikingly revealed in the chaotic public health situation facing many colonial and post-colonial cities.³⁵ Behind an apparent uniformity of developments – at least within much of Europe, North America and parts of Asia – lies a complex set of debates concerning the precise role and limitations of government.³⁶ A Foucauldian reading of the history of public health not only risks a historical elision between different phases in the emergence of the bacteriological city and different forms of 'scientific urbanism' but also overlooks the tensions between different combinations of scientific expertise and rival political ideologies. We should be careful, in other words, not to read the technical and institutional transformation of the modern city in functionalist terms, since the precise outcome of these complex deliberations varied significantly in different local contexts.

An emphasis on the bio-political regulation of urban space tells us much about the institutional context for the modern politics of the body, yet Foucault's theoretical legacy reveals less about the dynamics of urban change as a political struggle to create a functional public realm in the place of multitudinous private interests. There is, for example, an ambiguity surrounding the institutional and legislative legacy of the nineteenth century for the development of modern infrastructure: an empirical lacuna which is perhaps underpinned by Foucault's neglect of civil engineering in his analysis of professional discourses relating to the health of the human body.³⁷ Foucault also has little to say about the reconstruction of the public realm or the 'physical city' as a political as well as an architectural project. There is, in other words, an uncertainty surrounding the architectonic expression of a rational 'public interest' in urban space, whether this relates to sanitary discourses or nascent forms of urban planning. And his theoretical legacy remains detached from any workable system of universal norms which might facilitate a more general critique of modernity as evidenced by the intellectual tensions between Foucault and Habermas in their rival interpretations of the meaning and significance of the practical and philosophical legacy of the Enlightenment.³⁸ Yet the Habermasian response to these questions is in turn hampered by its somewhat naïve attachment to the prospects for political consensus, and a failure to register the intersection between multiple and often contradictory modernities whose legitimation often rests not on the basis of some form of rational deliberation but on a panoply of competing claims, desires and justifications.

Dispersed geometries

These theoretical tensions become even more apparent when we explore the bio-political dynamics of the contemporary city. The partial demise of the bacteriological city posits a new kind of relationship between the body and evolving forms of municipal politics in which the historical associations between public health and urban reform have been extensively severed. People are now connected to each other in different ways so that the cholera-driven 'corporeal unity' of the nineteenth-century city has given way to a radical dissimulation and fragmentation of bodily interconnections. In the shift towards what we might term 'anti-biotic urbanism', an increasingly individualized health regime has displaced the earlier interconnections between urban governance, social reform and medical advocacy. Yet this earlier corporeal unity engendered by the threat of disease has not entirely dissipated, as evidenced by the potential impact of viral mutations or the resurgence of infectious diseases such as tuberculosis that had until recently been in long-term decline.

The locus of power in the contemporary city has increasingly shifted from concentrated and visible manifestations of state power (governmental bureaucracies, police services and so on) to a diffuse set of networks dominated by capital (corporate lobbies, financial derivatives and other dispersed and ultra-mobile elements). In positing a distinction between concentrated and dispersed sources of power we should be careful, however, not to set up a misleading duality within which the role of

centralized state apparatuses is exaggerated in relation to other forms of power in modern societies.³⁹ The current emphasis on 'governance', for example, can be read as an adjunct to the neo-liberalization of public policy where the power of the state is increasingly circumscribed by a mesh of organizational structures that originates from outside the democratic arena. The legitimacy of the state and existing forms of urban governance has also been challenged by processes such as the 'de-secularization' of modern societies and the rise of new forms of ethnic chauvinism and religious zealotry.⁴⁰ What is critically significant in the case of cities such as Mumbai and Jakarta, which have recently seen widespread violence and sectarian unrest, is the inter-connection between economic instability and community breakdown so that the 'public realm' – however we wish to define this term – is placed under severe strain. These neo-liberalized and politically unstable cities are increasingly characterized by 'marked bodies' rather than citizens – in a reprise of twentieth-century fascism – so that landscapes of paranoia become interwoven with longstanding structural inequalities to produce volatile topographies of hatred and mistrust.

The interplay between formal and informal networks of power, and between the visible and invisible manifestations of authority, has significantly altered the relationships between different sources of power engendered by the Foucauldian notion of 'governmentality'. Modes of governmentality have diversified, to encompass at one end of the spectrum a highly sophisticated technological fusion under the aegis of 'digital citizenship' and at the other end various forms of 'authoritarian governmentality' involving the co-opting of a vast reserve army of human bodies to protect interests, lives and property, ranging from security personnel patrolling individual premises, streets or neighbourhoods to the co-opting of militias to undertake operations such as the guarding of pipelines or industrial installations.⁴¹ In the wealthier and more strategically significant urban centres of the global North, the bio-politics of the body has entered a new phase marked by an intensification of the disciplinary modes of intersection between the human body and dispersed or hidden sources of power. The enhanced panopticism of contemporary cities, enabled by new data-gathering and biometric measuring devices, has introduced an anticipatory governmentality where even facial expressions can produce visual algorithms capable of triggering new forms of pre-emptive security interventions.⁴² In the poorer cities of the global South, however, the tendency is towards an array of physical barriers to restrict entry into communities in combination with a human shield of poorly paid security personnel.

In the contemporary city the disciplinary techniques and strategies of the past have acquired new spatial forms. The placing of social deviants within institutions so that they might be 'improved' or re-educated in preparation to rejoin society has been displaced by the logic of permanent exclusion exemplified by the carceral archipelagos developing around many US cities.⁴³ Though the public rhetoric of social control is now primarily focused on terrorism or violent crime, the principal concern of these new disciplinary structures and practices is aimed at the control of those forms of social deviance which threaten economic activity such as the presence of 'undesirable' people in public or quasi-public spaces.⁴⁴ There is a proliferation of private security services, for example, whose uniformed visibility presents a form of 'state ventriloquism' so that

their authority appears to derive from state institutions rather than private interests. The classic notion of one entity or sovereign power with control over society as a whole has fundamentally changed, so that society is increasingly controlling itself through innumerable surveillance networks. The radical dispersal of power poses new dilemmas for the relationship between the body and the city, in which the rationale for urban order is no longer linked to the cohesive demands of the industrial city but to the role of cities as competitive nodes within the global economy.

The body has become a critical terrain for new processes of differentiation and exclusion within urban space, whether in terms of the commodification of individual bodies or the pervasive use of body images as part of the visual culture of late modernity. The trafficking and exploitation of bodies, for example, is an increasingly significant component of the 'flesh economy' of the contemporary city. The post-industrial city is also marked by a libidinous and hyper-sexualized interaction between economy and society, rooted in intensified modes of consumption whereby social control is effected not by repression but by ever greater degrees of sensory stimulation.⁴⁵ No longer the focus of the disciplinary and health campaigns associated with the 'productive body' of the industrial city, the post-industrial body has instead become the visual icon of an aesthetic feeding frenzy. The contemporary city has taken on a quality of bodily excess in which an idealized body aesthetic has become an increasingly ubiquitous if not iconic dimension to urban culture. The depiction of the fascist body exemplified by Leni Riefenstahl's *Olympia* (1938), for example, bears striking similarities to the idealized figures that gaze from illuminated billboards in the contemporary city, in an illustration of the ideological proximity of ostensibly diverse visual cultures (and arguably a corollary of Agamben's observations on the bio-political continuities between liberal and authoritarian states).⁴⁶ The pervasive blurring of aesthetic and ethical discourse also provides ideological legitimation for new and widening forms of social and economic inequality. Product branding, generalized ennui and a vast extension in oligopolistic power structures have reduced the democratic arena to little more than a digitized chimera: a consultative forum within which every alternative has already been ruthlessly circumscribed.⁴⁷ Where opposition fleetingly appears it is often an expression of negation, whereby a refusal to engage or the rejection of 'choice' marks a sudden rupture or striation across the verisimilitude of consensus.

The intensified cycles of investment and disinvestment in the post-industrial metropolis lend a 'bulimic' quality to the contemporary city. The bulimic metaphor is especially apposite for many of the vast mega-cities of the global South, where waves of investment in the built environment are subject to violent perturbations in response to factors such as political instability, the vicissitudes of state finances and the effects of drastic currency devaluations: cities such as Lagos, for example, are characterized by dilapidated networks of oil-financed urban infrastructures from the 1970s engulfed within the pyroclastic expansion of the informal city.⁴⁸ In these and other 'post-productive' cities, only partially or tangentially connected with the global economy, the bio-politics of urban space takes on new and uncertain dimensions.

When Georg Simmel described the blasé attitude as an inevitable response to the sensory overload of the modern city, he cannot have anticipated the degree to which the consumption-driven political dynamic of the post-industrial city would work assiduously to eliminate any real sense of 'shock' from those critical social strata that underpin the new global economy. The people who generate profits either as workers or shoppers are no longer blasé but fearful and powerful groups who live in an increasingly isolated sphere whether outside the city itself or confined to chic enclaves within it. The new strategies of bodily exclusion form part of a globalized bio-political dynamic in which the earlier differentiation and stigmatization of the body has been radically extended. The body remains a crucial locus for strategic intervention within which the disciplinary approaches of the past have been extensively supplanted by a new set of relations between the body, space and power.

With the fracturing of the contemporary city the relationship between a sovereign power and a clearly defined, territorially demarcated population has become increasingly porous. The body has become subject to multiple and often conflicting jurisdictions, so that the urban polity or 'social body' from which power seeks its legitimacy and *raison d'être* has become ever more opaque. A characteristic feature of modern political discourse has been its emphasis on the 'people' as a political abstraction in contrast with the recognition of the people as a 'fragmentary multiplicity of needy and excluded bodies'.⁴⁹ An emphasis on what Deleuze, following Spinoza, terms the 'multitude' holds very different implications for how we might conceptualize processes of governance and legitimation in modern societies. The idea of the 'public' or the 'public realm' needs to be reconsidered in the light of the impossibility of achieving an imaginary social or political unity. Drawing on Elias Canetti's *Crowds and power*, for example, Deleuze distinguishes between, on the one hand, 'mass multiplicities' associated with classic conceptions of 'the crowd', identified by their size, the similarity of their constituents and the dominance of one-way hierarchies of power, and, on the other hand, 'pack multiplicities' marked by dispersion, variability and the 'impossibility of a fixed totalization or hierarchization'.⁵⁰ These explorations of the political manifestations of social complexity have important implications for any attempt to reformulate Foucauldian conceptions of 'governmentality' in a context of radical dispersal of power and greater fluidity in the institutional basis for modernity. Yet the contemporary emphasis on the multitude as a new locus for political agency advanced by Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, Paolo Virno and others does not satisfactorily resolve the tension between individual and collective will: the role of reason in distinguishing between private or common benefits remains obscure in an intellectual swerve that leads from Hobbes via Spinoza to a position not radically dissimilar from the 'polycentric order' espoused by Friedrich von Hayek.⁵¹

Under what the anthropologist Marc Augé terms a drift towards 'supermodernity' and the production of 'non-place', it appears that the Baudelairean modernity of the historical palimpsest is being displaced by a hybridized uniformity of architectural expression whereby design, consumption and spatial form have become fully integrated in the service of a faux authenticity.⁵² The suppression of 'class' as an analytical category, in combination with the erasure and repackaging of historical

memory, lends the contemporary city a sense of cultural and political disorientation. Or, to express this scenario in slightly different terms, modernity appears to be 'transparent to itself', in Claude Lefort's apt phrase, but the possibilities for critical or independent thought have actually diminished.⁵³ This is not to argue that urban space can no longer be interpreted in any systematic way but rather to underline the degree to which the contemporary city has evoked a cognitive hiatus that necessitates an extensive rethinking of both the objects and the methods of urban enquiry. What Deleuze brings to this discussion is a radically extended phenomenology of human experience that presents opportunities for connecting urban design with intensified spaces of human imagination and creative potential: through his blurring of the boundaries between art, philosophy and everyday life, Deleuze complements the emancipatory currents in Foucault's bio-political schema to engage with a range of novel forms of architectural practice.⁵⁴ Yet the theoretical implications of both Foucault and Deleuze remain vague in relation to the practical dilemmas of urban *Realpolitik* at the scale of an entire city or metropolitan region. It is here that we can detect an emerging field of philosophical engagement between the limits of the public realm associated with the industrial city (and its bacteriological counterpart) and attempts to delineate different forms of social and political complexity in the post-industrial metropolis.⁵⁵

Conclusions

If we trace the intellectual lineage from Foucault to more recent explorations of power in modern societies, we can detect an emphasis on the radical indeterminacy of power and its contradictory implications for the maintenance of social order. The Foucauldian notion of 'governmentality' needs to be complemented by a fuller recognition of the materiality of the body, the diversity of spatial manifestations of bio-political power and the political implications of social and spatial complexity. The work of Agamben and other scholars is suggestive of a renewed engagement between political economy, material histories of the body and Deleuzian-inspired reflections on complexity. But can this somewhat inchoate analytical framework actually work in practice? At times, for example, Agamben appears to elide 'bare life' and 'sacred life' in his conception of the bio-political, and in so doing tends towards a metahistorical interpretation of social change. Equally, his account of processes of exclusion from sovereign power appears at times to blur markedly different phenomena under an overarching analytical framework: it is questionable, for example, whether the anomie experienced in airports is comparable with the experience of inmates in a concentration camp.

We need to engage with those marginal, invisible or 'indistinct' spaces that reveal tensions or anomalies in the structures of power underpinning the modern city. There is, therefore, a clear spatialization or 'localization' to the manifestation of power which runs counter to the flattening morphologies encountered in some 'rhizomatic' and neo-structuralist conceptions of space which eschew any directionality or hierarchy in the

distribution of power. By bringing together the critical insights of Foucault and Deleuze we might begin to move our focus from abstract, discursively constructed generalities to a set of more concrete and specific manifestations of the bio-political realm. Current Deleuzian-inflected discussions of ideas surrounding urban complexity have, however, tended to be restricted to design-related issues, and have yet to be systematically linked to either Foucauldian insights into power or wider historiographic recognition of the multiple modalities of urban history in relation to the cultural politics of the body. The Deleuzian emphasis on multiplicities as autonomous rather than dialectical entities, for example, is seemingly at odds with the adoption of a realist ontology that can include cultural and historical analysis.⁵⁶

The role of bio-political power in urban space – whether expressed explicitly or implicitly – is rooted in shifting strategies for determining modes of inclusion and exclusion. These power geometries are linked by a web of different mechanisms and belief systems ranging from the diffusion of capitalist labour relations to the persistence of patriarchal cultures of male domination. Like capitalism itself, therefore, the impetus behind bio-political power has displayed a chameleon like ability to augment or incorporate pre-existing structures of control as part of a wider dynamic behind the development of modern cities and the formation of a fully networked global economy. A critical reflection on the bio-political dynamics of urban space not only exposes the limitations and dangers lurking behind unitary conceptions of modernity but also underpins the centrality of the body to contemporary developments in social theory.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to the referees for their detailed and helpful comments. Earlier versions of the paper were presented to audiences in Berlin, Denver and London, and the research was supported by the Economic and Social Research Council and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

Notes

- ¹ On the relative absence of the physical body as opposed to the discursively constructed body in Foucault's writings, see for example C. Shilling, *The body and social theory*, 2nd edn (London, Sage, 2003). On the body–city interface, see also E. Grosz, 'Bodies-cities', in B. Colomina, ed., *Sexuality and space* (New York, Princeton Architectural Press, 1992), and E. Grosz, *Architecture from the outside: essays on virtual and real space* (Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 2001).
- ² On debates surrounding 'governmentality' see for example C. Gordon, 'Governmental rationality: an introduction', in G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller, eds, *The Foucault effect: studies in governmentality* (Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991), pp. 1–52. On some of the anomalies in Foucault's analysis see for example M. Walzer, 'The politics of Michel Foucault', in D. Couzens Hoy, ed., *Foucault: a critical reader* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1986), pp. 51–68.

- ³ M. Foucault, *The history of sexuality*, vol. 1, trans. R. Hurley (New York, Random House, 1978 [1976]), p. 139 (emphasis in the original). See also H. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow, eds, *Michel Foucault: beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1992).
- ⁴ G. Agamben, *Homo sacer: sovereign power and bare life*, trans. D. Heller-Roazen (Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, 1998 [1995]), pp. 8–9. Agamben is careful to point out that the Nazi concentration camp had its juridical origins in the detention of political prisoners in the Weimar era. The use of the camp also finds earlier precedents in the control of colonial insurrections in Cuba and South Africa by Spanish and British authorities respectively. Agamben, *Homo sacer*, pp. 166–69.
- ⁵ Mitchell Dean, for example, who following Foucault traces the origins of modern governmentality to sixteenth-century Europe, distinguishes authoritarian governmentality ‘from liberalism in that it regards its subjects’ capacity for action as subordinate to the expectations of obedience’. M. Dean, *Governmentality* (London, Sage, 1999), p. 9. Hence the particular significance of this distinction in a colonial context where versions of modernity have been imposed in the absence of modern citizenship rights. See for example P. Joyce, *The rule of freedom: liberalism and the modern city* (London, Verso, 2003).
- ⁶ See for example M. Lock, ‘Death in technological time: locating the end of meaningful life’, *Medical anthropology quarterly* 10 (1996), pp. 575–600.
- ⁷ Agamben, *Homo sacer*, pp. 143, 159.
- ⁸ *Ibid.* p. 4.
- ⁹ *Ibid.* p. 11.
- ¹⁰ On the global politics of death and disease see for example P. Farmer, ‘Social scientists and the new tuberculosis’, *Social science and medicine* 44 (1997), pp. 347–58; M. Gandy, ‘Deadly alliances: death, disease and the global politics of public health’, *Public Library of Science: Medicine* 2 (2005), pp. 9–11; L. Garrett, *Betrayal of trust: the collapse of global public health* (New York, Hyperion, 2000); S. Szreter, ‘Economic growth, disruption, deprivation, disease and death: on the importance of the politics of public health for development’, *Population and development review* 23 (1997), pp. 693–728.
- ¹¹ Z. Bauman, *Wasted lives: modernity and its outcasts* (Cambridge, Polity Press, 2004). Agamben describes the systematic division of the world along bio-political lines as a form of ‘thanatopolitics’ in which the production of death is functional to the system as a whole: *Homo sacer*, p. 142. He also warns that the ‘bio-political machine’ is pushing towards a ‘global civil war’ – a term he borrows from Hannah Arendt and Carl Schmidt – rooted in new forms of sovereign intervention and the ideological legitimization of unending conflict. G. Agamben, *State of exception*, trans. K. Attell (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2005 [2003]), p. 3.
- ¹² Agamben, *Homo sacer*, p. 5.
- ¹³ *Ibid.* p. 6.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.* p. 19.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.* p. 20.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 175–76, (emphasis in the original).
- ¹⁷ ‘The camp,’ writes Agamben, ‘which is now securely lodged within the city’s interior, is the new biopolitical *nomos* of the planet.’ *Homo sacer*, p. 176. See also G. Agamben, *Remnants of Auschwitz: the witness and the archive*, trans. D. Heller-Roazen (New York, Zone Books, 2002 [1999]), and C. Minca, ‘The return of the camp’, *Progress in human geography* 29 (2005), pp. 405–12.
- ¹⁸ M. Mamdani, *Citizen and subject: contemporary Africa and the legacy of late colonialism* (Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1996). See also E. Balibar, ‘Outlines of a topography

- of cruelty: citizenship and civility in the era of global violence', *Constellations* 8 (2001), pp. 15–29; M. Mamdami, 'Making sense of political violence in postcolonial Africa', in O. Enwezor, C. Basualdo, U. Meta Bauer, S. Ghez, S. Maharaj, M. Nash and O. Zaya, eds, *Documenta 11_Platform 2. Experiments with truth* (Ostfildern-Ruit, Hatje Cantz, 2002), pp. 21–42; A. Mbembe, *On the postcolony* (Berkeley, CA, University of California Press, 2001); and A. Norris, 'Giorgio Agamben and the politics of the living dead', *Diacritics* 30 (2000), pp. 38–58.
- ¹⁹ Agamben, *Homo sacer*, p. 19.
- ²⁰ The tension between conceiving the city as an outcome of generalized processes or as an autonomous catalyst for political change is captured in the intellectual antinomy between the interventions of Manuel Castells and Henri Lefebvre in the 1970s. See for example D. Cunningham, 'The concept of metropolis: philosophy and urban form', *Radical philosophy* 133 (2005), pp. 13–25. More recently, however, there has been a renewed engagement with the less determinist neo-Marxian legacies of Lefebvre along with Siegfried Kracauer, Georg Simmel and other classic accounts that recognize the role of the city as a symbolic focus for political action with concrete implications for society as a whole.
- ²¹ M. Foucault, 'The politics of health in the eighteenth century', in P. Rabinow, ed., *The Foucault reader*, trans. C. Hubert (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1984), p. 283. Originally published in *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*, ed. C. Gordon (New York, Pantheon, 1980). See also M. Foucault, 'The birth of biopolitics', in *Michel Foucault: ethics. Essential works 1954–1984*, vol. 1, ed. P. Rabinow (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 2000), pp. 73–74.
- ²² Foucault, 'The politics of health in the eighteenth century', p. 277.
- ²³ T. Osborne, 'Security and vitality: drains, liberalism and power in the nineteenth century', in A. Barry, T. Osborne and N. Rose, eds, *Foucault and political reason: liberalism, neo-liberalism and the rationalities of government* (London, UCL Press, 1996), pp. 99–121.
- ²⁴ Foucault, 'The politics of health in the eighteenth century', p. 283.
- ²⁵ A. Corbin, *The foul and the fragrant: odor and the French social imagination* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1986 [1982]).
- ²⁶ M. Gandy, 'Rethinking urban metabolism: water, space and the modern city', *City* 8 (2004), pp. 371–87.
- ²⁷ Agamben, *Homo sacer*, p. 78.
- ²⁸ See for example E. Heidenreich, *Fliessräume. Die Vernetzung von Natur, Raum und Gesellschaft seit dem 19. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt, Campus, 2004); J. Vögele, *Sozialgeschichte städtischer Gesundheitsverhältnisse während der Urbanisierung* (Berlin, Duncker & Humblot, 2001), and J. von Simson, *Kanalisation und Städtehygiene im 19. Jahrhundert* (Düsseldorf, Verein deutscher Ingenieure, 1983).
- ²⁹ See for example S. Kaviraj, 'Filth and the public sphere: concepts and practices about space in Calcutta', *Public culture* 101 (1997), p. 113.
- ³⁰ See for example M. Gandy, 'Cyborg urbanization: complexity and monstrosity in the contemporary city', *International journal of urban and regional research* 29 (2005), pp. 26–49; A. Picon, *La ville territoire des cyborgs* (Paris, Les Éditions de L'imprimeur, 1998), and Erik Swyngedouw, 'The city as a hybrid: on nature, society and cyborg urbanization', *Capitalism, nature, socialism* 7 (1996), pp. 65–80.
- ³¹ The Metropolitan Working Classes' Association for Improving Public Health, *On household cleanliness* (London, John Churchill & B. Wertheim, 1847), p. 4. During the first half of the nineteenth century we find a proliferation of tracts and pamphlets giving advice on the correct use of water for washing and bathing, yet the per capita usage of water remained very limited

in comparison with the second half of the nineteenth century. Very few dwellings had private bathrooms, and only limited quantities of water were used for washing. Most of the existing sewer networks were primarily intended for storm water, and were rarely connected into the plumbing systems of individual dwellings, which continued to rely mainly on cesspools, cesspits and other private means of disposing of human waste. On the cultural complexities of water infrastructure see for example A. Guillerme, 'Sottosuolo e costruzione della città/ Underground and construction of the city', *Casabella: international architectural review* 542/543 (1988), p. 118; M. Kaika and E. Swyngedouw, 'Fetishising the modern city: the phantasmagoria of urban technological networks', *International journal of urban and regional research* 24 (2000), pp. 120–38; N. Lahiji and D.S. Friedman, eds, *Plumbing: sounding modern architecture* (New York, Princeton Architectural Press, 1997); and D. Laporte, *History of shit*, trans. N. Benabid and R. el-Khoury (Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 2000 [1978]).

³² See for example S. Frank, *Stadtplanung im Geschlechterkampf: Stadt und Geschlecht in der Großstadtentwicklung des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts* (Opladen, Leske & Budrich, 2003); K. Ross, 'Starting afresh: hygiene and modernization in postwar France', *October* 67 (1994), pp. 23–57; G. Vigarello, 'Higiene e intimitad del baño: las formas de la limpieza corporal', *A & V (Monografías de arquitectura y vivienda)* 14 (1988), pp. 25–32; G. Wright, 'Sweet and clean: the domestic landscape in the Progressive era', *Landscape* 20 (1975), pp. 38–43; G. Wright, *Moralism and the model home* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1980).

³³ See for example D. Glassberg, 'The public bath movement in America', *American studies* 20 (1979), pp. 5–21; J.-P. Goubert, 'Wasser und Intimhygiene am Beispiels Frankreichs', in B. Busch and L. Förster, eds, *Wasser*, trans. S. Barmann (Cologne, Wienand, 2000), pp. 168–76; C. Trupat, "'Bade zu Hause!'" Zur Geschichte des Badezimmers in Deutschland seit der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts', *Technikgeschichte* 63 (1996), pp. 219–36; and T. van Leeuwen, *The springboard in the pond: an intimate history of the swimming pool* (Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 1998).

³⁴ Osborne, 'Security and vitality'.

³⁵ See M. Gandy, 'The bacteriological city and its discontents', *Historical geography* 34 (2006), pp. 14–25.

³⁶ Consider the contrast between narrowly Chadwickian attempts to rationalize the technological structure of the modern city and the wider political reforms demanded by public health advocates such as Robert Koch and William Putney Alison. See for example C. Hamlin, *Public health and social justice in the age of Chadwick* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998).

³⁷ In his 1984 interview, 'Space, knowledge, and power', however, Foucault does concede the critical significance of the École des Ponts et Chaussées and the role of engineers in 'thinking space' through 'the three great variables – territory, communication, and speed' which 'escape the domain of architects' (Rabinow, *The Foucault reader*, p. 244).

³⁸ On tensions between Foucault and Habermas, see for example J. Habermas, *The philosophical discourse of modernity: twelve lectures*, trans. F. Lawrence (Cambridge, Polity Press, 1987 [1985]), and D. Ingram, 'Foucault and Habermas on the subject of reason', in G. Gutting, ed., *The Cambridge companion to Foucault* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994), pp. 215–61. On the limitations of the Habermasian approach see for example C. Mouffe, 'For an agonistic public sphere', in O. Enwezor, C. Basualdo, U. Meta Bauer, S. Ghez, S. Maharaj, M. Nash and O. Zaya, eds, *Documenta 11_Platform 1. Democracy unrealized* (Ostfildern-Ruit, Hatje Cantz, 2002), pp. 87–96.

- ³⁹ See J. Allen, 'The whereabouts of power: politics, government and space', *Geografiska Annaler* 86 B (1) (2004), pp. 19–32.
- ⁴⁰ On ethnic and religious violence in Mumbai, for example, see A. Appadurai, 'Burning questions: arson and other public works in Bombay' *ANY: Architecture New York* 18 (1997), pp. 44–47; J. Masselos, 'Postmodern Bombay: fractured discourses,' in S. Watson and K. Gibson, eds, *Postmodern cities and spaces* (Cambridge, MA, Blackwell, 1995), pp. 199–215; and D. Padgaonkar, ed., *When Bombay burned* (New Delhi, UBS Publishers' Distributors, 1993).
- ⁴¹ For contrasting perspectives on oil, imperialism and 'authoritarian governmentality', see A. Barry, 'Technological zones', paper presented to the London Group of Historical Geographers, Senate House, University of London, 24 May 2005, and Michael Watts, 'Development and governmentality', *Singapore journal of tropical geography* 24 (2003), pp. 6–34. On topographies of fear and social difference in the cities of the global South, see for example T. Caldeira, *City of walls: crime, segregation and citizenship in São Paulo* (Berkeley, CA, University of California Press, 2000), p. 334–35. 'Cities of walls', notes Caldeira, 'do not strengthen citizenship but rather contribute to its corrosion.' See also J. Holston and A. Appadurai, 'Cities and citizenship', in J. Holston, ed., *Cities and citizenship* (Durham, NC, Duke University Press, 1999), pp. 1–18.
- ⁴² See for example M. Gray, 'Urban surveillance and panopticism: will we recognize the facial recognition society?', *Surveillance and society* 1 (2003), pp. 314–30.
- ⁴³ See Mike Davis's diagrammatic representation of the 'gulag rim' in *Ecology of fear: Los Angeles and the imagination of disaster* (New York, Metropolitan Books, 1998).
- ⁴⁴ See for example S. Thabe, ed., *Raum und Sicherheit* (University of Dortmund, Institut für Raumplanung, IRPUD, 2001); K. Ronneberger, S. Lanz and W. Jahn, *Die Stadt als Beute* (Bonn, J.H.W. Dietz Nachfolger, 1999); and R. Rorty, 'Feind im Visier', trans. K. Wördemann, *Die Zeit* (18 Mar. 2004).
- ⁴⁵ M. Foucault, *Power/knowledge*, p. 57.
- ⁴⁶ For a classic account of fascist aesthetics in relation to the body, see S. Sontag, 'Fascinating fascism', in *Under the sign of Saturn* (New York, Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1974).
- ⁴⁷ Günther Grass, for example, makes a trenchant defence of democratic institutions and warns that the German parliament is 'degenerating into a subsidiary of the stock exchange'. G. Grass, 'The high price of freedom', *The Guardian* (7 May 2005).
- ⁴⁸ On urban 'bulimia' see for example N. Tadiar, 'Manila's new metropolitan form', in V.L. Rafael, ed., *Discrepant histories* (Philadelphia/Manila, Temple University Press/Anvil Publishing, 1995), pp. 285–313. On crisis-driven patterns of urban development in Lagos, see M. Gandy, 'Learning from Lagos', *New Left Review* 33 (2005), pp. 37–53.
- ⁴⁹ Agamben, *Homo sacer*, p. 177.
- ⁵⁰ G. Deleuze and F. Guattari, *A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia*, trans. B. Massumi (London, Athlone Press, 1987 [1980]), p. 33.
- ⁵¹ M. Bull, 'The limits of multitude', *New Left Review* 35 (2005), pp. 19–39. See also M. Hardt and A. Negri, *Multitude: war and democracy in the age of empire* (London, Hamish Hamilton, 2005); P. Virno, *A grammar of the multitude*, trans. I. Bertoletti, James Cascaito and Andrea Casson (New York, Semiotext(e), 2004).
- ⁵² M. Augé, *Non-places: introduction to an anthropology of supermodernity*, trans. J. Howe (London, Verso, 1995 [1992]), p. 78. See also H. Foster, *Design and crime (and other diatribes)* (London, Verso, 2002).
- ⁵³ C. Lefort, cited in P. Fitzpatrick, 'Bare sovereignty: *Homo sacer* and the insistence of law', *Theory and event* 5 (2001), p. 11.

- ⁵⁴ The philosopher John Rajchman, for example, writes of ‘an exuberant detachment of form’ associated with what he terms “‘postindustrial’ electronic architecture’, and calls for a fundamental rethinking of current architectural practice. John Rajchman, *Constructions* (Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 1998), p. 30.
- ⁵⁵ See for example O. Enwezor *et al.*, *Documenta 11_Platform 1*.
- ⁵⁶ Hence the influence of the bio-physical sciences and a resurgent ‘naturalism’ within a variety of Deleuzian-inflected architectural writing and design. See for example M. DeLanda, ‘Deleuze and the use of the genetic algorithm in architecture’, in N. Leach (ed.), *Designing for a digital world* (Chichester, Wiley-Academy, 2002), pp. 117–20, and M. DeLanda, ‘Space: extensive and intensive, actual and virtual’, in I. Buchanan and G. Lambert, eds, *Deleuze and space* (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2005), pp. 80–88.