INTRODUCTION

Space, places and social control

Vijay Devadas & Anne Begg
Auckland University of Technology & University of Otago

There has been a proliferation of research on and about space as a strategic resource in recent years, not just in sociology but also across various disciplines including geography, communication studies, media studies, anthropology, film studies and cultural studies to name a few. This proliferation indicates that space matters, or more precisely that a theorization of space is crucial to understanding how regimes of power structure our lives. We are not suggesting that a critical mediation of space is recent; the works of Michel Foucault, Henri Lefebvre, Michel de Certeau and Edward Soja have interrogated the concept of space and deployed this as a key analytical category through which to understand power and everyday life. What we are saying though is that recently there has been a strong 'return' to, or reconsideration of, space motivated by the dominance of neoliberal globalization: an uneven, violent, and exclusionary assemblage of power and practices that has produced a social present marked by massive inequalities and environmental crisis. And it is to this terrain of debate on and about space that this issue of *borderlands* contributes.

Traversing different spaces—white supremacist colonial relations in Manitoba; migrant containment in the US; air, that which sustains life, in China; higher education; and the Australian beach—the articles in this issue address the operations of power (dominance, regularization, resistance), neoliberalism, globalization, identities, and politics through a spatial perspective. They reflect what Chantal Mouffe eloquently articulated, 'space poses the question of how we are going to live together. This is a crucial question, of course, for democratic politics' (2013, p. 22). The commitment to a critical discussion of space is, therefore, a political question, aimed at rethinking the democratic imperative, making sense of the biopolitical strategies of governance that dissect and inscribe exclusionary and inclusionary regimes to manage people and the environment (see contributions from Landertinger, Fowler, Nieuwenhuis, and Ellison and Hawkes), or recomposing the language of higher education in line with neoliberal

marketplace logic (see Katz's contribution). Collectively, the essays gathered here articulate the significance of thinking through the spatial —as a 'dimension' as Doreen Massey puts it (1992, p. 67)—that is foundational to and constitutive of the political, and as a dimension to critique contemporary politics.

The debate about what space is has been going on for some time now: suffice to say that there are certain views that have come to be agreed on, and consolidated, in academic discussion.[i] Here are some of the main tenets of its conceptualisation: space is not static, it is socially constructed, it is forged out of uneven relations of power (at global, national, grassroots levels) and it informs complex social, cultural and economic regimes. Space is multifaceted and perpetually changing. In short, space is the product of uneven shifting (inter)relations traversing every aspect of everyday life. As Massey puts it, we must think of 'space as constructed out of interrelations, as the simultaneous coexistence of social interrelations and interactions at all spatial scales, from the most local level to the most global' (1992, p. 80).

We need to urgently focus on space to rethink politics and democracy because, according to Massey, the violence of neoliberal globalization in the 1990s has been felt most intimately on space, that is the demarcation of space, its uneven splitting, has produced significant and glaring inequalities. To put it another way, the focus of neoliberal globalization is the reorganisation of space: its splitting, reconnections and redrawing. This is the argument Massey makes in 'Politics and Space/Time', a key contribution that argues for taking space seriously and which has been reinforced by other scholars. Clewer, Elsey and Certomà, for example, note that:

> In contrast to the cheerful image of future prosperity painted by the advocates of neoliberal globalisation in the 1990s, this world is marked by spatial manifestations of deep inequality where those with power and wealth increasingly resort to barricading themselves off from swelling ranks of the disenfranchised, sealing themselves inside enclosed enclaves of privilege whose creation simultaneously produces zones of exclusion. (Clewer, Elsey & Certomà 2012, p. 3).

This focus on space not only signals the ways in which neoliberal globalization has reorganized the many spatial scales that we occupy and are part of, but also emphasises how thinking through the spatial enables and develops 'a set of intellectual and political tools to bring analytical clarity and purchase on diverse situations' (Featherstone and Painter 2013, p. 2). This is an important point: focusing on space empowers us to engage with and intervene into modalities of constituting space founded upon and perpetuating forms of violence. It provides us the 'intellectual tools for understanding the contested nature of dependencies, interconnections and effects between the local and the global' (Wainwright 2013, p. 236). Space is thus both the scene of dominance and activism as Hilary Wainwright points out in her essay examining the production of counter-flows which reorganize space in ways that are much more equitable and which the people want. These

counter-flows, architectured by civic organisations, social movements, activists, and likeminded citizens who wish for a better future in cities such as Porto Alegre in Brazil, Cochabamba in Bolivia, and London in UK are material instantiations of thinking about another way of organising space, and therefore, life, politics and democracy. Further, and perhaps more importantly, from these examples we learn that the 'counter-flows it produced and reinforced, connecting the local to the global … [inspires] the confidence to resist' (Wainwright 2013, p. 236). In other words, another way, or other ways of organising space is possible. It is a dimension of multiplicity as the authors in this issue demonstrate: space is on the agenda as a site for hegemonic imposition, for closing down counter-flows and a site that enables counter-flows, reminding us of the importance of enabling other ways of being together.

Laura Landertinger in '"Hell Holes": Unmapping Settler Colonial Geographies and Child Welfare in Manitoba' examines the racial-spatial constructs that sustain white supremacist colonial relations in Manitoba, Canada. Settler colonial geographies situate Indigenous people in dysfunctional 'spaces of savagery' while allowing modern citizen-subjects to claim moral superiority from 'spaces of bourgeois respectability'. Once constructed, 'aboriginal spaces' are systematically renounced and vilified and held up 'as emblems of degeneracy and dysfunction' (this issue). As Landertinger explains, a reiterative colonial narrative justifies the construction and policing of 'aboriginal spaces' as the only way to contain and control the non-modern Natives who not only threaten the civilized but also need to be protected from themselves. Such narratives serve an imperialist agenda, one that seeks to characterize and discredit First Nation people as 'too dysfunctional to live self-determined lives, and most importantly, too dysfunctional to own the land' (this issue). Space, as Landertinger argues, is intimately tied to power; spatial enactments are also racial enactments and, especially in the settler colonial context, sovereign power is sustained and 'fundamentally rests on (re)articulations of land and space—as something that can be discovered, named, enclosed, developed and owned' (this issue).

After examining the material and symbolic construction of 'aboriginal spaces' in terms of Indian reserves and the remaking of the land around the reserves, Landertinger focuses on the city of Winnipeg, examining, first, its racial-spatial construction as a space from which aboriginal bodies 'must be expunged' (this issue). She then shows how the reiterative enactment of this racial-spatial discourse not only normalizes disproportionately high rates of Indigenous deaths but also endorses the violent removal of Indigenous children from their families. The statistics are alarming. In 2010, the Manitoba Office of the Children's Advocate reported that 'currently 86% of children in Manitoba's custody are Indigenous' and, furthermore, 'apprehensions through child welfare authorities constitute the number one reason why a First Nation child in Manitoba may no longer be living with their parents' (Landertinger, this issue). In the context of a racial/spatial discourse in which First Nation parents are imagined as degenerate and too dysfunctional to care for

their children, intervention by child welfare authorities becomes a necessity.

This racialized state violence is legitimized and shored up in contemporary media narratives which consistently portray 'Aboriginal spaces', whether in rural reserves or urban places, as spaces 'of savagery and chaos' and as 'manifestations of the degeneracy that is considered inherent to aboriginal culture' (this issue). Landertinger's interrogation of child welfare policies in Manitoba exposes the continuing racial-spatial constructs that condemn the Indigenous and situate white settler citizen-subjects as moral guardians and as the rightful owners of the land. It also demonstrates how the production of 'space' and 'place' works as a key factor in matters of social control and sovereign power in postcolonial societies.

Rebecca Fowler's contribution, 'U.S. Biopolitical Geographies of Migrant Containment' approaches notions of 'space' and 'place' through United States policies that currently target undocumented migrants, either as invisible 'fodder for the global, corporate capital machine' or as 'illegal' overstayers who must be tracked down, detained and/or deported. Fowler writes of 'a deathly biopolitical project' through which brown illegalized residents face detainment or deportation and the 'deadly hostile environs in desert treks' serve as a useful 'space' or 'place' of containment at the border (this issue). Foucault's concepts of biopower, biopolitics and state racism provide a fine platform from which to examine the implications of notions of 'space' and 'place'. For Foucault, biopolitical management of populations requires the creation of 'biopolitical enemies against whom society must defend itself' and, to this end, certain groups are singled out for exclusion (Fowler, this issue). Both the Indigenous brown body occupying 'aboriginal space' in Manitoba and the brown body constrained by 'illegal alien' status in the U.S. are 'marked by the state as an external threat, both to society and to state sovereignty and governmentality' (Fowler, this issue). Rather than operating to protect society from external threat, however, such biopolitical state racism works only to benefit the powerful private and public interests who profit from the subjugation and exploitation of the placeless and disenfranchised.

Fowler's own resistance to the use of the dehumanising term 'illegal alien' demonstrates how powerful forces work to maintain the status quo. As she discovered, staunch defenders of corporate interests regard any attempt to 'elevate undocumented immigrants from their subhuman status to fully human or to diminish the illusion of the danger they present as public safety and health hazards to the dominant white society' as an 'imminent threat to be quashed'. Defining undocumented persons as 'illegal', 'alien' and thus 'subhuman' is a deliberate biopolitical strategy that maintains white privilege and 'functions in the management of racialized populations whose inassimilability is a foregone conclusion' (Fowler this issue). As Fowler argues, in an age of neoliberal globalization, 'the ability to traverse space to make place

for oneself in the world,' has become a right accorded to some and denied to others (Walters 2010, cited in Fowler, this issue). The undocumented person can be made to literally vanish from the social place he or she once inhabited and 'caught up in the wastelands of state-managed violence … a countless number of them are made to disappear' (Fowler this issue). Against all forms of migrant containment and racialized governance of space and place, Fowler calls for compassionate open border policies that reject the supremacy of the neoliberal subject.

Marijn Nieuwenhuis, in 'The Governing of the Air: A Case Study of the Chinese Experience' links China's form of neoliberal governance with biopolitical strategies that confine the issue of air pollution to scientific systems of management and control while leaving underlying causes unchallenged and unaddressed. As Nieuwenhuis claims, 'air pollution and climate change are depoliticised as technological issues that just need 'smart' fixing (this issue). In order to maintain economic growth and socio-political stability, China focuses on pragmatic solutions determined by the 'interests of a capitalist system which in a very short period of time has become both the offender of its polluting and the primary supporter for its redesigning' (this issue).

Atmospheric pollution costs millions of lives annually, especially in developing countries, but despite this, a narrative is emerging in China 'in which the state is transformed from being an offender to a defender of the respiratory environment' (Nieuwenhuis, this issue). The fixing of the air is deemed to reside in more data and better technology and it is thanks to this instrumental approach that research on geoengineering and weather modification programmes have become popular subjects in public debates in China. An impressive number of initiatives, including almost 10,000 government-sanctioned environmental NGOs, are working with the state towards a 'collective struggle for clean air' (Zhang 2015, p.7, cited in Nieuwenhuis, this issue). Under this regime, the air is conceived as a controllable medium which translates itself in quantifiable output data to be collected and monitored for effective governance. Faith in technology is a running theme in all discussions on the challenge that the polluted air poses to existing politics.

However, as Nieuwenhuis claims, this approach to the governing of the air leaves no room for introducing political initiatives that could examine the bigger picture and question the policies that permit continuing air pollution and place people's health in jeopardy. Nieuwenhuis warns that the governing of the air is becoming increasingly 'securitised not only through scientific, but also military means' (this issue). Here, she is highlighting the fact that under neoliberal governance 'spaces' and 'places' must, even in the face of environmental disaster, function to serve the interests of capital gain and economic productivity. Nieuwenhuis concludes by calling for a return to the political, that is, to 'the crucial space necessary to think, debate and imagine alternative relationships to the air' (this issue).

Louise Katz invokes 'Corpspeak' and 'Zombilingo' in 'Feeding Greedy Corpses' to demonstrate how language-use functions in higher education to normalize economic parameters and to situate education as yet another major industry in a ubiquitous and monocultural neoliberal marketplace. As Katz explains, current incursions of 'inapt ideology-laden vocabulary and collocations' inculcate corporate values and economic rationalism as both reasonable and inevitable, while effectively undermining pedagogical scholarship and intellectual creativity (this issue). Katz highlights the difficulty of producing alternative ways of thinking and living while educative goals are couched in terms of business-oriented mission statements and the names 'student', 'academic' and 'university', for example, are reinscribed as 'client', 'productivity unit' and 'multi-output organisation' (this issue).

Katz's article is grounded in the statement that 'language is the most profound feature of any place' (Hustvedt 2005, cited in Katz, this issue). For Katz, Zombilingo and Corpspeak provide a space or place from which to consider the pervasive power of language as a transformative social force. Although closely related, these terms are not interchangeable. Corpspeak consists of 'linguistic imports into education from the business imaginary' while Zombilingo refers to the vocabulary of critical or creative thinkers which is appropriated by the business realm and then sold back to the academy 'having undergone a kind of psychic surgery' (this issue). Creativity, for example, is one of the most zombified of words. As opposed to meaning 'fresh ideas from an interplay of senses and intellect in the domain of imagination and intuition' it now refers to ways universities may be enjoined to develop 'creativity' in students and so prepare them to compete in the global marketplace. As Katz claims, while creativity involves activities that may yield a new understanding or artifact, or even the possibility of an original thought, 'it is a gross misnomer to consider it simply as a 'problem solving' mechanism for increasing profit' (this issue).

After discussing other examples of both Zombilingo and Corpspeak in academia, including the rhetorical power of the term 'consumer', Katz discusses the importance of subversion and the uptake of 'countermagics' against the effects of Zombilingo and Corpspeak. As Katz sees it, by claiming and utilising the transformative potential of language, we could 'come to see ourselves less as 'consumers' (with its implications of a rather passive grazing animal) and instead as 'citizens' (actively engaged social participants), in a 'society' rather than a 'marketplace'' (this issue).

Elizabeth Ellison and Lesley Hawkes explore the Australian beach as a cultural space that is often taken for granted but which deserves to be more thoroughly researched as a key component of understandings of national identity in 'Australian Beachspace: The Plurality of an Iconic Site'. Ellison and Hawkes utilise Edward Soja's Thirdspace (1996) and Doreen Massey's *For Space* (2005) as appropriate tools for developing the concept of beachspace, a term that 'embraces complexity and

nuance' and accounts for the beach as a 'complex, dynamic, changing and plural site' (this issue). Following Soja's notion of Thirdspace, the term beachspace provides a way of examining the beach as always under construction and as something more complex and slippery than any idea of place with fixed boundary allows. It also resonates with Massey's second proposition from *For Space*, in which she suggests it is imperative to understand that space has 'contemporaneous plurality' (2005, p. 31) (this issue). For Ellison and Hawkes then, Soja and Massey present complementary ideas that conceptualise 'space' in terms of both temporal and historic encounter and experience and as that which exists alongside and through the polysemic meaning-making inherent in the landscape.

Australian beachspace is examined first as a monolithic image and national icon whereby 'the beach' constitutes 'an integral component of international tourist campaigns as well as the featured location of exported popular television shows such as *Home and Away* and *Bondi Rescue*' (this issue). Ellison and Hawkes also discuss constructions of the beach as a monolithic idyllic space for purposes of tourism and as a place of nostalgic yearning as encapsulated in a subtitle 'the lure of where I am not' (this issue).

Of course, Australian beachspace can never be reduced to such an all-encompassing idyllic space. This was made abundantly clear when, in 2005, Cronulla beach in New South Wales became the setting of violent race riots. As Ellison and Hawkes argue, 'the myth of the egalitarian, monolithic beach is an illusion, consistently challenged by representations of culture in fictional texts and real life events' (this issue). This article utilises examples from Australian literary texts, popular texts, and films across multiple genre to highlight the capacity of beachspace to complicate interpretation and blur boundaries. The article also considers several understandings of beachspace in Aboriginal cultural heritage. For example, in her article titled 'The Beach as "Dreaming Place"' (2003), Anne Brewster describes it as 'a border zone where different temporalities conjoin' (p. 35) (cited by Ellison and Hawkes, this issue). In noting that 'Indigenous understandings of the beach differ greatly from Western understandings' Brewster draws attention to the importance of examining beachspace in terms of unassimilable cultural enunciation and ongoing struggle. The authors emphasise the importance of recognising that the 'social space [that is the Australian beach] is produced and structured by conflicts. [And] with this recognition, a democratic spatial politics begins' (Deutsche 1996, p. xxiv), one that affirms the centrality of indigenous culture, practices, and ways of relating to the land as constitutive of and foundational to understanding the beachspace; and this is a non-negotiable.

The interrogation of various spaces by the contributors, in their respective ways, emphasise that to ignore space 'is to greatly impoverish our political imaginations' (Featherstone and Painter 2013, p. 3), to ignore forms of violences, inequalities, and discriminations, and miss the important task of 'map[ping] power relations' (Massey 2013).

It also cuts short the possibility of constructing a political landscape that confronts the normativity of the present and engenders an equitable, non-discriminatory future that bears witness to differences and diversities. For 'space concerns our relations with each other and in fact social space … is a product of our relations with each other, our connections with each other' (Massey 2013). And by taking space seriously, 'we really re-imagine the world in a different way, it presents us with different political questions' (Massey 2013).

We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their comments, the authors for their contribution and our readership for their continued support.

Notes

[i] For a cogent overview of the debates, see Massey (1992) and Featherstone and Painter (2013).

References

Clewer, N, Elsey, D & Certomà, C 2012 'Introduction', in C Certomà, N Clewer & D Elsey (eds.), *The politics of space and place*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK.

Deutsche, R 1996 *Evictions: art and spatial politics*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, London, UK.

Featherstone, D & Painter, J 2013 'Introduction: "There is no point of departure": the many trajectories of Doreen Massey', in D Featherstone & J Painter (eds), *Spatial politics: essays for Doreen Massey*, Wiley-Blackwell, Malden USA, Oxford UK.

Massey, D 2013 'Doreen Massey on space', *Social Science Space,* a new podcast series with leading social scientists, 1 February, viewed 2 January, 2017, http://www.socialsciencespace.com/2013/02/podcastdoreen-massey-on-space/

——1992 'Politics and space/time', *New Left Review*, vol. 196, pp. 65-84.

Mouffe, C 2013 'Space, hegemony and radical critique', in D Featherstone & J Painter (eds), *Spatial politics: essays for Doreen Massey*, Wiley-Blackwell, Malden USA, Oxford UK.

Wainwright, H 2013 'Place beyond place and the politics of "empowerment"', in D Featherstone & J Painter (eds), *Spatial politics: essays for Doreen Massey*, Wiley-Blackwell, Malden USA, Oxford UK.