SPACE POWER FOUCAULT

SYNOPSIS

This paper is concerned with the built and urban environment as a response, creation and a mechanism of 'Power-Knowledge' from Michel Foucault's theoretical framework. The term 'Power-Knowledge' refers to the power structures established in society through the creation, maintenance and existence through established system of knowledge, culture and social norms. This effects the built environment because the built environment is formed and shaped to facilitate the structures of 'Power & Knowledge", as epitomised in the planning and utopian vision of Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon and the radial and highly ordered urban planning of the late enlightenment period. Power structures, relations and their effects, are actualized and stabilized through their integration into formalized structures. This perspective negates the role of the designer architect, planner and other formative principles of design, as it focuses on the main forces that shape design of the urban environment as those governed by the power-knowledge relations. Therefore the authorship of urban design is not the designer, politicians and owners, it is the power and knowledge and it structure of dispersing hierarchy, discipline and norms of the social and cultural body.

The paper is focused on Power & Knowledge structures and how they are manifested within the Modern and contemporary urban Western context. Foucault identifies the role of surveillance as being the main force of power structures within the modern period and its effect and use of space and planning. This principle of surveillance and its effect on space and thus the built environment for Foucault is critical to modern power relations in its establishing of institutions and the individualisation of actors within, surveillance thus becomes the governing theme of enlightenment and modern space, as the institution becomes central in the formation of power relations. This core principle is also a key element of urban public space which is epitomised with the Haussmanisation of Paris. The role of surveillance and the ordering of public space and form, works within two perspectives. The

1

first is the physical effect of controlling and the appearance of controlling space through surveillance and ordering. The next is at the utopian level, where the grand radial planning and absolute visibility expresses the theme of ordering and surveillance of the individual and social body within the mechanism of power.

The focus of this paper was to understand the contemporary power and knowledge relations within the public space of Sydney. From my travels I wanted to understand a cultural linage of the manipulation and creation of public space within the western tradition. Drawing from Paris and its rich history of urban design, a contemporary theme of power and public space becomes obvious, not only surveillance has become the central focus Centrifugal urbanism and the increase of 'public space' owned by private interests has become the dominate theme. Whereby the historical and established quarters of the city (or the whole city !) becoming gentrified territories, leaving the sprawl and its relationship with the city as the contemporary embodiment of the current power structures.

SPACE POWER FOUCAULT

What has always eluded me in my understanding of our urban environment is what are the formative reasons or causes. Is it the response of market and economic forces, politics, architectural and planning interventions and responses. These reasons seem to successfully provide a logical explanation but they always address the urban and the city as a result of socio-economic or cultural forces. Unsatisfactorily the city and the urban is seen as a by-product and not an entity of itself that is equally evolved in the formation of the social and cultural body and the individual.

Foucault's concept of Power-Knowledge offers a theoretical perspective of interpreting the urban fabric as an integral factor in the formation of the cultural and social. Power structures, relations and their effects, are actualized and stabilized through their integration into formalized structures.

At the risk of oversimplification, Foucault's notion of 'power' is not to be considered in the colloquial understanding, it is a far more complex, intricate and omnipresent. For Foucault 'power' is co-extensive with society, it regulates and is utterly pervasive. "Power reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday life." (Foucault, M. Power/Knowledge pg 39).

'Power' cannot be captured in a dichotomous construct of dominators and dominated. It can be an oppressive agent in society, yet is the also the creative. It is the implementation which creates our cultural and social circumstances. Foucault illustrates how power is embodied in cultural and material institutions, including architectural manifestations as examined in his analysis of the panopticon. In the study of the panopticon Foucault is illustrating that architecture may become an apparatus for creating and

sustaining power relationships independent of the persons who operate it. (Foucault, M. Discipline & Punishment. pg 201) In other words, architectural form can help to engender a form of social control. (Leach, N. Architecture and Revolution. pg 120)

Foucault traces the history or genealogy of power relations and how Power (more specifically Power-Knowledge) is constructive and the result of a particular period. In effect power is historicised, its particular quality and effects and nature belong to a particular period of history, cultural and social relations. In summary Foucault identifies an essential shift in power relations, from the top down powers of the sovereign and monarch to disciplinary modern and contemporary power relations where the power of the elite is not visible and difficult to comprehend. This paradigm shift is important because it marks the creation of the modern and contemporary period and how we are formed within the social body.

In traditional forms of power, like that of the sovereign, power itself is made visible, brought out into the open, put constantly on display. The multitudes are kept in the shadows, appearing only at the edges of power's brilliant glow. Disciplinary power reverses these relations. Now, it is power itself which seeks invisibility and the objects – those on whom it operates – are made the most visible. It is this fact of surveillance, constant visibility, which is the key to disciplinary technology. Whereas in monarchical regimes it was the sovereign who had the greatest visibility, under the institutions it is those who are to be disciplined, observed, and understood who are made the most visible.

The panopticon introduces the basic ideas of 'Power', 'Power-Knowledge and discipline. On the first level of understanding, the Panopticon or the Panopticon machine illustrates the obvious influence and discipline surveillance or the appearance of surveillance in controlling behaviour and the pedagogical exertion of discipline over the body. To quote Bentham to 'grind rogues honest'. The goal of the Panopticon is to individualise the body, allowing the body to be isolated and clearly displayed rendering it docile to the norms of allowed behaviour.

This importance in surveillance does not just belong to the prison, but to institutions and as Foucault believes the modern era. The Panopticon is an obtuse example that clearly introduces the concept of surveillance working within and with regimes of power and knowledge. Within the Panopticon knowledge is the ordering, standardising and the theoretical and ideological motivation for the building, with power it is the reason why the building and institutions exists. 'Power is productive of knowledge and knowledge is productive of power'. It is the power of the gaze that ties the workings of Power-Knowledge as a disciplinary and normalising force, because it enforces control, without surveillance there would be no control mechanism.

Knowledge acting through institutions (such as the Panopticon) and ordered by knowledge regularizes, distributes, standardises and orders, where the individual is isolated and individualised allowing observation and the implementation of control mechanisms. Control mechanisms or the knowledge of, forces the subject into compliance. Foucault labels this as the 'normalizing individuation', where subjects are constructed in institutions in such a way that they too become a resource of power. Military cadets, factory workers, hospital patients, insane asylum patients, school children, and so on. The prime example is the production of an individual through an institution that not only produces material for the institution but advocates and supports it, but becomes integrated in the knowledge system of the institution. Power structures, relations and their effects, are actualized and stabilized through their integration into formalized structures. Institutions, not understood in the formal sense as an entity but as a social practice are a result. This result is not merely productive, but reproductive of the very relations which presuppose it. Subjects are thus transformed into beings of a particular type whose conduct is patterned and governed, attributes and skills, and too the greater extent thinking and ideological position.

One point I think needs to be made clear is the precise role of surveillance, and its spatial importance. In formative institutional structures, or as latter I will illustrate within public space, ordering, rationalising and demarcation of space is ineffective if the knowledge of the institution or social norm is not respected and ignored. The importance of space and structure is

5

to furnish surveillance and the threat of correction and retribution, it is the active force that enforces or encourages normalisation. If the gaze within the panopticon was ignored, the ordering, partitioning and rationalising of the space of the prison would merely be material, the intended reproduction of Power-Knowledge relations and structure would evaporate.

Disciplinary power and Power-Knowledge relations are not specific to institutional bodies. Foucault forwarded that the modern era, including the Enlightenment 'power is productive of knowledge and knowledge is productive of power'. The formation of Power-Knowledge differs from a sovereign or monarchical power relationships is that knowledge systems are the productive means of ordering establishing networks, not the rule of the sole elite. The elite have been replaced with a homogeneous network of knowledge's (ie ideologies, utopias assumed objective truths deduced from science and cultural norms) that are formative and reproductive of power.

According to Foucault institutions are essential, because they house and are 'sites' of Power-Knowledge. Institutions, schools, hospitals and insane asylums, and so on, were all individuals are trained and judge, are sites of and centres of power-knowledge. But institutions exist and function within the larger social body. Institutions do not exist in physical isolation, they exist within the greater structure of the state, city and the urban and the domestic. The city and urban space ties together, reproduce, expand and forms the power-knowledge that are produced within the sites of institutions, where according to Foucault surveillance still is the disciplinary controlling mechanism.

"If power were never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but say no, do you think one could be brought to obey it? What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things; it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body, much more than as a negative whose function is repression". (Foucault. Power/knowledge)

Power-Knowledge relations can be expanded from the institutional to the 'public spaces' of the urban environment. Institutions need a context to function within. Public space and the physical networks of the city and urban provide another level of institutionalising of the social body and individual. The pre- modern urban space supported the existing regime of power relations, as is discussed further in the paper. In the modern period Foucault saw the Panopticon as synonymous with the public space. Not only the physical similarity, but the same spatial effect of isolating the individual and normalising through surveillance. Not only the question of surveillance but the Power-knowledge relations that form the fabric, the reasons for the planning, portioning and formation of boundaries and transport networks through regimes of the knowledge that are the ultimate judge and modifier of the social body. Within public space surveillance is still the key to Foucault's conception of the workings of power. It is the binding element that solidifies and generates discipline.

A parallel to this thinking of urban space as productive and reproductive of power and the inhabitants as actors is the view of Lefebvre. In Summary Lefebvre view is that the urban is a 'form without content'. The city creates nothing, rather the city and the urban centralises creation. It affords the formal situation and site for exchange and proximity to take place. The urban is a place of encounter, assembly, simultaneity. But the form of the urban and city has no specific content, it is an abstraction, a concrete abstraction of pure form.

This position parallels with Foucault's because the urban and public space affords not only a vessel of social and cultural interaction and production, but its form and ability to shape its contents is recognised not as bilateral relationship, but a symbiotic and reproductive.

Public Space and Power

In older forms of socio political structure, Foucault refers to the 17th and 18th century, visibility was essential. Spectacles of terror and punishment as well as those of patronage and benevolence acted as a kind of 'natural policing'. Public space was formed to facilitate the spectacle that displayed the power of the monarch or sole ruling body. Power vested in the pre-modern period is obvious and easy to comprehend because of it unilateral and top down nature.

Throughout my travels these observations of historical public spaces of spectacle were of great importance because of the complete lack of this typology within Australia. Australia does have architecture and spaces of spectacle, but they don't belong within the public realm as rich as the examples I will extrapolate and weren't conceived with strong purpose of reproducing and creation Power-Knowledge relationships as per the pre-modern period. This is because Australia was densely urbanised post the 19th century, where public space and the spectacle were of different importance. It is impossible to surpass the tourist gaze and the social and cultural context these places were conceived in, but one thing all the places shared was the ability to display spectacles of activity or display the architecture of patronage or oppression.

The medieval, gothic and renaissance city of Florence provided the richest encounter of the role of spectacle within public space. The piazza outside the steps of Palazzo Vecchio provided a theatre for the observation and display of the power of the Commune and later the power of the Medici's. It provided a physical place for the performance of spectacle and the display of cultural and social benevolence. These functions were later added to with the later addition of the Loggia della Signoria which functioned as a meeting place, site of public pronouncements and a showcase for the Medici's family collection en plein air. The piazza also provides a platform for the display of the civic grandeur of Piazza Vecchio.

The piazza and the city is spatially unconcerned with the observation of the inhabitants, but solely concerned with the visibility of the power of the elites though civic buildings and.

This example of Florence gives fruit to an interesting argument that our conception of public space of medieval, gothic and renaissance Europe as romantised and idealised. I have often found these conceptions of 'public space' as glorified social space with egalitarian and socialist overtones. In effect 'public space' served to proved spectacle and political theatre, other than domestic duties such as cleaning, eating and so on that have been internalise into the family home. From Foucault position much of the public space such as piazzas, were conceived and functioned to maintain the status quo of the elites through the display of spectacles and benelvance.

Another striking example of 'public space' for the purpose of display for the elites is the medieval city of Avignon. The particular example I like to draw upon is the 'public space' immediately outside the entrance of the Avignon Papacy of the medieval period. This space forms a large piazza, separating the urban fabric from the Papacy. Although interpreted as 'public space' this space was specifically designed and used for the display of Papal supreme power to the public of the period.

The Jodphur Fort in Jodphur Rajatsan India is also an exemplary example of pre modern architecture designed for the spectacle of power. Although not apart of western history, the expression of absolute power is universal. The sandstone fort sits on a natural hill, surrounded by dense urban sprawl on all sides. The fort is physically disconnected from the urban surrounding through its vertical position over the city and physical access. The only historical road access is the utilitarian path up the side of the hill with no intention of a grand site for spectacle. This physical disconnection creates a complete disconnection with the ruling and oppressive monarchs with the populace, the only visual connection the population had was with the fort. The spectacle of the fort is the shear massing, size and its physical command of the city, territory and landscape. The design of the fort other than military defence was to encourage the relationship of the absolute ruling monarchical sovereign, a spectacle of complete repression.

The architecture and treatment of space in the pre-modern period is easy to comprehend because it is unilateral and is directed from the top down. This is different in comparison to the enlightenment, modern and contemporary period were the visibility and surveillance has shifted from the rulers and the elites to the ruled. According to Foucault the nature of space and power of the emergent modern and modern period took on a new nature in the mechanisms of producing power-knowledge relationships. Visibility and surveillance worked together with the knowledge of ordering, rationalisation, impersonal, utopia and the utopian 'scientific' man to create and urban fabric that established, simple, disciplined and everyday patterns that facilitated the new industrial city and institutions of power and wealth. This conception of modern power is once again exampled in the form of the panopticon. Qualities of the panopticon, ordering, regularizing, standardising individualising and the binding factor of surveillance are transcended from the panopticon into the urban fabric of the modern city. The urban fabric is engendered and planned with a scope to normalise the individual to become a functional and docile mechanism within the Power-Knowledge dynamics of an industrial city.

Foucault's concept of modern Power-Knowledge and discipline through surveillance of the modern city urban environment is clearly articulated within the planning of Paris. The Power-Knowledge relations that were being conceived in the modern period is exactly what was done through Hausmann and the post Hausmann regularisation of Paris. In general the regularisation and standardisation of Paris produced two major effects to the fabric of the city. The cutting of the straight wide boulevards through the medieval fabric of Paris rendering streets that were for walking to work, shopping and socialising into corridors of relative high speed movement, transport and communication. The goal was to link, to put into communication, and get rid of sinuosity. Pace and commerce of the city was quickened and adapted for new industrial mechanisms of production, transport, business and work. The wide

Boulevards also converged to a central radial points allowing visibility and central points throughout the city.

The building fabric was similarly conceived on the basis of social patterns and the new bourgeoisie's ideas of order. This is particularly apparent in the cultural institutions sponsored by the bourgeoisie, as epitomized in the Barcelona Opera and the Paris Opera. In housing design, uniform facades and apartment buildings as opposed to townhouses formed the new fabric. Separate districts were also formed to separate the middle class from the working class, enforcing and reproducing the social geography and gradual gentrification of the city.

The cover page illustration of 19th century Paris illustrates an interpretation of the city and the cities spaces as comprised of the grand boulevards, radial planning and the buildings of civic and institutional importance, virtue and influence. The Boulevards and selected buildings are grossly out of scale to the rest of the cities fabric, ignoring and shrinking the old quarters and working class districts. The only buildings shown are those of civic and institutional importance. Paris and its urban space is visualised as solely comprised, ordered and governed by the boulevards and visually dominated by the selected buildings.

The construction of the boulevards also had a social function in combating urban rioting and upheavals. The radial planned boulevards allowed for visibility and efficient troop deployment in large numbers and usage of weaponry such as the machine gun. The main nullify effect of the 'rationalisation' of Paris on potential civil disobedience was creating larger streets and public spaces that required excessive crowds number to compromises the flow of the street. In the previous street setting a small crowd of protestors could easy gain momentum as a crowd in the confined spaces of the medieval streets, which was the case in the French Revolution. A small crowd could command a given public space and gain support, making potential successful public unrest volatile. The new boulevards required numbers on grand scale to gain momentum and even greater numbers to create disobedience.

It is not the surveillance of the crowd that I believe Foucault identifies is the formative surveillance principle of normalising individuals within the urban environment. It is the surveillance of the individual. The individual can never escape visibility from other inhabitants and the perceived gaze of monumental civic buildings, or find seclusion as per the historic quarters. Behaviour is under constant observation and unless the public space is heavily occupied anonymity is impossible. Just as the panopticon, the form of the urban and public space is regularised and standardised to facilitate the functioning of the industrial city, but the provision of surveillance and appearance of, attempts to discipline the urban and normalise individuals to function and reproduce the norms of the established power-relations. The generators or those who command power seek invisibility, but the objects those on whom it operates are made the most visible.

Therefore who held the power in the modernisation of Paris, the industrialists and the rising middle class are the obvious candidates, and it was the working class that power operated on to the greatest extent. This is obvious prior to any contribution of Foucault, as clearly stated above. From Foucault perceptive the working class are the objects of power because they have become the visible, and it is there necessary utilisation of public space that becomes visible. The middle class of Paris gained surveillance of its urban territory, removing anonymity and the domestic from the streets, replacing it with clear circulation, and observation.

But like the panopticon if the prisoners rebelled the panopticon would fail. Urban discipline can easily fail if the rules of power are ignored. In Speed and Politics, by Virlio introduces the book in illustrating the Parisian Boulevards in the 70s and 80s and unemployed me took to the street. Crowd masses and crowd cohesion can usurp the existing power relations within public space. The individual becomes absorbed into a body that is intolerant of observation and the norms of public space. The effect of the boulevards in normalising individuals is ignored. However military physical crowd control is still brutally efficient.

The Hausmannisation of Paris ultimately replaced existing housing for the working class of Paris with middle class apartment housing. Public space and boulevards no longer facilitated the working class of Paris. Surveillance of the occupants of the city no longer facilitated important power relations, as those power is exercised on(as per the prisoner) have been shifted to outskirts, suburbs and satellite cities of Paris, leading to the gentrification of Paris. The creation of extensive transport networks into the city allowing for working class housing and public space to be shift beyond the outskirts of the city. Paris ultimately becoming the territory of the middle class, whilst the working class shifted into the new suburbs and satellite cities of Paris, all in proximity to provide labour to Paris.

The contemporary power relations of Paris are not being played out in the boulevards of Paris. Socio and political Power-Knowledge relations of the city are being played between the city of Paris and the banlieue.

POWER-KNOWLEDGE & CENTRIFUGAL URBANISM
Is Surveillance Relevant?

The current urban development of Paris from the 40-50s has been focused on centrifugal urbanism. Centrifugal urbanism refers to urban development that is a prescribed outward push that is unconcerned with densification but expansion and a horizontal matting. The formation of satellite cities the growth of the banlieue and respective transportation network is the result within Paris, and in terms of the banlieue identical to Sydney.

The satellite cities and the banlieue of Paris is the response and the mutual creation of the current socio-cultural geography of Paris. At the time of my travels in late 2005 there were extensive riots throughout the satellite cities and banlieue of Paris. The rioters being unemployed and dissatisfied youth from predominately migrant families. These occurrences did not occur in a vacuum, centrifugal urbanism has allowed for a push of the working class,

new immigrant families and the unemployed out and beyond the established boundaries of the city. The boulevards and the networks of power of the city are no longer important in the control of crowds and the act of normalising the individual of the working class. Power relations and crowd control are played at an entirely different urban scale. Whilst the city of Paris has become gentrified, the working class have been geographically isolated and only in a proximity to provide cheap labour.

Surveillance or the appearance of, still is effective. The urban fabric of the of this form of urbanism contains little meaningful public space, and existing public space is increasingly controlled by various forms of surveillance and increasing invested with private meanings. There is a complete lack of anonymity, the individual due to the lack of density and public space is always visible. The only public space amongst the crowd is within prescribed boundaries such as the shopping centre.

This is exemplified with the area of Cretel south east of Paris. As per the mapping, the housing ignores any form of street address of creation of public space. The individual outside their dwelling is completely visible and isolated. Through this urban fabric the individual becomes normalised into a discipline that maintains there position by limiting access to public space and social cohesion.

What has always eluded me in my understanding of our urban environment is what are the formative reasons or causes. Is it the response of market and economic forces, politics, architectural and planning interventions and responses. These reasons seem to successfully provide a logical explanation but they always address the urban and the city as a result of socio-economic or cultural forces. Unsatisfactorily the city and the urban is seen as a by-product and not an entity of itself that is equally evolved in the formation of the social and cultural body and the individual.

Foucault's concept of Power-Knowledge offers a theoretical perspective of interpreting the urban fabric as an integral factor in the formation of the cultural and social. Power structures, relations and their

effects, are actualized and stabilized through their integration into formalized structures.

At the risk of oversimplification, Foucault's notion of 'power' is not to be considered in the colloquial understanding, it is a far more complex, intricate and omnipresent. For Foucault 'power' is co-extensive with society, it regulates and is utterly pervasive. "Power reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday life." (Foucault, M. Power/Knowledge pg 39).

'Power' cannot be captured in a dichotomous construct of dominators and dominated. It can be an oppressive agent in society, yet is the also the creative. It is the implementation which creates our cultural and social circumstances. Foucault illustrates how power is embodied in cultural and material institutions, including architectural manifestations as examined in his analysis of the panopticon. In the study of the panopticon Foucault is illustrating that architecture may become an apparatus for creating and sustaining power relationships independent of the persons who operate it. (Foucault, M. Discipline & Punishment. pg 201) In other words, architectural form can help to engender a form of social control. (Leach, N. Architecture and Revolution. pg 120)

Foucault traces the history or genealogy of power relations and how Power (more specifically Power-Knowledge) is constructive and the result of a particular period. In effect power is historicised, its particular quality and effects and nature belong to a particular period of history, cultural and social relations. In summary Foucault identifies an essential shift in power relations, from the top down powers of the sovereign and monarch to disciplinary modern and contemporary power relations where the power of the elite is not visible and difficult to comprehend. This paradigm shift is important because it marks the creation of the modern and contemporary period and how we are formed within the social body.

In traditional forms of power, like that of the sovereign, power itself is made visible, brought out into the open, put constantly on display. The multitudes are kept in the shadows, appearing only at the edges of power's brilliant glow. Disciplinary power reverses these relations. Now, it is power itself which seeks invisibility and the objects – those on whom it operates – are made the most visible. It is this fact of surveillance, constant visibility, which is the key to disciplinary technology. Whereas in monarchical regimes it was the sovereign who had the greatest visibility, under the institutions it is those who are to be disciplined, observed, and understood who are made the most visible.

The panopticon introduces the basic ideas of 'Power', 'Power-Knowledge and discipline. On the first level of understanding, the Panopticon or the Panopticon machine illustrates the obvious influence and discipline surveillance or the appearance of surveillance in controlling behaviour and the pedagogical exertion of discipline over the body. To quote Bentham to 'grind rogues honest'. The goal of the Panopticon is to individualise the body, allowing the body to be isolated and clearly displayed rendering it docile to the norms of allowed behaviour.

This importance in surveillance does not just belong to the prison, but to institutions and as Foucault believes the modern era. The Panopticon is an obtuse example that clearly introduces the concept of surveillance working within and with regimes of power and knowledge. Within the Panopticon knowledge is the ordering, standardising and the theoretical and ideological motivation for the building, with power it is the reason why the building and institutions exists. 'Power is productive of knowledge and knowledge is productive of power'. It is the power of the gaze that ties the workings of Power-Knowledge as a disciplinary and normalising force, because it enforces control, without surveillance there would be no control mechanism.

Knowledge acting through institutions (such as the Panopticon) and ordered by knowledge regularizes, distributes, standardises and orders, where the individual is isolated and individualised allowing observation and the implementation of control mechanisms. Control mechanisms or the knowledge of, forces the subject into compliance. Foucault labels this as the

'normalizing individuation', where subjects are constructed in institutions in such a way that they too become a resource of power. Military cadets, factory workers, hospital patients, insane asylum patients, school children, and so on. The prime example is the production of an individual through an institution that not only produces material for the institution but advocates and supports it, but becomes integrated in the knowledge system of the institution. Power structures, relations and their effects, are actualized and stabilized through their integration into formalized structures. Institutions, not understood in the formal sense as an entity but as a social practice are a result. This result is not merely productive, but reproductive of the very relations which presuppose it. Subjects are thus transformed into beings of a particular type whose conduct is patterned and governed, attributes and skills, and too the greater extent thinking and ideological position.

One point I think needs to be made clear is the precise role of surveillance, and its spatial importance. In formative institutional structures, or as latter I will illustrate within public space, ordering, rationalising and demarcation of space is ineffective if the knowledge of the institution or social norm is not respected and ignored. The importance of space and structure is to furnish surveillance and the threat of correction and retribution, it is the active force that enforces or encourages normalisation. If the gaze within the panopticon was ignored, the ordering, partitioning and rationalising of the space of the prison would merely be material, the intended reproduction of Power-Knowledge relations and structure would evaporate.

Disciplinary power and Power-Knowledge relations are not specific to institutional bodies. Foucault forwarded that the modern era, including the Enlightenment 'power is productive of knowledge and knowledge is productive of power'. The formation of Power-Knowledge differs from a sovereign or monarchical power relationships is that knowledge systems are the productive means of ordering establishing networks, not the rule of the sole elite. The elite have been replaced with a homogeneous network of knowledge's (ie ideologies, utopias assumed objective truths deduced from science and cultural norms) that are formative and reproductive of power.

According to Foucault institutions are essential, because they house and are 'sites' of Power-Knowledge. Institutions, schools, hospitals and insane insylums, and so on, were all individuals are trained and judge, are sites of and centres of power-knowledge. But institutions exist and function within the larger social body. Institutions do not exist in physical isolation, they exist within the greater structure of the state, city and the urban and the domestic. The city and urban space ties together, reproduce, expand and forms the power-knowledge that are produced within the sites of institutions, where according to Foucault surveillance still is the disciplinary controlling mechanism.

"If power were never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but say no, do you think one could be brought to obey it? What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things; it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body, much more than as a negative whose function is repression". (Foucault. Power/knowledge)

Power-Knowledge relations can be expanded from the institutional to the 'public spaces' of the urban environment. Institutions need a context to function within. Public space and the physical networks of the city and urban provide another level of institutionalising of the social body and individual. The pre- modern urban space supported the existing regime of power relations, as is discussed further in the paper. In the modern period Foucault saw the Panopticon as synonymous with the public space. Not only the physical similarity, but the same spatial effect of isolating the individual and normalising through surveillance. Not only the question of surveillance but the Power-knowledge relations that form the fabric, the reasons for the planning, portioning and formation of boundaries and transport networks through regimes of the knowledge that are the ultimate judge and modifier of the social body. Within public space surveillance is still the key to Foucault's

conception of the workings of power. It is the binding element that solidifies and generates discipline.

A parallel to this thinking of urban space as productive and reproductive of power and the inhabitants as actors is the view of Lefebvre. In Summary Lefebvre view is that the urban is a 'form without content'. The city creates nothing, rather the city and the urban centralises creation. It affords the formal situation and site for exchange and proximity to take place. The urban is a place of encounter, assembly, simultaneity. But the form of the urban and city has no specific content, it is an abstraction, a concrete abstraction of pure form.

This position parallels with Foucault's because the urban and public space affords not only a vessel of social and cultural interaction and production, but its form and ability to shape its contents is recognised not as bilateral relationship, but a symbiotic and reproductive.

Public Space and Power

In older forms of socio political structure, Foucault refers to the 17th and 18th century, visibility was essential. Spectacles of terror and punishment as well as those of patronage and benevolence acted as a kind of 'natural policing'. Public space was formed to facilitate the spectacle that displayed the power of the monarch or sole ruling body. Power vested in the pre-modern period is obvious and easy to comprehend because of it unilateral and top down nature.

Throughout my travels these observations of historical public spaces of spectacle were of great importance because of the complete lack of this typology within Australia. Australia does have architecture and spaces of spectacle, but they don't belong within the public realm as rich as the

examples I will extrapolate and weren't conceived with strong purpose of reproducing and creation Power-Knowledge relationships as per the pre-modern period. This is because Australia was densely urbanised post the 19th century, where public space and the spectacle were of different importance. It is impossible to surpass the tourist gaze and the social and cultural context these places were conceived in, but one thing all the places shared was the ability to display spectacles of activity or display the architecture of patronage or oppression.

The medieval, gothic and renaissance city of Florence provided the richest encounter of the role of spectacle within public space. The piazza outside the steps of Palazzo Vecchio provided a theatre for the observation and display of the power of the Commune and later the power of the Medici's. It provided a physical place for the performance of spectacle and the display of cultural and social benevolence. These functions were later added to with the later addition of the Loggia della Signoria which functioned as a meeting place, site of public pronouncements and a showcase for the Medici's family collection en plein air. The piazza also provides a platform for the display of the civic grandeur of Palazzo Vecchio.

 The piazza and the city is spatially unconcerned with the observation of the inhabitants, but solely concerned with the visibility of the power of the elites though civic buildings and.

 This example of Florence gives fruit to an interesting argument that our conception of public space of medieval, gothic and renaissance Europe as romanticised and idealised. I have often found these conceptions of 'public space' as glorified social space with egalitarian and socialist overtones. In effect 'public space' served to proved spectacle and political theatre, other than domestic duties such as cleaning, eating and so on that have been internalise into the family home. From Foucault position much of the public space such as piazzas, were conceived and functioned to maintain the status quo of the elites through the display of spectacles and benevolence.

 Another striking example of 'public space' for the purpose of display for the elites is the medieval city of Avignon. The particular example I like to draw upon is the 'public space' immediately outside the entrance of the Avignon

Papacy of the medieval period. This space forms a large piazza, separating the urban fabric from the Papacy. Although interpreted as 'public space' this space was specifically designed and used for the display of Papal supreme power to the public of the period.

The Jodphur Fort in Jodphur Rajatsan India is also an exemplary example of pre modern architecture designed for the spectacle of power. Although not apart of western history, the expression of absolute power is universal. The sandstone fort sits on a natural hill, surrounded by dense urban sprawl on all sides. The fort is physically disconnected from the urban surrounding through its vertical position over the city and physical access. The only historical road access is the utilitarian path up the side of the hill with no intention of a grand site for spectacle. This physical disconnection creates a complete disconnection with the ruling and oppressive monarchs with the populace, the only visual connection the population had was with the fort. The spectacle of the fort is the shear massing, size and its physical command of the city, territory and landscape. The design of the fort other than military defence was to encourage the relationship of the absolute ruling monarchical sovereign, a spectacle of complete repression.

The architecture and treatment of space in the pre-modern period is easy to comprehend because it is unilateral and is directed from the top down. This is different in comparison to the enlightenment, modern and contemporary period were the visibility and surveillance has shifted from the rulers and the elites to the ruled. According to Foucault the nature of space and power of the emergent modern and modern period took on a new nature in the mechanisms of producing power-knowledge relationships. Visibility and surveillance worked together with the knowledge of ordering, rationalisation, impersonal, utopia and the utopian 'scientific' man to create and urban fabric that established, simple, disciplined and everyday patterns that facilitated the new industrial city and institutions of power and wealth. This conception of modern power is once again exampled in the form of the panopticon. Qualities of the panopticon, ordering, regularizing, standardising

individualising and the binding factor of surveillance are transcended from the panopticon into the urban fabric of the modern city. The urban fabric is engendered and planned with a scope to normalise the individual to become a functional and docile mechanism within the Power-Knowledge dynamics of an industrial city.

Foucault's concept of modern Power-Knowledge and discipline through surveillance of the modern city urban environment is clearly articulated within the planning of Paris. The Power-Knowledge relations that were being conceived in the modern period is exactly what was done through Hausmann and the post Hausamann regularisation of Paris. In general the regularisation and standardisation of Paris produced two major effects to the fabric of the city. The cutting of the straight wide boulevards through the medieval fabric of Paris rendering streets that were for walking to work, shopping and socialising into corridors of relative high speed movement, transport and communication. The goal was to link, to put into communication, and get rid of sinuosity. Pace and commerce of the city was quickened and adapted for new industrial mechanisms of production, transport, business and work. The wide Boulevards also converge to a central radial points allowing visibility and central points throughout the city.

The building fabric was similarly conceived on the basis of social patterns and the new bourgeoisie's ideas of order. This is particularly apparent in the cultural institutions sponsored by the bourgeoisie, as epitomized in the Barcelona Opera and the Paris Opera. In housing design, uniform facades and apartment buildings as opposed to townhouses formed the new fabric. Separate districts were also formed to separate the middle class from the working class, enforcing and reproducing the social geography and gradual gentrification of the city.

The cover page illustration of 19th century Paris illustrates an interpretation of the city and the cities spaces as comprised of the grand boulevards, radial planning and the buildings of civic and institutional importance, virtue and influence. The Boulevards and selected buildings are grossly out of scale to the rest of the cities fabric, ignoring and shrinking the old quarters and working class districts. The only buildings shown are those

of civic and institutional importance. Paris and its urban space is visualised as solely comprised, ordered and governed by the boulevards and visually dominated by the selected buildings.

The construction of the boulevards also had a social function in combating urban rioting and upheavals. The radial planned boulevards allowed for visibility and efficient troop deployment in large numbers and usage of weaponry such as the machine gun. The main nullify effect of the 'rationalisation' of Paris on potential civil disobedience was creating larger streets and public spaces that required excessive crowds number to compromises the flow of the street. In the previous street setting a small crowd of protestors could easy gain momentum as a crowd in the confined spaces of the medieval streets, which was the case in the French Revolution. A small crowd could command a given public space and gain support, making potential successful public unrest volatile. The new boulevards required numbers on grand scale to gain momentum and even greater numbers to create disobedience.

It is not the surveillance of the crowd that I believe Foucault identifies is the formative surveillance principle of normalising individuals within the urban environment. It is the surveillance of the individual. The individual can never escape visibility from other inhabitants and the perceived gaze of monumental civic buildings, or find seclusion as per the historic quarters. Behaviour is under constant observation and unless the public space is heavily occupied anonymity is impossible. Just as the panopticon, the form of the urban and public space is regularised and standardised to facilitate the functioning of the industrial city, but the provision of surveillance and appearance of, attempts to discipline the urban and normalise individuals to function and reproduce the norms of the established power-relations. The generators or those who command power seek invisibility, but the objects those on whom it operates are made the most visible.

Therefore who held the power in the modernisation of Paris, the industrialists and the rising middle class are the obvious candidates, and it was the working class that power operated on to the greatest extent. This is obvious prior to

any contribution of Foucault, as clearly stated above. From Foucault perceptive the working class are the objects of power because they have become the visible, and it is there necessary utilisation of public space that becomes visible. The middle class of Paris gained surveillance of its urban territory, removing anonymity and the domestic from the streets, replacing it with clear circulation, and observation.

But like the panopticon if the prisoners rebelled the panopticon would fail. Urban discipline can easily fail if the rules of power are ignored. In Speed and Politics, by Virlio introduces the book in illustrating the Parisian Boulevards in the 70s and 80s and unemployed me took to the street. Crowd masses and crowd cohesion can usurp the existing power relations within public space. The individual becomes absorbed into a body that is intolerant of observation and the norms of public space. The effect of the boulevards in normalising individuals is ignored. However military physical crowd control is still brutally efficient.

The Hausmannisation of Paris ultimately replaced existing housing for the working class of Paris with middle class apartment housing. Public space and boulevards no longer facilitated the working class of Paris. Surveillance of the occupants of the city no longer facilitated important power relations, as those power is exercised on(as per the prisoner) have been shifted to outskirts, suburbs and satellite cities of Paris, leading to the gentrification of Paris. The creation of extensive transport networks into the city allowing for working class housing and public space to be shift beyond the outskirts of the city. Paris ultimately becoming the territory of the middle class, whilst the working class shifted into the new suburbs and satellite cities of Paris, all in proximity to provide labour to Paris.

The contemporary power relations of Paris are not being played out in the boulevards of Paris. Socio and political Power-Knowledge relations of the city are being played between the city of Paris and the banlieue.

POWER-KNOWLEDGE & CENTRIFUGAL URBANISM
Is Surveillance Relevant?

The current urban development of Paris from the 40-50s has been focused on centrifugal urbanism. Centrifugal urbanism refers to urban development that is a prescribed outward push that is unconcerned with densification but expansion and a horizontal matting. The formation of satellite cities the growth of the banlieue and respective transportation network is the result within Paris, and in terms of the banlieue identical to Sydney.

The satellite cities and the banlieue of Paris is the response and the mutual creation of the current socio-cultural geography of Paris. At the time of my travels in late 2005 there were extensive riots throughout the satellite cities and banlieue of Paris. The rioters being unemployed and dissatisfied youth from predominately migrant families. These occurrences did not occur in a vacuum, centrifugal urbanism has allowed for a push of the working class, new immigrant families and the unemployed out and beyond the established boundaries of the city. The boulvareds and the networks of power of the city are no longer important in the control of crowds and the act of normalising the individual of the working class. Power relations and crowd control are played at an entirely different urban scale. Whilst the city of Paris has become gentrified, the working class have been geographically isolated and only in a proximity to provide cheap labour.

Surveillance or the appearance of, still is effective. The urban fabric of the of this form of urbanism contains little meaningful public space, and existing public space is increasingly controlled by various forms of surveillance and increasing invested with private meanings. There is a complete lack of anonymity, the individual due to the lack of density and public space is always visible. The only public space amongst the crowd is within prescribed boundaries such as the shopping centre.

This is exemplified with the area of Cretel south east of Paris. As per the mapping, the housing ignores any form of street address of creation of public space. The individual outside their dwelling is completely visible and

isolated. Through this urban fabric the individual becomes normalised into a discipline that maintains there position by limiting access to public space and social cohesion.