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Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography

Stuart Elden and Jeremy W. Crampton

From architectural plans for asylums, hospitals and prisons; to the exclusion of the leper and the confinement of victims in the partitioned and quarantined plague town; from spatial distributions of knowledge to the position of geography as a discipline; to his suggestive comments on heterotopias, the spaces of libraries, of art and literature; analyses of town planning and urban health; and a whole host of other geographical issues, Foucault’s work was always filled with implications and insights concerning spatiality. Many geographers, philosophers and social scientists have developed these issues in their own work, either through a sustained analysis of Foucault’s own work, or in application in a range of other areas. Taking these debates to a new level, this book provides a series of challenges, appreciations, critiques and developments concerning the relation(s) between Foucault and geography.

In its sustained and in-depth encounter between Foucault and questions of space, place and geography Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography has two main aims. The first is to provide a comprehensive overview of Foucault’s engagement with geographical concerns and geography’s engagement with Foucault; the second is to begin to open up a new range of themes and questions for the continuation of that engagement. That continued engagement is, it seems to us, two-way, since there is much of Foucault’s own work still to discover: either in untranslated material published in his lifetime, or in the fascinating lecture courses that are appearing in French for the first time, and slowly being translated into English. As the French series editors have noted, because Foucault used these lectures as explorations rather than outlines for books, they do not reduplicate the studies he published in his lifetime. Foucault therefore still lives for us through these posthumous publications.

Questions and Responses

In 1976 Foucault took part in an interview with the geographers of the radical French journal Hérodote. It appeared in English translation in the 1980 collection Power/Knowledge as ‘Questions on Geography’, and has proved to be one of the most cited pieces concerning Foucault’s relation to questions of space and power. Following
shortly after the translation of *Discipline and Punish* in 1977, and the first volume of *The History of Sexuality* in 1978, the *Power/Knowledge* collection was designed to contextualize and make available a representative sample of his shorter writings from this period of Foucault’s work, in much the same way as the *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice* collection had for an earlier period (Foucault 1977a).

Although it took a few years, Foucault found a ready audience for his geographical analyses, with some key figures of Anglophone geography part of this first wave of interest and appropriation. Writing in 1985, Felix Driver (Driver 1985) discussed the implications of *Discipline and Punish* for institutions, the law and the state. Driver was stimulated by the spatial implications of the historical transformation of power described in that book. Driver notes that for Foucault, power is both productive and negative, locally defined and yet immanent within particular fields of technology and action. Space is a vital part of the battle for control and surveillance of individuals, but it is a battle and not a question of domination. As Driver mentions this has inspired interesting discussions of governmentality (Driver 1985, 444) as the contact point between technologies of domination and technologies of the self (Foucault 1999, 162), a thematic pursued in the questions back to geographers. Chris Philo also drew on this material in work on the spatiality of madness (Philo 1986; 1989; 1992), while the work of John Pickles took up Foucault’s ‘insurrection of subjugated knowledges’ (Pickles 1988; 2004). Derek Gregory’s influential book *Geographical Imaginations* drew repeatedly on Foucault, especially the essay ‘Of Other Spaces’, but also displayed a sensitivity to the relations between power, knowledge and space and the ‘cartographic anxiety’ or crisis in geographical representation (Gregory 1994).

Hannah’s contribution to this volume provides much important context to this story. It is interesting that these engagements by geographers came relatively late, mainly dating from after his 1984 death, and at some distance from Foucault’s influence in other disciplines. As Hannah discusses, two points of entry proved significant – in the early 1980s at Cambridge University where Derek Gregory and his then-students (Felix Driver and Chris Philo) read Foucault, and Soja’s book on postmodern geographies (Soja 1989).

Whether this is because geography in its traditional sense is not directly confronted by Foucault, or because the discipline itself did not make the ‘cultural turn’ is debatable. Certainly the cultural unrest of the 1960s made a number of geographers increasingly uneasy with its quantitative and law-finding focus, and demands grew for a more political account of power, race, sexuality or globalization, in which culture was a form of politics. Harvey’s *Social Justice and the City* (Harvey 1973) was perhaps the first marker in this shift, and if for many during the 1970s and 1980s the old geographies were still satisfactory, there were signs of an emerging critical geography (Peet 2000).

By the early 1990s this situation was more fully in reversal, with the primary overview works taking up Foucault’s work in some detail (see, for example, Cloke et al. 1991). The essay on heterotopia proved to be particularly influential, informing the work of Edward Soja (1989), and Kevin Hetherington (1997) for example.
Although this essay is an early work (it was written in 1967, but published only in Foucault 1984) it has attracted many commentaries. In it, Foucault makes a few programmatic and largely suggestive remarks that the traditional idea that time is creative and progressive, while space is static, could be reversed:

The great obsession of the nineteenth century was, as we know, history: with its themes of development and of suspension, of crisis, and cycle, themes of the ever-accumulating past, with its preponderance of dead men … the present epoch will perhaps be above all the epoch of space. We are in the epoch of simultaneity: we are in the epoch of juxtaposition, the epoch of the near and far, of the side-by-side, of the dispersed. We are at a moment, I believe, when our experience of the world is less that of a long life developing through time than that of a network that connects points and intersects with its own skein. (Foucault 1986, 22)

For geographers these remarks signalled something of a vindication, and despite their sketchy and possibly ‘Kantian’ overtones of absolute space (see Harvey, this volume), they have acted for years as a convenient standard bearer.

As Fall notes in this volume, the story within Francophone geography was rather different. Despite the Hérodote interview there has been little direct engagement with Foucault’s relation to geography, and with the notable exception of Claude Raffestin, Francophone work which draws on Foucault is scant. While the interview with the geographers is regularly cited within Anglophone geography, what is much less well-known is that Foucault sent some questions back to the journal for a subsequent issue in 1976, which received responses the following year from some eminent Francophone scholars. It is interesting and perhaps significant that Foucault almost never went back to a journal following an interview, but as he admitted he had formed a mistaken impression about the geographers’ intent and, as we further discuss below, he wanted to engage issues of space some more.

Foucault’s questions back to the journal touch upon many of the issues discussed in the interview, but raise some important issues of their own. Foucault asks four related questions: What are the relations between knowledge (savoir), war and power? What does it mean to call spatial knowledge a science? What do geographers understand by power? and What would the geographies of medical establishments (implantations) understood as ‘interventions’ look like? Until now, these questions have never appeared in English translation. It is instructive to compare these questions with a parallel series that Foucault published as part of his ‘Course Summary’ for the 1975–1976 Society Must Be Defended, a lecture course on war, race, strategic knowledge, historiography and politics (Foucault 2003). While the questions cover related grounds, the latter make no mention of space or geography; and yet as the chapters by Philo and Elden demonstrate the concerns of that course can be related to geographical issues in a number of ways.

Although we reprint Foucault’s interview with Hérodote later in this volume, the centrepiece of this book is Foucault’s own questions to geographers, which are written from the perspective of an engaged and interested interlocutor, someone who is looking for answers both from himself and from others. We follow these questions
with a selection of the original French language responses, revealing both in terms of an engagement with Foucault in a very different context from the Anglophone academy, but also in terms of the concerns of radical Francophone geography in the 1970s.

They are followed by newly commissioned responses, written thirty years after the initial encounter, from within the English-speaking world. These responses, which both respond to Foucault’s questions and raise issues and problems of their own, are of two kinds. On the one hand we have David Harvey and Nigel Thrift, two of the most important contemporary geographers in the Anglophone academy; on the other hand two figures from outside geography who have engaged with Foucault’s spatial concerns. Both Harvey and Thrift offer some incisive critiques of Foucault’s work, at the same time establishing a distance between Foucauldian inspired radical geography and their own projects (see Harvey 2001; Thrift 2006 among many others). Sara Mills brings a perspective from English Studies, raising issues concerning gender; Thomas Flynn more directly answers Foucault’s questions, but from the perspective of his being ‘a philosopher, not a geographer’. Both these authors have dealt with Foucault’s own work and its relation to spatial questions elsewhere (Flynn 1997; 2005; Mills 2003; 2005) although these analyses have largely yet to be appreciated or appropriated by geographers.

**Contexts**

Comparing the responses from 1977 and 2006, and from a Francophone and Anglophone perspective, raises an important issue of context. The timing of Foucault’s questions is revealing, in that they were posed at the time of *Society Must be Defended* and the first volume of *The History of Sexuality*, which appeared in late 1976; are coterminous with his concern with biopower; and slightly predate his work on governmentality. They also tie back to his work on the origin of the disciplines (in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*) madness and the hospital (in *History of Madness, The Birth of the Clinic and Discipline and Punish*) and the concern for space that runs through these topics. The year 1976 was a crucial one for Foucault as it saw the collision of two projects – the analysis of discipline that he had been working on in concentrated form from the beginning of the decade; and the genealogy of the subject that occupied him until the end of his life. Stuart Elden’s chapter therefore focuses on Foucault in this year, particularly looking at the concerns of strategy, medicine and the spatial politics of habitat, in order to situate the encounter with *Hérodote*. It does this by locating the questions and *Society Must Be Defended* within the various projects Foucault was engaged with at the time, both those mentioned above and lesser known collaborative works.

It is followed by two remarkable chapters that contextualize Foucault within two very different academies. Matthew Hannah’s chapter ‘Formations of “Foucault” in Anglo-American Geography: An Archaeological Sketch’ accounts for the development of an interest in Foucault’s work within British and North American
geography, including material gleaned from discussions with some of the people
involved with that appropriation. It is followed by a chapter by Juliet J. Fall that
uncovers an encounter unknown to almost all Anglophone geographers, the way
that Francophone geographers have used, critiqued or ignored Foucault. Focusing
particularly on the work of the Swiss geographer Claude Raffestin, Fall shows how
Foucault is read within a very different tradition. Rounding off this section is a
newly translated piece by Raffestin himself, on the question of ‘Could Foucault have
Revolutionized Geography?’ In it Raffestin demonstrates how Foucault’s writings
could have played a role in geography similar to the way Paul Veyne suggests they
have for history, a claim that Fall’s analysis helps us to understand.

Texts

Although much of Foucault’s work is available in English translation, there are some
striking omissions. His first major work, *Histoire de la folie à l’âge classique* has
only just been translated into English in other than a heavily abridged form (Foucault
1967; 2005); and some of his collaborative projects with other scholars have never
been translated at all (Farge and Foucault 1982; Foucault 1977b; Foucault et al.
1979 [though Foucault’s own essay appears in 1980]). While his lecture courses are
being translated into English, albeit with an understandable time-lag, the remarkable
collection of his shorter writings, published in France in 1994 as the four volume,
3400 page, collection *Dits et écrits* has been only partially translated. In the three
volumes of *The Essential Works of Michel Foucault* English readers are given much
new material, but also a number of other essays, long available in other collections.
Much material, some of it of the utmost interest, remains inaccessible to English-
only speakers.

In this volume we have therefore included a very small sample of those
missing texts, which we feel particularly speak to the encounter between Foucault
and questions of spatiality, broadly conceived. These new translations are of two
important lectures first given in Brazil; and two texts that bring questions of space
to bear on literature and visual art. The first of the lectures is the final of Foucault’s
three 1974 Rio lectures on medicine, ‘The Incorporation of the Hospital into Modern
Technology’ (the other two lectures appear in translation as Foucault 2000; 2004a).
It only appeared in French for the first time in 1994, previously available only in
Spanish and Portuguese translations. In it Foucault shows how hospital architecture
and the situation of the hospital in an urban setting are crucial mechanisms in the
politics of health. As such it provides a bridge between early concerns with health in
*The Birth of the Clinic* and the spatial aspects of discipline and bio-power in works of
the mid 1970s. Indeed it is in these lectures that bio-power first emerges as a category
of Foucault’s thought. Foucault argues that the ‘question of the hospital at the end of
the eighteenth century was fundamentally a question of space’, and the medicine of
this time was, through its use of space, simultaneously one of the individual and the
population. Discipline, declares Foucault, is ‘above all an analysis of space’. Along
the way Foucault discusses both civil and military hospitals, political and military techniques of control and discipline, and mechanisms for the treatment of epidemics and the use of quarantine.

The second lecture is ‘The Meshes of Power’ which provides an overview analysis of Foucault’s work on power in 1976. Here Foucault articulates his standard position that power is not repressive: ‘I am going to try to develop, or better, to show in which direction one could better develop an analysis of power that would not simply be a negative, juridical conception of power, but a conception of a technology of power.’ Given the timing of this lecture it has obvious parallels with the first volume of The History of Sexuality, but also with the 1973–1974 lectures on psychiatric power (Foucault 2006). Foucault draws on Marx for some ideas about the positivities of power, such as the fact that power is heterogenous: ‘if we want to do an analysis of power … we must speak of powers and try to localize them in their historical and geographical specificity’. Two objectives are underlined that prefigure their more explicit formulation in the governmentality work, especially the need for government to govern lightly and liberally. First, this discontinuous nature of power, in which the ‘meshes of the net’ were too wide and for example border control became problematic, and second the need: ‘to find a mechanism of power that, at the same time as controlling things and people up to the finest detail, is neither onerous nor essentially predatory on society, that exercises itself in the very sense of the economic process’.

This lecture is an important addition to the governmentality literature in that it links his spatial concerns in Discipline and Punish (the dispersion of objects, the technologies of surveillance) to the continued focus on power in his later work. As Foucault discusses in more detail elsewhere, he identifies the second half of the 18th century as a time when politics shifted from the individual to that of populations, that is: ‘living beings, traversed, commanded, ruled by processes and biological laws. A population has a birth rate, a rate of mortality, a population has an age curve, a generation pyramid, a life-expectancy, a state of health, a population can perish or, on the contrary, grow.’

The question arises however, just how geographical did Foucault intend the notion of governmentality to be? While it is true that the lectures of 1978–1979 were entitled Security, Territory, and Population the geographical analysis is somewhat underplayed in the lecture course as actually delivered. This is crucial, because governmentality and biopolitics informs the work of an increasing number of geographers (one could speak of a geo-governmentality school). Foucault also suggests, drawing on a text from the 16th century writer Guillaume de la Perrière that ‘the definition of government in no way refers to territory: one governs things’ (Foucault 1991).

But care is needed here not to read Foucault out of context; in the passage cited he is concerned with contrasting governmentality as the ‘conduct of conduct’ (see Huxley, this volume) with that of an earlier style of politics, that is, sovereignty. Under sovereignty (and here Foucault discusses Machiavelli at length; see Elden 2007; Holden and Elden 2005), the political focus is on defending and retaining
territory, or perhaps more properly, terrain, from those enemies inside and outside the state. Machiavelli’s purpose is to offer advice to the prince on how to defend territory, not just militarily but also politically. Foucault elaborates:

I think it is not a matter of opposing things to men, but rather of showing that what government has to do with is not territory but, rather, a sort of complex composed of men and things. The things, in this sense, with which government is to be concerned are in fact men, but men in their relations, their links, their imbrication with those things that are wealth, resources, means of subsistence, the territory with its specific qualities, climate, irrigation, fertility, and so on … what counts is essentially this complex of men and things; property and territory are merely one of its variables. (Foucault 1991)

So Foucault then is shifting the emphasis from a simple retention of territorial control to a more nuanced notion of government over a ‘complex’ of men and things constituted as a population. And he says that a population is not just ‘the sum of individuals inhabiting a territory’ (Foucault 2004b) but an object itself, with birth and death rates, healthiness and so on. In Foucault’s reading, Machiavelli differentiates between the object (territorial retention) and the target of the population who must be controlled. The art of government is less about geopolitics (territorial gain and retention) and more deeply geographical. This population thus had to be known in its spatial dispersion, giving rise not only to statistics but to a new form of cartography (Crampton 2004), something which Matthew Hannah develops in his study Governmentality and the Mastery of Territory in Nineteenth-Century America (Hannah 2000).

‘The Language of Space’ – a review of several novels that originally appeared in the journal Critique in 1964 – shows Foucault’s under-appreciated qualities as a literary critic and reviewer. Foucault suggests that until the twentieth century, writing obeyed a formalism of chronology, or at least of a narrative return to its origins after a period of absence (as in the Odyssey). After Nietzsche and Joyce however: ‘it is in space that, from the outset, language unfurls.’ Here Foucault posits space as a space of freedom, as unconstrained by barriers. He adds that: ‘Such is the power of language: that which is woven of space elicits space, gives itself space through an originary opening and removes space to take it back into language.’ In this short piece we can see some of the same concerns that animated him in The Order of Things, namely the process of representation; as well as in a range of other more ‘literary’ texts from this period (see, for example, those collected in Foucault 1977a).

‘Force of Flight’ was originally published in 1973 to accompany a series of paintings by Paul Rebeyrolle (1926–2005). Rebeyrolle’s work is little known outside France, but is reminiscent of that of Francis Bacon in some of its style, although with a pronounced emphasis on texture and the incorporation of objects in a blend between collage and painting. Here Foucault offers some abbreviated comments on space as power:

In the world of prisons, as in the world of dogs (‘lying down’ and ‘upright’), the vertical is not one of the dimensions of space, it is the dimension of power.
It dominates, rises up, threatens and flattens; an enormous pyramid of buildings, above and below; orders barked out from up high and down low; you are forbidden to sleep by day, to be up at night, stood up straight in front of the guards, to attention in front of the governor; crumpled by blows in the dungeon, or strapped to the restraining bed for having not wanted to go to sleep in front of the warders; and, finally, hanging oneself with a clear conscience, the only means of escaping the full length of one’s enclosure, the only way of dying upright.

But finally the dogs in the series of paintings escape through a force of flight, a force which is not present in the paintings themselves as a representation, but which ‘produces itself unspeakably between two canvases’ will have ‘left you alone in the prison where you find yourself now enclosed, high on the passing of this force which is now already far from you and whose traces you no longer see before you – the traces of one who “saves oneself”’. Spaces of captivity can be reversed: the ‘inside outside’.

These four new translations are partnered by one reprinted piece, the previously mentioned interview ‘Questions on Geography’. Given its importance to the posing of the encounter between Foucault and Hérodote, and the fact it was one of the texts from the 1980 Power/Knowledge collection that was not reprinted in the final volume of the Essential Works, devoted to ‘Power’, it seemed appropriate to reprint it here.

**Development**

Foucault ends his original Hérodote interview with a comment that is much cited by geographers (e.g., see Harvey and Philo, this volume): ‘Geography must indeed necessarily lie at the heart of my concerns’ (Foucault 1980, 77). Was Foucault just being polite? He gave many interviews throughout his life and no doubt was often asked to consider the special interests of the interlocutor. Perhaps his comment is no more than such an acknowledgement and, in fact, Foucault had just remarked on this issue himself:

I have enjoyed this discussion with you because I’ve changed my mind since we started. I must admit I thought you were demanding a place for geography like those teachers who protest when an education reform is proposed, because the number of hours of natural sciences or music is being cut. So I thought ‘It’s nice of them to ask me to do their archaeology, but after all, why can’t they do it themselves?’ I didn’t see the point of your objection. Now I can see that the problems you put to me about geography are crucial ones for me. (Foucault 1980, 77)

It is true in one sense that, with some signal exceptions in short works and interviews, Foucault did not write primary texts that foreground spatial concerns, but it is also true that spatiality was more than just a passing interest. It is notable for instance, as Harvey discusses in this volume, that Foucault’s introduction to Kant’s Anthropology (Foucault 1960) does not mention the latter’s Physische Geographie, which like
the *Anthropology* is based on lecture materials. We therefore feel strongly that our aim here is not to show that somehow space is the hidden explanatory lens through which Foucault’s work must be seen, but rather that it is a factor, at times only in the margins or in the background, that can be found throughout much of his work.

For Foucault, space, knowledge and power were necessarily related, as he stated, ‘it is somewhat arbitrary to try to dissociate the effective practice of freedom by people, the practice of social relations, and the spatial distributions in which they find themselves. If they are separated, they become impossible to understand’ (Foucault 1984, 246). In many places in Foucault then, spatiality occurs as an integral part of a larger concern, and as one of us has argued extensively elsewhere, a tool of analysis rather than merely an object of it (Elden 2001).

The chapters in the last part of this book aim to develop and extend these concerns. Is Foucault’s work coherent in terms of its geographical explorations? Is it possible, or necessary, for a group of commentators to speak through Foucault to each other and find common ground? The reader will certainly find in these eight chapters a number of approaches, not all of them commensurable with each other. If there is a thematic throughout this section however, it is that most of the pieces concentrate on the mid to later work, including the topics of governmentality (Huxley, Crampton, Legg, Philo), health and sexuality (Kearns and Howell), and surveillance (Wood). In our call for chapters and specific invitations we placed no time periods on possible topics and it is interesting to note this clustering. It seems to us that one reason that authors made these choices is that the mid and later period is the one most obviously seen as the political period in Foucault’s work. Of these chapters Coleman and Agnew’s, which engages with Gramsci, Hardt and Negri and the problem of empire, is only the most explicitly political. What these chapters share, then, is an interest in the way institutions and political rationalities ‘thought out space’ (Foucault 1984, 244).

This focus on the political is at first sight a puzzling one. While Foucault is rightly seen variously as a historian, philosopher, critic and activist, he has also often been characterized as a political defeatist because he did not offer foundational grounds for taking positions, or (even more problematically) that the grounds he did offer were irredeemably defeatist (in that power is seen as everywhere). This assessment has often drawn the ire of commentators interested in a more definitive – not to say Marxian – political position, as represented by the contributions of Harvey and perhaps Thrift in this volume.

We would argue forcefully that Foucault’s politics is not one of defeatism: a claim that has been made before, but which bears repeating. While liberation and freedom are both desirable and achievable, they will not come about with the mere passing of certain laws or by the guarantee of rights. Rather, freedom is a practice or a process that has to be constantly undertaken. This theme runs through both the collective work on populations and the mode of their governing, and at the individual level in his later work on practices of the self. To take a particularly ‘spatial’ example, when Paul Rabinow interviewed him for an architecture journal in 1982 Foucault remarked:
I do not think it possible to say that one thing [architectural project] is of the order of ‘liberation’ and another is of the order of ‘oppression.’ There are a certain number of things that one can say with some certainty about a concentration camp to the effect that it is not an instrument of liberation, but one should still take into account – and this is not generally acknowledged – that, aside, from torture and execution, which preclude any resistance, no matter how terrifying a given system may be, there always remain the possibilities of resistance, disobedience, and oppositional groupings … liberty is a practice. (Foucault 1984, 245 emphasis added)

He then made the point in more explicitly general terms:

The liberty of men is never assured by the institutions and laws that are intended to guarantee them. That is why almost all of these laws and institutions are quite capable of being turned around … which is not to say that, after all, one may as well leave people in slums, thinking that they can simply exercise their rights there. (Foucault 1984, 245–6)

The chapters in this part develop many of these points as well as covering the major themes with which Foucault is associated: surveillance, government, power, knowledge, sexuality and mental health. The chapters bring together a geographical sensibility to these familiar questions and represent the first sustained encounter between Foucault and geography. Additionally the chapters bring in some of the concerns only just now emerging from Foucault’s new translations, such as race, bio-power, and territory and populations. Throughout this part the authors do not hesitate to identify latencies and undeveloped analyses (either in Foucault’s work or in that of geographers) or productive ways of going ‘beyond’ Foucault.

Whereas the Foucault of the early to middle periods is often seen as concentrating on dystopian aspects; surveillance and prisons for example (although see Wood’s chapter, where he develops a ‘post-Panoptic’ critique of surveillance through actor-network theory), other contributors to this book concentrate on the overlapping period of middle to later work that emphasizes the productive side of power. Using ‘diagrams’ or examples Margo Huxley addresses the way that space and environment are imbricated as rationalities of government. Using the formulation of government as *le conduire des conduits* (conduct of conducts) she indicates a wide remit of government from bodily discipline to whole populations; which have nevertheless not been posed as ‘substantive geographies of government’ until the mid-1990s (see also Hannah 2000). These geographies are not just arranged supine for surveillance and control; rather subjectivity is ‘fostered through the positive, catalytic qualities of space, places and environments’ (Huxley, this volume). She identifies three such qualities (dispositional, generative and vitalist, mapping roughly onto geographies of arrangement, health, and bio-politics) that act to produce such positive geographies.

Taking up these latter two themes in more detail, Gerry Kearns similarly focuses on the shaping of subjectivity with reference to medical geography. Historically, Kearns identifies two styles of medical geography, one focused around the environment and one around spatial science. Although (or perhaps because) these
histories are fragmented, they can be analyzed through three of Foucault’s historical tactics: discourse/practice; subjectivation; and the politics of medical history writing. In this he is concerned to apply these historical developments to contemporary medical geographies such as AIDS. In the colonial context for example (as noted in Stoler 1995) the empire was brought back home in the sense that the dangers of the environment and the ‘race experience’ were not just felt overseas, but also domestically (see also Legg, this volume). A stark reminder of this is provided in the literature on the geography of AIDS. A ‘discourse of blame’ is constructed around an imaginary environmentalism of disease, the tropics, and race. The question then becomes one of risk groups rather than risk behaviours: the ‘dangerous individual’ (Foucault 1988).

Race figures again in the contribution by Crampton. He shows the way mapping ‘thought out space’ (Foucault 1984, 244) in the peace negotiations after World War I. ‘Sites’ of geographical knowledge were established to redraw Europe’s borders, but Crampton traces out the previously unknown linkages to eugenics and the goal of racial partitioning. Here maps were vital in the geographic imaginary. Eugenic scientists not only contributed reams of ethnographic data to the negotiations, but also used their affiliation to push for immigration reform to exclude or sterilize the ‘degenerate’ stock made visible in the cartography.

One of the key themes for readers of Foucault has always been his groundbreaking analyses on surveillance and its role in the generation of knowledge. Whether it is knowledge of populations, medicine or maps, surveillance has many spatial connotations. As Wood shows, these need not be irredeemably unproductive. The disciplinary gaze attempted to ward off plague, abnormality and disorder, and its success in doing so helped inoculate it from critique. Reading through the large literature, Wood explores interpretations beyond **Discipline and Punish**, notably drawing on the work of Deleuze and actor-network theory. If the Panopticon is not the only model of power or even of surveillance, Wood argues that ANT is the only comprehensive attempt to develop a post-Foucauldian understanding of power.

This post-Foucauldian theme is expanded by Legg, who calls Foucault’s silence on colonialism ‘astounding’. Undoing this silence, suggests Legg, means going beyond Foucault to ‘counter-discourses of modernity’ that do not just focus on the imperial centre. Legg traces the positioning of geographical research in the relations between Foucault and Edward Said. For Said, Foucault lacked ‘political bite’ and failed to consider other spaces of existence beyond the present (Legg this volume, 271). Yet perhaps surprisingly, Said circled back to Foucault’s geographical work on control of territories, not just in discourse but in material practices of government. To achieve a new emphasis beyond the imperial centre then, would suggest taking seriously Foucault’s remarks on the ‘insurrection of subjugated knowledges’ across different scales, and that occur materially as well as discursively.

In analyzing Foucault’s work on sexuality, Howell firstly clears away a number of mistaken impressions in geography and other disciplines regarding such works as the **History of Sexuality**. The lack of geographical engagement with this work – and the biased focus on power rather than sexuality – is for Howell a serious analytic
oversight. Spatial orderings around sexuality or sex work such as prostitution (Howell 2004), for instance, are particularly neglected by geographers, although it is interesting to speculate how this would have been affected by Foucault’s proposed book on *Woman, Mother, and Hysteric* (see Elden, this volume; 2005). Spaces of sexual penitence for prostitutes (Howell discusses the Magdalen Hospital) are particularly suggestive here as a ‘site’ of sexuality. Others include the family and the ‘closet’. These are more than spatial metaphors but speak to the spatialization of the body, whether travelling from the suburbs to the city for sex, or the surveillance of the child’s bedroom (see Brown 2000). Here Howell’s appeal to biopolitics – in this instance a ‘geopolitics of sexuality’ – has much in common with other contributors’ work emphasizing the health of the *population* (e.g., Legg on population geography, Legg 2005), Kearns on medical geographies or Crampton on the mapping of race in this volume).

Geopolitics reappears in the next chapter, in which Coleman and Agnew take on the post 9/11 ‘climate of fear’ and the role of the United States as a (neo)imperial power. Using Hardt and Negri’s *Empire* as a jumping off point (Hardt and Negri 2000) Coleman and Agnew reject its binaries of power as either centred on states or decentred in networks to argue for its re-territorialization. Interpreting Foucault as a philosopher rather than a historian – or at least as a non-periodizing historian, Coleman and Agnew argue that contra *Empire* power is more manifest in space than periodization in time. That is, power does not get exercised over ‘undifferentiated blocks of subjects fixed in absolute spaces’ but as a series of overlapping and discontinuous spatialities of power. Here Coleman and Agnew once again draw on Foucault’s work since the mid-1970s on governmentality of populations, not as a replacement but as a supplement to disciplinary power.

If Coleman and Agnew find inspiration in this work, it falls to Philo to articulate it in the most detail. Here Philo shifts his long engagement with Foucault’s work on madness and hospitals (Philo 1989; 2004) to perhaps the most political book, *Society Must be Defended*. If this book centralizes biopower, the population and the end of sovereignty, for Philo it also connects back to archaeologies of discourse and knowledge. The ‘bellicose history’ found therein is deeply predicated on ‘the local’ especially local knowledges and their ‘subjugation’. It is to war and politics that Foucault looks for an elaboration of power for it is through the challenge of these counter knowledges and their local settings that alternatives can emerge. Philo underlines a key point of the book that discourses and knowledges, including histories of rightful territorial possession, battle it out to be accepted and that this results in ‘an uneven geography’ of knowledge about society.

The chapters in this part share a goal of going ‘beyond’ Foucault while at the same time seeing in a lot of his work (government of populations and territory for example) much of potential interest to geographers. While some authors offer close readings of Foucault, others use it as a jumping off point. Some of the contributors to this book have long engaged his work; for others the encounter is relatively recent. But if Foucault’s questions back to geographers reveal his interests in exploring the context of strategy, tactics and conflict, then the ‘developments’ included here show
something of geographers’ own potential deployments of Foucault. Just as theory, for Foucault, is not something separate from practice, but rather a practice itself, so too is the process of critique an inherently practical tool, a mode of engaging in struggle.

Conclusion

The questions posed by Foucault to geographers are ones that spring from his own concern about issues of space, and are indicative of his thinking – both for what he asked and for what he did not pose or overlooked. This book therefore aims to cast light on Foucault’s own thinking about space, power, knowledge, governmentality, and war. While Foucault may appear to be an extraordinarily familiar figure within the intellectual landscape, much remains to be known about his work. This includes the Collège de France lectures that are discussed in many of the chapters included here, but also supposedly well-known writings, and material unavailable in English.

The purpose of this collection is therefore to suggest that Foucault’s position in relation to geography remains unclear. Where he does not just remain a forbidding thinker in the distance, he is too often used in an emblematic and superficial manner. The contributors to this book, although writing from a diverse series of perspectives and interests, show that it is fruitful to establish a critical encounter with Foucault’s work. Such an encounter does not consist in uncritically applying Foucault’s work (which itself is diverse) to close off dialogue, but rather to encounter it in a way that deliberately opens up questions, possibilities and reappraisals. It is therefore the aim of this book to go beyond the simple appropriation of Foucauldian terms such as ‘heterotopia’ and ‘disciplinary space’ and to put these terms in their larger and proper context. Foucault’s work was remarkably informed by the spatial problematic at many stages of his career. Although he may not have wanted or needed to bring this problematic explicitly to the surface at all times it runs deeply. The aim is both to contextualize Foucault’s work within geography and to use it as a springboard to explore these issues of spatiality in detail. As such it demonstrates not just that the relation between space, knowledge and power works in a number of ways, but equally that the relation between Foucault and geography is one that works both ways:

These are not questions that I pose to you from the position of a knowledge that I already have. They are inquiries that I am asking myself, that I address to you, thinking that you are probably more advanced than me on this path. (Foucault 1994, III, 9; this volume, 19)

As Foucault suggested in the original interview with Hérodote, if geographers could make use of some of the ‘gadgets’ [‘trucs’] of approach or method he had used, then he would be delighted. But, he tells them, ‘if you find the need to transform my tools or use others then show what they are, because it may be of benefit to me’ (Foucault 1994, III, 30). Geographers have, still, much to learn from Foucault. But
as he himself acknowledged, his work, and today that of Foucault studies generally, have much to learn from geographers.
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