

https://dspace.org/

Montecassino as a panoptic heterotopia

Smit, Ouida

2015-01-20
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/16646

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

The copyright of the above-mentioned described thesis rests with the author or the University to which it was submitted. No portion of the text derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author or University (as may be appropriate). *Short quotations may be included in the text of a thesis* or dissertation for purposes of illustration, comment or criticism, provided full acknowledgement is made of the source, author and University.

Montecasino as a Panoptic Heterotopia.

Ouida Smit

Question:
How does the spatiality of Montecasino as a Panoptic Heterotopia constitute the subject?

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Arts, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts by coursework.


Johannesburg, 2003
Research Report: MA (Coursework)
Ouida Smit 89/06563J

Acknowledgements

My sincere gratitude to: my family for being there, my friend Brian Webber, for extraordinary performances of this report. Dominique Wooldridge for invaluable advice and an inexhaustible reading list that should keep me off the streets for the rest of my life and my supervisor Jane Taylor for being an inspiration.

Declaration

I declare that this research report is my own unaided work. It is submitted for the degree of MA by Coursework in the School of Art, at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any other degree or examination in any other university.



Ouida Smit
Wednesday, August 13, 2003

CONTENTS

- INTRODUCTION. 5
- CHAPTER 1: SPATIAL THEORY. 10
- CHAPTER 2: THE FLÂNEUR AND THE GAMBLER. 25
- CHAPTER 3: HETEROTOPIA. 36
- CHAPTER 4: PANOPTICON. 48
- CONCLUSION. 59

- BIBLIOGRAPHY 63

INTRODUCTION

Title: Montecasino as a Panoptic Heterotopia.

Question:
How does the spatiality of Montecasino as Panoptic Heterotopia constitute the subject?

Rationale
The many interpretations of signs, symbols and images of the city are plural. In addition 'meaning' and more specifically the 'meanings of spatiality in the city' are political instruments. They are not overtly political but are never the less political. Edward Said writes in *Culture and Imperialism*: " Just as none of us is outside or beyond geography, none of us is completely free from the struggle over geography. That struggle is complex and interesting because it is not only about soldiers and cannons but also about ideas, about forms, about images and imaginings."[1]

The phenomena of flânerie - wondering and wandering, prostitution, gambling - taking a chance and drug taking - altering our states of being are part of the lived experience of city space. Flâneurie, prostitution, drug taking and gambling pose a dilemma for the state, city planners and for those who live in the streets of the city where these practices form part of the lived experience of public space. In certain cases they constitute powerful economic nodes that operate outside of State-sanctioned taxable industry. The dilemma faced by State and Public is how to manage these nodes and their specific spatiality in a way most beneficial for state, personal, private and public interest.

Research of this kind is important if we are to interrogate how we create the world and how it creates us. Any form of 'power' that is a collaboration of state and private interest should be under scrutiny, especially if it might curtail our liberties and harness our most powerful desires and drives: i.e. our wondering and wandering, our sexuality, taking a chance and altering our states of being. As these collaborations of state and private interest create spaces that are not strictly public it is important to keep in mind that public space in the city needs to be created, maintained and managed in a constructive way.

Anthropologists Jean and John Comaroff[2] suggest that the world economy is dominated by speculation. I would like to add that our other passions also

---

[1] Said, E. (1993) *Culture and Imperialism*. London. Chatto & Windus Ltd.. p 6.
[2] Comaroff, J. & J. (1999) Alien-Nation: Zombies, Immigrants, and Millennial Capitalism. CODESRIA Bulletin 3 & 4:17-27.

constitute very powerful economic nodes. Why do state and private interest cooperate to institute enclaved legalized spaces or panoptic heterotopias for these passions? I investigate how these spaces are perceived, conceived and lived, how they function, what they look like and who benefits most from such spaces, by examining how this specific spatiality as a panoptic heterotopia discursively defines the subject. I suggest that Montecasino is an Adult Crèche[3] in which the activity of gambling is state sanctioned within an enclaved panoptic space in order to tax the players.

Why is it valuable for us to "read the signs" from a spatial rather than a historical or social perspective? If, as Soja[4] suggests, space is the ontological basis for distinguishing subject and object, space allows a window into subjecthood, thus allowing views on identity and selfhood. Space provides the stage that encapsulates both time and being and therefore allows a new perspective on history and social being, simultaneously. Looking at debates from a spatial perspective might enable us to see the issues or what is at stake in the power play in a different light. Take for instance the current debate on the legalization of prostitution. Should prostitution be legalized as a street activity or should it only be legalized within enclaved or controlled spaces? A spatial perspective on the debate can show us who benefits from "controlled spaces", and what the city street entails. By examining how the subject is constituted through the space we are able to determine aspects of identity and selfhood constituted by such spatialities. We can look at that complex and interesting struggle that is about ideas, about forms, about images and imaginings of lived city space. History and social being might be transitory, but they leave traces in the spatial. In these manifestations we are able to read the hidden ideological implications of social and historical relations.

Aim

The aim of this project is to investigate those ideas, forms, images and imaginings involved in the struggle over geography that Said refers to. The investigation can contribute to our understanding of the workings of Lived Space hidden in the spatiality of Montecasino as panoptic heterotopia.

The aim is to consider the spatiality of Montecasino as a panoptic heterotopia. For introductory purposes I would like to concisely define the panopticon and the heterotopia, for use in this report.

The panopticon is a space that observes. Its functions are surveillance, supervision, correction and examination. I will investigate who supervises or

---

[3] Eco, U. (1987.) *Travels in Hyperreality*. London: Picador. p12

[4] Soja, Edward W. (1989) *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion Of Space In Critical Social Theory*. London & NY: Verso. p133.

guides and examines behavior in the space and to what end, by investigating how the panoptic spatiality discursively defines the subject.

The panopticon is a spatiality that has come to be associated with the control and discipline of the everyday life of the subject. The aim is to demonstrate how this spatiality moves from external power to the internalized conviction of the subject and thus discursively defines the subject.

The heterotopia is an enclaved space of illusion or compensation that functions in relation to the space that it excludes or denies. I will contextualize Montecasino within the broader context of the spatiality that it possibly denies, in order to investigate the meanings of the spatiality. This ushers in questions for further research to suggest alternative imagineerings.

My aim is to bring spatial theory, cultural theory, ethnography and the semiotics of spatiality together in a conjoined approach. I position myself as a cultural theorist examining space.

I explore the spatiality of the actors in Montecasino and their relationship to it as panoptic heterotopia. For this exploration I delimit the spatiality under consideration to the Lived Space, a space in which the conceived and the perceived come together, as it is experienced by an agent. Here I will restrict my enquiry to examine the flâneur and the gambler as a particular kind of social agent, one who is addicted to the phantasmagoria of space and in the case of the gambler the phantasmagoria of time.

Further research could bring together investigations of the Lived Space from conversations with agents in, as well as critical analysis of the space. Through an investigation of what fantastical investments its agents make in it, as well as what performance and imagination of space the panoptic heterotopia allows, it could interrogate the ethos that it engenders. Though the above is a discursive process this project focuses more on how the space defines the subject.

Methodology

I situate myself as cultural theorist, using various transdiciplinary procedures to explore the spatiality of Montecasino as a panoptic heterotopia. I limit my reference to Montecasino, which I use as a laboratory or case study for a certain kind of spatiality. Montecasino acts as an exemplary space for patterns in similar spatialities. My aim is to bring spatial theory, the 'signs' of spatiality and ethnography together, in a conjoined methodology.

The research question explores issues that are relevant to debates in urban theory, cultural studies and social science. As I come from a performance theory background and not a social studies background, this report will favour a cultural studies approach tending to de-emphasize issues such as class and race to

focus more on how the subject is constituted as consumer by the spatiality of Montecasino.

The space as heterotopia does relate to other real and imagined spaces: this research report makes cursory reference to the materiality that underpins the space of Montecasino and how this might reflect similar spatial trends in the city. These references do however point to deductions that can form the basis of further research.

Spatial Theory

I will employ Lefebvre's Trialectical thinking. His trialectics of being: spatiality/historicality/sociality and trialectics of spatiality: conceived/perceived/lived are engaged as a procedures. The theoretical framework in Chapter 1 explains these procedures in more detail, as the theory engenders the method, but let us look briefly at the approach.

The Lived Space that is the focus of this project, is the arena of social being in space. Lefebvre's notion of conceived and perceived space, coinciding in the Lived Space, will delimit the focus of the exploration. It is in this Lived Space that subjects participate through conceptions and perceptions of space. This introduces the subject as a variable in the exploration of spatiality. The conjoined methodology is focussed on an analysis of a lived spatiality, and how the subject is constituted through the implications of that spatiality.

Foucault's theories provide the theoretical framework for the analysis of the space as a Panopticon and as Heterotopia. Various readings will be employed in comparative procedures to shed light on the specific spatiality of Montecasino. For the analysis of Montecasino as Panopticon, readings will chronicle where and how the space observes, and to what end. In reading the space as heterotopia, material will investigate Foucault's principles in relation to Montecasino, concluding with the spatiality that it denies - is it the urban complexity and contradictions of the city of Johannesburg or a more illusive scamscape? (A scamscape is a space in which the real and the imagined, fact and fiction become spectacularly confused and impossible to tell apart.)

Montecasino and Montecassino

Montecasino is a themed casino in Fourways - Johannesburg, South Africa. The theme of the casino refers back to a Cassinese abbey in Italy called Montecassino. Montecassino was built on the remnants of a pre-existing Roman fortification of the municipium Casinum. Today at the foot of the mountain on which the Cassino stands is the town of Cassino. Montecassino is the site from which Benedictine rule spread and is to this day a Benedictine abbey. This classic panoptic heterotopia is devoted to this day to the Benedictine motto: 'Ora et Lavora", Prayer and Work. The spatiality constitutes its subjects/actors as Benedictine monks. They live their waking lives in the enclaved space or panoptic heterotopia and each dreams individuated in their individual cell in the Cassino.

Montecassino has been rebuilt 4 times. The Longabards destroyed it in 577, and then in 883 the Saracens destroyed it again. In 1349 it was destroyed by an earthquake and in 1944 by American bombing. The last reconstruction is therefore quite recent, and was completed in 1964.

For further information on the two sites you can refer to the websites:

- Montecasino the casino: http://www.tsogosun.co.za/montecasino/index.html
- Montecassino the abbey: http://www.officine.it/montecassino/

CHAPTER 1: SPATIAL THEORY.

Though Lefebvre and Foucault were aware of each other, and they were both obsessed with space, their points of departure are very different. Lefebvre's greatest concern was the production of space and Foucault's the 'production' of the individual through space. In an attempt to find ways of enquiry as to how the subject is constituted though space, I conjoin the theories of Lefebvre and Foucault.

This chapter uses Lefebvre's trialectical thinking to suggest new ways of contemplating subjecthood, leading to Chapter 2, in which the subjecthood for this report is delimited and discussed. Lefebvre's greatest criticism of Foucault was that his fascination with individualism failed to explore the "collective subject".[5] By considering the flâneur and gambler of the spatiality (Montecasino) as consumers and then exploring how the "otherness" of the space constitutes them, I hope to initiate ways of conjoining the ideas of Lefebvre and Foucault, or ways of bringing notions of the collective and individual subject closer together.

Soja is engaged with and motivated by the work of both Lefebvre and Foucault. Mobilizing Edward Soja's objectives, to get us to think differently about space, is his belief that the spatial dimension of our lives has never been of greater practical and political relevance than it is today. In *THIRDSPACE*[6] Soja argues that we are intrinsically spatial beings, active participants in the social construction of our embracing spatialities. He suggests that perhaps more than ever before, a strategic awareness of this collectively created spatiality and its social consequences has become a vital part of making both theoretical and practical sense of our contemporary life-worlds. He suggests that this spatial awareness is vital to our understanding of the world - at all scales from the most local to the most global, from the intrinsically individual to the intrinsically collective.

I will be exploring one particular spatial formation, Montecasino in Fourways. I will also use this case study as a heuristic tool with which to examine recent themes of space, subjectivity and agency. Montecasino is a localized example of a global phenomenon, by examining how this spatiality constitutes the subject we are able to make deductions about the individual and collective subject.

Foucault claims that spatiality used to be seen as reflection, container, stage, environment, or the external constraints on human behavior and social action, when he writes that " Space was treated as the dead the fixed, the undialectical, the immobile. Time on the contrary was richness, fecundity, and life, dialectic."[7] However the life work of Lefebvre and Foucault has given space a more active

---

[5] Soja, E. W. (1996). *Thirdspace.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. p146.
[6] Ibid. p1.
[7] Foucault, M. (1980) ' Questions on Geography', in C. Gordon (ed.), *Power/Knowledge*: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972 –1977, p63-77.p 70.

role. According to Soja the last century saw a growing awareness in critical thinking on the spatial dimension of our lives.

Both Lefebvre and Foucault establish the argument for spatiality as a node of critical enquiry. Lefebvre provides a structure for the reading of spatiality. Foucault provides the theoretical framework of the heterotopia and the panopticon from which the research proceeds. Foucault's enquiry was into the relationship between power, knowledge and spatiality. He provides a view into the workings of ideology, of control and power in relation to spatiality.

Animated by the work of Lefebvre and Foucault, Edward W. Soja in *THIRDSPACE* encourages us to think differently about the meanings of the disciplines or spaces that compose the spatiality of human life.

Soja suggests that, keeping our contemporary consciousness of spatiality creatively open to redefinition and expansion in new directions enables us to resist any attempt to narrow or confine its scope. In keeping with the above objectives he introduces the concept of Thirdspace, as a set of ways of thinking about space. It is a purposefully tentative and flexible term that attempts to capture what he argues is actually a constantly shifting and changing milieu of ideas, events, appearances and meanings.

Soja contends that the historical and social have always formed a part of making sense of our lives. In other words understanding the world and ourselves has always been a simultaneously social and historical project. According to Soja contemporary thinking demonstrates a growing awareness of the complexity of being through the joining of the spatial with the social and historical dimensions. Space is now treated to be as rich, fecund, and dialectical as time or being. This three-sided sensibility of "spatiality – historicality – sociality" poses a challenge that is transdiciplinary in scope. Lefebvre argued that historicality, sociality and spatiality are too important to be left to narrowed specializations such as History, Sociology and Geography.

Contemporary theorists from most disciplines, including cultural studies and spanning a wide variety of interpretive perspectives now use space as a node of enquiry. The marginal space of postmodernist, postcolonial, post-structuralist, post-Marxist and Feminist critiques of space create a field of radical openness for contemporary enquiry.

Lefebvre in *The Production of Space* argued for the linking of historicality, sociality and spatiality in a strategically balanced trans-disciplinary triple dialectic.

Lefebvre chose space as his primary interpretive thread. Employing his triple dialectic (Trialectic) as a way of relating to spatiality and an expanding spatial imagination has homologous methodological implications. This chapter will

discover what trialectical thinking would involve and what the methodological implications would be in employing these.

Lefebvre's work opens readings of spatiality up to transdisciplinary perspectives on space, or being, or time. Lefebvre introduces a trialectics of being that includes Spatiality, Historicality and Sociality. Edward W. Soja in *THIRDSPACE* argues that although Lefebvre's Trialectics of being is primarily an ontological assertion (about "being') the trialectics of Spatiality, Historicality and Sociality apply at all levels of knowledge formation, from ontology to epistemology, theory building, empirical analysis and social practice.

Soja calls Lefebvre's strategy a critical Thirding-as-Othering that involves the reassertion of spatiality against the tendency in Western thought to bifocalize on the interactive historicality and sociality of being. He claims that his notion of Thirding-as-Othering is inspired by Lefebvre's deep critique of the oppositional dichotomies of power and other forms of binary logic. Lefebvre's choice when faced with 'the argument' reduced to binary oppositions is "Il y a toujours l'Autre". In other words " there is always the Other".

Lefebvre's trialectical thinking or what Soja calls "Thirding" creates a reconceptialization of the relation between centres and peripheries, perceived and conceived space, which will be employed to produce the readings and insights for this project. If we take to heart Lefebvre's "there is always the Other", perceived space or spatial practice and conceived space or representations of space have a third that is the Lived Space or spaces of representation. Lefebvre suggests models for such thirding: centrality - periphery – mediation, or subject – object – unity. Questioning from a "third" perspective might accordingly produce new insights on existing debates.

Before taking the argument further let me define clearly what I mean with Thirding as I am taking the concept from a spatial disciplinary lineage. In order to do that we must start with a very clear sense of First, Second and Thirdspace.

This project is concerned with Lefebvre's understanding of meaning as a spatial construct. Lefebvre's starting point is that in capitalist society, space is used as commodity. Montecasino is one of many examples of space as a commodity, where space itself is used to create value for experiential consumption. In the tradition of the 19th century arcades of Paris or Milan, the contemporary mall presupposes consumerism. In other words a place in which the phantasmagoria of space is employed in the service of consumption. In Montecasino space is not just the environment of the commodity but space itself is a commodity which produces value for experiential consumption. At the same time space is employed in the service of two specialized forms of consumption. The one is a mutant form of flâneurie as consumption and the other is gambling as a form of consumption. In the next chapter we explore these unique subjecthoods of the desire industry. In order to look at how these subjecthoods are constituted in

Montecasino as a specific spatiality, it is necessary to trace clearly the disciplinary heritage of Lefebvre's Trialectics of spatiality.

Levebvre is concerned with the relationship between three elements of space: Spatial Practice, Representations of Space and Spaces of Representation. He has also termed them The Experienced (Lived Space), The Perceived (Perceived Space) and The Imagined (Conceived Space).

Lefebvre suggests a Trialectics of Spatiality: what he calls, Espace Perçu, Conçu and Vécu. The Trialectics of Space, combining Soja and Lefebvre's perspectives:

- **Espace Perçu**, what Soja calls Firstspace is perceived space or spatial practice.
- **Espace Conçu**, what Soja calls Secondspace is conceived space or representations of space.
- **Espace Vécu**, what Soja calls Thirdspace is Lived Space or spaces of representation.

More often than not the conceived and perceived are read separately, but for Lefebvre the perceived and conceived come together in the Lived Space.

As mentioned above, Lefebvre suggests, among others, a triad of subject-object -unity, where unity becomes a third instance. This triad is valuable in relation to the work of Foucault and the way in which this project explores the Lived Space as it constitutes the subject or the individual that Foucault is so fascinated with, as a discursive process. In other words the actual constitution of the subject is a discursive process in which subject and object form a discursive third instance as unity.

Whereas Lefebvre's life project was concerned with the ways in which spatiality is produced, his trialectical thinking enables another way of approaching the constitution of the subject as a triad. This is a triad of subject-object-unity that is specifically enabled through his trialectics of space.

Through linking practice to discourse Lefebvre reoriented the analysis of the construction of the spatial imagery and imaginary. This enquiry into the spatiality of Montecasino as a panoptic heterotopia defines and uses the link between experienced, perceived and imagined space, as it forms an other in Lived Space (experienced).

Lefebvre's Trialectics of space provides a framework for reading the perceived and the conceived in the Lived. By investigating what is meant by Lived Space, we can discover how the subject might be constituted through such a space.

Before we explore the agency in the Lived Space let's further examine and summarize Lefebvre's ideas on The Trialectics of spatiality as interpreted by Soja.

Firstspace (Spatial Practice)/ Perceived Space (Espace Perçu).
Perceived Space is the area of spatial practice concerned with the production and reproduction of space, with locations, with spatial sets and with the ensembles characteristic of social formation.

Perceived Space is the performance that spatial practice produces. Perceived Space is the medium and the outcome of human activity. The analytical standpoint of spatial practice is revealed through the deciphering of its space. Lefebvre refers to the "réalité quotidienne", (everyday life) and "réalité urbaine" (urban reality), which is a materialized socially produced empirical space. To explore Lived Spaces we interrogate perceived and conceived space and their respective epistemes, and borrow from them.

In *THIRDSPACE Soja* summarizes the practice of Firstspace. Firstspace epistemologies and ways of thinking, he argues, have dominated the accumulation of spatial knowledge for centuries. They focus their primary attention on the analytical deciphering of perceived space. Perceived Space is material and materialized physical spatiality that is comprehended in empirically measurable configurations. Firstspace is the absolute and relative configuration of things in space: objects and activities, sites and situations, patterns of distribution and designs. It is the differential knowledge of a multitude of material phenomena in space, the concrete mapable geographies of our life-worlds: ranging from the kinos-sphere of the body to social space, the action spaces of the city, the state, from economics to global geopolitics.

Tsogo Sun's international partner in the Montecasino venture is United States gaming giant MGM Grand and the concept architects were US-based Creative Kingdom. Their Firstspace knowledge of Montecasino would involve the development of the design as a strategic tool, branding the space as a proprietary process, branding the actual environment, retail strategy for the space and packaging the space for destination branding.

Firstspace epistemologies tend to privilege objectivity and materiality, aiming towards a formal science of space - for example the relations between society and nature or the built environment. Spatiality thus takes on the form of a text to be read. Firstspace is read at two levels: the surface and the exogenous or structural social processes. Though a social studies approach to Montecasino can produce a limitless factual scope of information on the space, accumulating and mapping accurate factual knowledge on the space in relation to its place in the city, it can not fall within the ambit of this project, and would have to form part of further research. In addition Firstspace analysis could include sociological and historical knowledge basis, however focusing mostly on how history and social being influences space, rather than asserting space as an influential factor on history and sociality.

A map of the ground plan of the gambling units of Montecasino, is a form of Firstspace knowledge. An example of a Firstspace analysis of the spatiality of Montecasino would involve a careful analysis of the actual material coordinates of these spatial relations. This would be a very interesting project but would have to form part of further research. It can not fall within the ambit of this research report, as it would be too expansive. Firstspace perspectives will however inform the research.

Secondspace (Representations of space)/ Conceived Space (Espace Conçu).

In Secondspace the dominant episteme is semiotics or that of the decoder. Soja calls Secondspace the storehouse of epistemological power. At play here is the power of the conceived space, the power of ideology, of the symbolic, of surveillance and of structure.

Conceptualized space is the stage of scientists, planners, urbanists and technocratic sub-dividers of space. Often first space perspectives inform decisions around conceptualized space. These relations of production and reproduction of conception and design impose control over knowledge, signs and codes. In Secondspace deciphering spatial practice produces spatial knowledge.

Secondspace epistemologies have arisen as a reaction to the closure and objectivism of Firstspace analysis, pitting the artist versus the scientist, the idealist versus the materialist or the subjective versus the objective approach.

Focused on Conceived Space, Secondspace knowledge is produced through the spatial workings of the mind, thus knowledge of space is comprehended through res cognito "thought things". Secondspace explanations can tend towards a more subjective, introspective, philosophical and individualized approach such as evident in Umberto Eco's *Travels in Hyperreality*.[8] The choice of spatiality for this project used Eco's choice of signs as a point of departure. The "signs" he chooses to read in *Travels in Hyperreality* have correlatives in Johannesburg spatialities. Montecasino is one of several similar brand destinations by the same company (Carnival City, The BoardWalk, Grand West, Royal Livingstone, Montecasino, Flamingo Casino, and Meropa Casino.) It is also part of the recent spurt of casinos in South Africa, under new gambling legislation. These range from very specific destination brands such as Montecasino to slightly more obscure never-never real-fake places such as Emerald City Casino. Emerald City Casino is themed around an obscure imagined place that has no referent in the real world, other than the very real conception of an Emerald City by the "branders" of the destination who had nothing holding them back but minor budget constraints.

---

[8] Eco, U. (1987) *Travels in Hyperreality*. London: Picador. p.1-73.

Eco's subjective individualized approach is evident in his choice of names for the real fakes of the American West Coast. He goes as far as calling them Satan's Crèches. This label is questionable from a Firstspace perspective.

Eco's readings provide a framework for comparative analysis, which assist in illustrating the objectives of this project. The concept of the Adult Crèche is taken from Eco. Later chapters will clarify why I should call this space a crèche, in relation to the space as 'miniature' and as panoptic heterotopia. However unlike Eco I will not read Montecasino only as a text, which in his work arises from a semiotic orientation. I will explore it as a Lived Space, and examine how that Lived Space discursively defines subjecthood.

Secondspace is the interpretive local for representing the world. The architect, utopian urbanist and spatial semiologist use it as a space of rationally interpretable signification. The imagined or conceived becomes the real, constructing Secondspace as a symbolic space of rationally interpretable signification.

Cognitive Space defines an urban reality on its own terms, separated from the perceived or material space. (Compare for instance the work of David Harvey with that of Jonathan Raban.) The danger exists that the mental or interpreted could purport to define, produce and explain the material and social world better than precise empirical information, but more importantly "separately". This danger is identified by Bourdieu who calls it the apartheid of knowledge basis.[9] If we compare the Firstspace perspective of the technocrats and Secondspace perspective of the critics of Montecasino, this apartheid is evident.[10] Levebvre suggests that the two collapse into each other at this point and what is lost is how the one produces the other. The fundamental historicity and sociality of space are lost. Spatial practice needs to maintain a sense of how the cognitive is itself a product of the social and how it is implicated in the relations between space, power and knowledge. Again this report can not claim to provide a comprehensive Secondspace analysis of Montecasino but will employ Secondspace epistemes and insights.

Lefebvre was particularly concerned with the hegemonic power of Conceived Space, as purveying and controlling Perceived and Lived Space. Epistemology is a powerful tool and therefore Secondspace can dominate the field of spatial practice. Lefebvre makes a case against forms of spatial reductionism and disciplinary fragmentation. Lefebvre's critique of Secondspace epistemologies becomes the precursor for postmodernist, postcolonial, post-structuralist, post-Marxist critiques of space.

---

[9] Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

[10] Compare for instance David Le Page at:
www.bluegreenprint.co.za/cv/journalism/archives/cat_architecture_urban.html
with the official Montecasino website:
http://www.tsogosun.co.za/montecasino/index.html

Let's consider the Secondspace episteme of Baudrillard and the insights it can provide in relation to Montecasino.

The hyper-reality of Lived Space.

Baudrillard suggests that Lived Space is embroiled in the precession of simulacra.[11] A simulacrum is an exact copy or representation of everyday life as it was or as it might never have been Lived, thus substituting for the real, the "Real Fake".

As a simulacrum, Montecasino is an 'exact' copy of a monastery or a house on the hill as it never was.[12] The fact however remains that Montecassino (the Benedictine Monastery to which its name refers) still functions as an abbey. Foucault suggests that the monastery is the classic precursor of the modern panopticon in its segmentation of time and space, the monastery is the first panoptic space to employ space and time in the service of a certain discipline and control of Lived Space.

Simulacra transform Lived Space into spin doctored scamscapes, spaces where the real and imagined, fact and fiction become spectacularly confused, impossible to tell apart. In the case of Montecasino as simulacrum the referent Montecassino is indeed preceded by the simulacrum Montecasino. The simulacrum reverses the relationship between the sign and the thing. In "On the Impossibility of Drawing a Map of the Empire on a Scale of 1 to 1[13], Eco suggests that such a map, representation or sign that is on a scale of 1:1 would be an exact copy, that would cover the territory or as the satire suggests be on top of the territory. The map or representation therefore precedes the territory[14], suggesting that we no longer know the difference between the map and the territory. It is certainly the case with most visitors to Montecasino that Montecassino is superceded and preceded by its real fake, and that there is no telling how exact the copy might be but more importantly no inclination or necessity for this telling as the model has replaced the territory.

Eco satirically demonstrates that the advantage of this inability to tell the map from the territory is that the "empire" becomes invisible to the enemy, the

---

[11] Baudrillard, J (1983) "The Precession of Simulacra", *Simulations*, tr. P. Fross, P. Patton and P. Beitchman, New York:Semiotext(e) p1-80.

[12] "Monte Cassino was a 15-century-old Benedictine monastery, a great center of European learning, before it was tragically destroyed by Allied bombing in one of the bloodiest battles of World War II. Many thousands of German, Polish and American soldiers died in its assault and defense. Parodying its name for the purposes of running a gambling joint is rather like naming a dental practice after Dachau or a pyrotechnics business after Dresden."
Le Page, D. (2001) Gauteng's newest citadel of sin. *The Mail and Guardian,* January 05, 2001

[13] Eco, U. (1994) *How to Travel with a Salmon.* San Diego/ NY/ London. Harvest. p.95-106.

[14] Ibid. p.95-106.

disadvantage however is that the "empire" becomes invisible also to itself. If we apply this hypothesis to Montecasino it would mean that the power structures or control mechanisms at work in Montecasino become invisible to the consumer in the space, but also that they become invisible to the "empire" itself. This would mean that even the planners and technocrats, the state or private interest involved in controlling the casino could lose sight of the real.

As simulacrum Montecasino is an example of a paradigmatic "real-and-imagined space" - a simulated state of space. The question then becomes how this state of space is the space of state, or control? Can it be that other forces have displaced the space of state, and what would they be? The material signs of the hyperreal are clear; flags of state and the private sector are hung as if they are in the same field. Perhaps the state needs the simulacrum to support the mythological hyperrealities spin-doctored, through myths such as "controlled space is good space", " the taxpayers' revolt is good business practice", "The government's reaction to that revolt is legitimate", " The magic of the market", " The end of time" and "The triumph of consumerism". In the case of Montecasino and enclaved gambling spaces in South Africa the above myths are certainly being played out.

When it comes to the ideological myths or ethos of Hyperreality, the signified becomes more difficult to read, or to come to a consensus on. The Lived Space of Hyperreality is infused and defused with ever-encompassing ideological hyperrealities. Let's examine what the myths of hyperreality are for Montecasino specifically, and how the actors in the space are constituted though this ethos. Our Journey into the hyperrealities of Montecasino starts with a quote from *The Wizard of Oz*, that Soja uses.

" Toto I have a feeling we are not in Kansas any more, but then again neither is Kansas." [15]

" Toto I have a feeling we are not in Montecassino any more, but then again neither is Montecassino."

Simulacra – exact copies of originals that no longer exist - present an elaboration on what Soja calls the real-and-imagined. Baudrillard collapses the terms into each other: the real-imagined and the re-imaged. Montecasino represents a growing incapacity to distinguish between the two. Montecasino visitors need never visit Montecassino, as Soja argues because we are not in Kansas/Italy anymore and for that matter neither is Kansas/Italy. Italy is now a real-imagined and the re-imaged hyperreal 'place' used to sell space. The provinces of Italy might now be better known as the names of cluster developments. As Mike Davis suggests in *City of Quartz*[16], 'Tuscany' is a real-imagined space that sells real estate in California. The subject in Montecasino is therefore an experiential consumer of a real fake spatiality.

---

[15] Soja, E. W. (1996). *Thirdspace.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. p.238.
[16] Davis, M. (1990) *City of Quartz.* NY/ London: Verso.

We are unable to distinguish between real and imagined, as hyperspace becomes part of our everyday life. Baudrillard draws our attention to the fact that reality is no longer what it used to be. The material and the imagined world are no longer what they used to be. In "On the Impossibility of Drawing a Map of the Empire on a Scale of 1 to 1"[17], Eco suggests that such a map (representation or sign) makes the empire redundant, as it is the empire.

If our world is no longer the world of the real or the world of the imagined but a world of the hyperreal, then studying the real material world or as Soja calls it Firstspace, or studying the Secondspace of representation, signs and symbols is also not enough. We have to study the Thirdspace – the Lived Space that is both real and imagined. In a space such as Montecasino where the image/imagined and the reality are confused and fused, it implies that subjecthood in the space is constituted through a process of fusion and confusion of real and imagined. However the subject is unable to tell the difference between the real and the fake as the fake has replaced the real.

Simulation effaces the categories true and false, which brings us to postmodern cultural preoccupations with identity and authenticity. In a case of the hyperreal, what would the actors in the Lived Space see as meanings and what are the referents? What does this imply for the actors in Lived Space in relation to identity and authenticity?

We do not know the difference between the map and the empire, because the map/sign/the signifier as Eco's satire suggests makes the empire invisible not only to enemy empires but also to itself. Baudrillard could have been referring to Montecasino when he said of Irvine: " Its immanence is breathtaking but lacking in a past through which to reflect upon it."[18]

This project is concerned with how hyper-reality affects the Lived Space. How hyper-reality is Lived, it's homologous relationship to ideological metafraud, how it is controlled and to what end? These are far ranging questions. Perhaps we were able to read the real and imagined separately when they were still separated. Now that they are intertwined it follows that we should explore them thus, Conceived and Perceived as Lived Space. The difficult question that arises from the notion of the hyperreal is what it does to the notions of the subjective and the objective. In such a hyperreal space are structure and agency also entertwined? These very difficult questions can be addressed through a Thirdspace approach.

If the space is hyperreal does it follow that being will also be hyperreal? If we can no longer tell the difference between real and imagined in space can we in being? Can we for time? How does the hyperreal inform ideology?

---

[17] Eco, U. (1994) *How to Travel with a Salmon.* San Diego/ NY/ London. Harvest. P95-106

[18] Baudrillard, J. (1988) *America.* London/NY Verso.

The divide between the material approach to spatiality for example David Harvey and the imagined or more discursive approaches to spatiality such as those of Edward Said or Jonathan Raban is huge. Thirdspace addresses the need to bring them together in a reading of the Lived Space. Let us explore the notion of Thirdspace in more detail.

Thirdspace (Spaces of Representation)/ Lived Space (Espace Vécu).
Lived Space embodies the complex symbolism of what is coded and not coded, the infinite amount of uncontrollable perhaps unknowable or unthinkable, variables in our equation. Lived Space is the underground of social life. Ethnographers have invented tools to study these variables. Bourdieu uses the notions of Habitus and Field[19] to provide his own unique tools for the exploration of Lived Space, as it is a domain of spatiality that introduces the agent as a variable in the examination of the space.

Let us define a basis for our thinking on Thirdspace or Lived Space. Lived Space is the space of domination and experience, a space in which social practice is acted not read. It is a space in which our imaginations change and appropriate spatial practice, according to Bourdieu not entirely at will, but with a 'feel for the game'. For Bourdieu, "habitus", the feel for the game, informs action.[20]

Lived Space is the intractable space that stretches across images and symbols. The actors at play in this space are its inhabitants and users, including the artists, philosophers, ethnologists, and anthropologists, in other words the students of representation. If art is a coding of the unknowable, nonverbal, subliminal things and thoughts, Lived Space sets on equal terms the real and imagined, or the liminal counter spaces.

Thirdspace epistemologies arise from the reconstruction of the Fist-Secondspace duality, what Soja calls thirding-as-Othering, designed to reinvigorate first and second space approaches to spatial knowledge with new possibilities. Thirdspace becomes as Soja says the limitless "Aleph"[21] and also what Lefebvre once called the city - a "possibilities machine", a remembrance-rethinking-recovery of spaces lost, or never sighted/sited spaces.

The Aleph is an esoteric concept that can take us on a different journey, however I would like to implement it briefly to introduce the agency in Lived Space. The Aleph is to space what infinity is to time - a container for potential. Borges introduces "The Aleph"[22] with a quote from Hamlet (II, 2):

---

[19] Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology.* Cambridge: Polity Press. p16-18.
[20] Ibid. p98.

[21] Borges, J.L. (1978) *The Aleph and Other Stories.* NY E. P. Dutton. p15-33.
[22] Ibid.

"O God! I could be bounded in a nutshell, and count myself a King of infinite space."

I refer to the concept of the Aleph, because it is a concept that interests students of space: Eco, Soja and in a roundabout way Walter Benjamin are all interested in the Aleph. Benjamin was interested in the Sefer Yitzirah, which is the book of formation, associated with the Aleph and "Ruach" or Air. What interests me is that Borges chooses not to quote the rest of Hamlet's sentence:

"...were it not that I had bad dreams."

Guildenstern calls these dreams ambitions. This brings us back to the world of formation, that which is "in the air" and what is in the air manifests in ambitions, desires or drives. Thus I would like to argue, for the purpose of this project, that whatever is in the Air/Aleph finds a way into manifestation, through the dreams, ambitions, desires and drives of its players. It is these manifestations that are brought into question through this project, whether they be visible or not - what performance theorist Eugenio Barba, in *The Paper Canoe*[23] calls the pre-expressive. The second question this leads us to ask is whether a nutshell can house our ambitions. Confounded to a nutshell or a Crèche, a panoptic heterotopia, what happens to our dreams, ambitions, desires and drives?

Conclusion/Overture

To summarize, Lefebvre's starting point for the re-opening of the spatial is the provocative shift from epistemology to ontology, to the ontological trialectic of Spatiality-Historicality-Sociality. His ontological re-balancing act includes a skepticism towards established epistemologies and ways of obtaining knowledge of the world.

Postmodern discourse is often a reaction against this epistemological crisis in forms of hyperrelativism, without addressing the new ontological issues being raised. Addressing the ontological foundations of knowledge formation can make a significant difference. The procedures by which we claim things to be true or our epistemes can not claim things to be true if our ontology has not affirmed their existence.

Ontological restructuring can thus lead to the spatialization of historicality and sociality in theory formation, empirical analysis, critical inquiry and social practice. This is an ongoing project, for which Lefebvre created a foundation.

Spatialization was Lefebvre's intent, demonstrating that knowledge of spatiality is not obtained in permanent constructions built around formalized closed

---

[23] Barba, E.(1994) *Paper canoe: a guide to theatre anthropology.* London: Routledge.

epistemologies but through an endless series of theoretical and practical approximations, where the journey to new ground never ceases. In spatiality we discover new forms of cultural politics and identity - a new transdisciplinary field of critical cultural studies, revolving around the multiplicitous spatiality of life as Lived Space. Lefebvre makes an active political choice to assert the importance of space as the realm in which time and being come together.

Lefebvre introduces a spatial problematic into all his concerns. He is concerned with everyday life, alienation, and the urban condition. His theorizing on the right to difference introduces a spatial dimension. He includes the spatial in his theory of representations and semiotics, on capitalism and its venue, the reproduction of the social relations of the production of space, as well as in his analysis of the State and its growing control over space, knowledge and power. The control over space, knowledge and power is a major concern for Foucault, whose thinking will be employed in relation to Montecasino as panoptic, heterotopia.

Lefebvre suggests that space brings all social being together and then envelopes it. Space is simultaneously subjective and objective, material and metaphorical, a medium and the outcome of social life. Life occurs in space. Spatial knowledge and the significance of space infuses all realms of social theory, it infuses every discipline and every discourse. Lived Space proceeds from the body and its relationship to space. Our discovery of the Lived experience of space, as it proceeds from the body and its relationship to space, will harness the work of Foucault, to examine how the panoptic and heterotopian nature of the spatiality of Montecasino constitutes subjecthood.

Before considering more specific perspectives on the reading of space real and imagined, or Lived, I summarize the thinking of Edward W. Soja, who comprehends both material and mental dimensions of spatiality, and drawing on Lefebvre, suggests new and different modes of thinking about spatiality.

Soja's importance as a theorist for this project is threefold: Firstly following in the footsteps of Lefebvre, he reclaims a place for spatiality. Secondly he suggests ways of reading space. Thirdly his readings of spatiality will provide a comparative framework for my readings of the spatiality of Montecasino

Soja emphasizes the resonant interplay of temporal succession and spatial conjunction, in Lived Space. This seems obvious, however a comparison might clarify the difference between a space in which there is such interplay, the space that I am to study in this project and Virtual Space.

Virtual Space is a space in which the ancient couple time (as a function of the spinning planets) and space are separated. In Virtual space the more multiple space becomes the more specific time. Virtual space is indeed virtual, in that the variables are determinable. It is a space in which the choices of the actors are determined by the structure. The players therefore become delimited by the

structure. Lived Space differs from Virtual space in this crucial instance: Lived Space despite tradition, or structure, or habitus is a space in which anything can happen. It is a possibilities machine and indeed it is the creative potential of the actors in Lived Space that is the germ of freedom. Virtual Space is a space of our own creation in which we delimit our choices, much like a miniature or a dollhouse, with many questions arising about point of view. This is however a different thesis, the point I wanted to make though, was that virtual space can be free of history, in virtual space we can reboot, reload and recalibrate and time is irrelevant. However in Lived Space we are unable to wipe clean the slate so to speak, in Lived Space we bring everything with us, including ourselves. In Lived Space we bring with us time and being. To the Lived spatiality of Montecasino we bring an extremely complex set of variables. One such a set might be the sociality of being a gambler in Johannesburg and the history of Montecasino as a simulated scamscape that is not a Benedictine monastery. This implies sincere fusion and confusion for the constitution of subjecthood, through the space. Chapter 2 will suggest ways to explore this subjecthood.

CHAPTER 2: THE FLÂNEUR AND THE GAMBLER.

In chapter one I postulate that Lived Space presupposes a certain kind of agency which is a subject – object – unity. If as Soja[24] suggests nothingness or space is the ontological basis for distinguishing subject and object, space is the place in which the subject and object can exist as a unity. The Lived Space is a space in which the perceived (object) and the conceived (subject) come together in the lived. However there is a third that comes into play in this construction of the subject and that is the power or knowledge that Foucault identifies in his genealogy of discipline and control. A power and knowledge that is extracted from the technology of the panoptic spatiality.

This chapter will set parameters for the agency that we explore in the next chapters. Foucault provides the theoretical framework of the Heterotopia and the Panopticon from which the research then proceeds.

Subjecthood, identity, actors, agents or being can be explored from many positions. Our aim is look at it from a spatial perspective, in order to see how spatiality discursively defines subjecthood.

Foucault like Lefebvre and Soja establishes the argument for spatiality as a node of critical enquiry. Foucault's enquiry was into the relationship between power and spatiality. He provides a view into the workings of ideology, of control and power in relation to spatiality.

"The great obsession of the nineteenth century was as, we know, history: with its themes of development and of succession, of crisis and cycle, themes of the ever accumulating past, with its great preponderance of dead men and the menacing glaciation of the world.... The present epoch will be perhaps 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-off, 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. **One could perhaps say that certain ideological conflicts animating present day polemics oppose the pious descendants of time and the determined inhabitants of space**"[25] (My emphasis.)

Thrift suggests that human agency must be seen as a continuous flow of conduct - through time and space - that is constantly interpolating social structure. The individual acts in time and space – located, moving, encountering, interpreting,

---

[24] Soja, Edward W. (1989) *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion Of Space In Critical Social Theory.* London: Verso, p133

[25] Foucault, M. (1986) 'Of Other Spaces', *Diacritics* (Translated from the French by Jay Miskowiec.) NY and London: Routledge p22-27

feeling, being and doing. [26] The subject in the Lived Space is therefore encountering the technologies of certain spatialities that act on the Lived Space.

Foucault introduces a unique 'subjecthood', the "determined inhabitant of space". He draws our attention to the inter-creation of agency and spatiality. The central research question is focussed on space and its determined inhabitants. These determined inhabitants of space are interpreted as 'social functions' that operate as 'social fictions'. I focus on the flâneur as the agent of the Lived Space. The flâneur is my chosen cultural fiction, through which to explore the spatiality of Montecasino. Through an exploration of the heterotopian and panoptic nature of the spatiality of Montecasino the research interrogates how the spatiality constitutes its flâneurs and gamblers.

The flâneur's empathy with the commodity is the condition that creates in him a subject – object – unity. Walter Benjamin in *Charles Baudelaire: A lyric poet in the era of high capitalism writes:*

" If the soul of the commodity which Marx occasionally mentions in jest existed, it would be the most empathetic ever encountered in the realm of souls, for it would have to see in everyone the buyer in whose hand and house it wants to nestle. Empathy is the nature of the intoxication to which the flâneur abandons himself in the crowd."[27]

The flâneur of Montecasino is empathetic not only to the commodity object but also the commodity experience; in other words the flâneur is also empathetic to the space. It is the express purpose of the concept architects Creative Kingdom to create a destination that engages the imagination of the subject.

Before looking in more detail at the notion of the flâneur I would like to draw selectively from ideas around ethnographic and semiotic thinking to Third the notion of the flâneur, which is indeed a micro approach to space. The flâneur is also a highly localized form of agency. The idea is to engender thinking about the global and about structure from this micro approach.

Bourdieu's notion of Habitus[28] as a system of acquired dispositions, functioning on the practical level as categories of perception and assessment, relate to what Lefebvre calls perception and conception as the organizing principles of action, within the Lived Space. The methodology constitutes the agent as the practical operator of the construction of spatiality through experience. But this agent is a

---

[26] Thrift, N. J. (1983a) 'On the Determination of Social Action in Space and Time', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 1 (1): 23-57.

[27] Benjamin, W. (1969/ 1973) *Charles Baudelaire: A lyric poet in the era of high capitalism.* Trans H. Zohn. London. Verso p.55

[28] Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology.* Cambridge: Polity Press. p. 20.

subject-object-unity. Therefore he is as much constituted by the space as it is by him. In being empathetic to the space he desires it.

The aim in the next two chapters is to examine how the panoptic and heterotopian nature of Montecasino discursively defines or constitutes the subject. However I will delimit the subject to a certain cultural fiction - that of the flâneur and to a lesser extent the gambler.

Bourdieu suggests that social functions are social fictions. By naming the person whom they define, they institute and constitute the agent. They order the agent to take his place in the game, in the fiction, to play the game, to act out the function. Thus contributing to ensuring the eternity of the function, which re-exists and survives him.[29] In the Lived Space of Montecasino agents produce and represent they take their place in the game as flâneurs and gamblers. In Lived Space the agent and the spatiality are in a process of constant conception and perception. In other words the Lived Space is a complex system of flux. Bourdieu's 'social functions as social fictions' are conjoined to the agents of Walter Benjamin. The flâneur and the gambler[30] define the agents that I attempt to examine in the specific spatiality. The project will compare the spatiality of the Arcades of 19th century Paris to that of an "Arcade" of Johannesburg 2003 to discover how the spatiality redefines the flâneur and the gambler.

Benjamin suggests that the flâneur is addicted to the phantasmagoria of space and the gambler to the phantasmagoria of time.[31] "Lafargue defines gambling as a miniature reproduction of the mysteries of the market-situation"[32] In the same way flanerie can be seen as a miniature reproduction of the mysteries of the city. The flâneur and gambler of Montecasino is addicted to a simulation that is a miniature of city space and a miniature of the speculation market.

Umberto Eco would define Montecasino as an adult "Crèche" and Benjamin suggested that the arcade is a city, even a world in miniature. It follows that the activities in such a space are hyperreal simulations of activities in the space that it is a miniature of. This is the interesting question in relation to Montecasino – what is the referent – what is it a miniature of? Could it be a miniature of the speculation market in which George Soros and Usama Ben Laden and one or two states are the only players or grownups. The subject in Montecasino plays in a simulated miniature much like the doll's house of the crèche or the simulated road on which you can drive your tricycle, where the subject can simulate grownup activities, but in miniature. Again this would have implications for subjecthood. In simulated space agency and structure are entertwined and so it

---

[29] Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology.* Cambridge: Polity Press. p. 98 -100.
[30] Benjamin, W. (1969/ 1973) *Charles Baudelaire: A lyric poet in the era of high capitalism.* Trans H Zohn. London. Verso. p.174
[31] Ibid.
[32] Ibid.

is impossible for the actors in the space to tell the difference, or even question it. I see this simulation as a way of subduing desires - a form of placating the subject. Baudrillard suggests that: " repression in the advanced countries is not any more an aggression it is an ambiance."[33]

Montecasino is an interesting example of a heterotopia that combines the much-used 'Medieval Tuscan dream' of experiential consumption with gambling but I could have chosen any themed enclaved space, to suggest insights for similar spaces. I use Montecasino as a laboratory for the study of cultural and economic practice harnessing spatiality to exploit the powerful drives or desires of the flâneur and the gambler. Montecassino is a classic panopticon. Montecasino combines the panoptic spatiality with a miniature simulacrum of city space. This combination mirrors urban trends in spatialities such as Melrose Arch or cluster home developments east of Pretoria that include a school and church/golf course in the enclave. The Nazi concentration camps designed in the model of the city[34] are perhaps the first speculum for this trend as the Arcades of Paris were not initially designed as panoptic spaces. Although the rise of prostitution, gambling and dug taking in the Arcades did result in increased policing of the space.

Eco's musings on the "Crèche" and Hyperreality and Baudrillard's ideas around simulacra and the hyperreal provide semiotic insights for the investigation of the Lived Space, its agents and their investments. As suggested, we were able to analyze the real and imagined separately when they were still separated. Now that they are intertwined it follows that we should analyze them as such, conceived and perceived as Lived Space. The complication that arises from the notion of the hyperreal is what it does to the notions of the subjective and the objective? If it would follow that in a hyperreal space structure and agency are also entertwined, then the subject comes as Lefebvre would suggest a subject-object-unity.

The concept of the Adult Crèche taken from Eco, who calls the theme parks of the US West Coast, Satan's Crèches, suggests that the space constitutes the subject as a minor who needs to be guided and observed. Montecasino is an Adult Crèche; the space is a 'miniature' and a panoptic heterotopia. Unlike Eco I, will not read Montecasino as a text; I will investigate it as a Lived Space, in which structure and agency are intertwined.

Why conjoin the above spatial theories with ethnography? Lived Space institutes the agent as a variable in the analysis of spatiality. Bourdieu's concern is with the reintroduction of the genesis of disposition, the history of the individual and with individual narratives. These are avenues that can be explored in further research.

---

[33] Gane, M. (1991) *Baudrillard's bestiary*. London NY: Routledge p. 26.

[34] **Night and Fog (Nuit et brouillard)**
1955/56, b/w and color, France, 32 min., in French with English subtitles Dir. Alain Resnais. Narrated by Michel Bouquet script by Jean Cayrol.

I would like to constitute the agent in the spatiality of Montecasino as perceiver/conceiver of the Lived Space, focussing on how the space constitutes the subject. I believe that this can provide insights for the conception of a constructive disposition, as it is this disposition of the agent that might hold the potential for freedom. As Foucault suggests: " It can never be inherent in the structure of things to guarantee the exercise of freedom. The guarantee of freedom is freedom."[35]

Bourdieu insists on the generative capacities of disposition, on social agents as creative, active inventive agents. [36] They can perform different functions in different spaces. For the purpose of this project I suggest that agents assume culture and identity according to the diversity of situations they find themselves in. The project will therefore inadvertently deal with identity and authenticity, as it is constituted by spatiality.

Selfhood and or identity are not as set as they might have been in pre-modern discourse. Identity is volatile and agents assume different identities in different spaces. Culture, like ethnicity and identity are not as easy to track down as they were for the old anthropologists, who could go to a specific place to study a specific culture in its set space. By analyzing the logistic or spatial parameters, materially and ideologically, of Montecasino, we can see how these might define the subject?

The difference in the spatiality of the 19th century arcades of Paris and that of the panoptic heterotopia of Montecasino in Johannesburg is significant. Homologous to the spatial evolution are the evolutions of the chosen social fictions. The flâneur of Montecasino is still addicted to the phantasmagoria of space, however that space is, as the research sets out to explain, a panoptic heterotopia, from which we can read in the visible, the invisible that constitutes it.

The critical issue in relation to Bourdieu and Benjamin is how urban space can be interpreted & meaning located in the context of subjective experience. The research intends to discover through the spatiality the evidence of latent meanings, signs & mythologies. The theoretical approach to space having postulated that urban culture can not be grasped though purely cognitive and intellectual process alone - the conundrum is how to interrogate the uniqueness of experience, the interface of individual experiences and cultural representation, fantasy and imaginative process. Benjamin and Bourdieu address meaning as an interface between personal conception and perception, and the historical and social construction of dominant meanings and values.

---

[35] Foucault, M. (1994) *POWER the essential works vol. 3 (* ed. Faubion J. & Allen Lane). The Penguin Press (London , NY, Victoria, Toronto, New Delhi, Auckland, JHB). p355.

[36] Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. The University of Chicago Press. p124 – 127.

I constitute the flâneur as a function of the lived spatiality of Montecasino. Elements of the spatiality such as the hyperreal, the crèche, the panoptic and the heterotopia, redefine the flâneur, in relation to his 19th century ancestor - his notions of selfhood, identity and authenticity.

Montecasino is a great many things in one: A space that turns history and culture into a toy. A shopping mall with food-court et al. A Gambling space. A tableau of a village street with a stream running through it. A miniature of the city. Distortions of perspective and scale. Distortions of time; Montecasino is a simulacrum of Montecassino (The original monastery). Montecasino is an oxymoron: It wants to be a city and not. It appropriates the street for those who want to stay as far away from it as possible. Montecasino Where "life is beautiful"(the pay-offline) is the embodiment of the "ex-city".

Perhaps the flâneurs (prostitutes, gamblers and drug addicts) of Montecasino are disenfranchised descendants of their 19th century Parisian ancestry. The ethos that a spatiality such as Montecasino engenders is explored in more detail in chapter 3.

The Flâneur and the Gambler.

The 'Arcades' of Walter Benjamin's: *The Arcades Project* are Paris's first shopping arcades, and the precursors to the modern mall. Built in the mid-19th century, when advances in the technology of construction (glass and cast iron) and of lighting (gas) first made such developments possible. They became the setting for displays of luxury goods, for the self-displays of the fashionable and eccentric, and for the pursuit of thrills like sex and gambling. In other words they institute a certain kind of mall one that is first and foremost there for the consumption of luxury goods but also elicits and employs other desires in the service of consumption. In the case of Montecasino the retailers have complained that the agents in the space are only gambling and not shopping, though it was the intention of the developers to create a shopping mall that would rival Sandton City.

The flâneur is constituted first and foremost by the fact that he is on foot. The major difference between the two arcades then is the fact that the Parisian flâneur is on foot but the flâneur of Montecasino drives to a simulated street and then only is he on foot. This flâneur chooses a simulated street, a crèche street. If the flâneur is to wonder and wander, if he is to desire the phantasmagoria of space, of time, of sex or an altered state then this flâneur chooses to do so in his crèche under supervision. This could indicate one of two things either he is afraid of the street or afraid of his own desires, or as Lefebvre might ad, he is afraid of both. The agents of Montecasino promptly assume their identity as flâneur or gambler as they enter the space. Their identity and authenticity, as it is determined by spatiality, does not seem to be in question they are readily prepared to assume it as they enter. They drive to the enclaved space for the very purpose of performing the role of gambler and flâneur, for playing the game.

However the space is a simulation which implies that the identity of the subject as gambler or flâneur is also simulated.

For Benjamin, the intriguing aspect of the arcades is the extent to which they were linked with the social history and the manifestations of the collective unconscious of the time. They formed, he argues, a "threshold" between two worlds. One is the world of trade and business, in which the arcades perform their overt function as markets for the transmission of commodities. The other is the deeper world of the psyche. In chapter 3 we will examine the heterotopian nature of Montecasino and look in more detail at the social context and the manifestations of the collective unconscious and contemporary ethos of Johannesburg, South Africa, 2004, ten years after 'freedom'.

Entering the arcades, the various figures of bourgeois Paris slip into a subterranean world illuminated by the flickering flames of the gas. Entering Montecasino the figures of proletarian Johannesburg slip into a simulated miniature of a city far removed from theirs in both time and space. They, both however, encounter a heterotopia of dreams and of ecstatic de-personalization. In sensuous interaction with the objects and experiences they desire would-be consumers are themselves transformed into objects. They cease to be agents guided by, the deliberate rationality of operators in the market, and slide into a space in which people become things and things became displays charged with personal significance.

At the same time, however, the Parisians were uneasy in their dream. In it, they imagined their awakening from their thing-like condition. They fight back against the shocks and indignities of their condition by acquiring fantasy identities as street fighters, detectives and other desperadoes. Even these fantastical role models, however, could not seriously engage with reality; like the avatars in modern Internet games, they stayed strictly virtual - they froze back into the posture and the mask. The hyperreal nature of Montecasino makes it unnecessary for its flâneurs and gamblers to make imaginary investments - they are simply desiring consumers who do not assume fantasy identities. The flâneurs of Montecasino do not seem to believe that they need to fight anything, for them the panoptic casino is a form of escapism from reality but at the same time very much part of what is considered real. For them it is a part of their everyday lives, a necessary form of entertainment and relaxation. They readily accept the panoptic discipline of their chosen Adult Crèche.

For the Parisian flâneur there was an underlying sense of decline and of the loss of contact with nature, or as Baudrillard later suggests the real. Every age thinks it is the first to face this; but in fact, as Benjamin shows, this loss of grip, of purpose, of belonging is certainly prolonged, and possibly recurrent. The relentless march of the international market, today's globalization, and our unease with its rapid changes are nothing new. Not only in Benjamin's day, but even in the mid-19th century, as commentators like Engels suggest, the top-

hatted mill-owner had already long been submerged in the anonymity of the public stock market with its institutional investors. In other words the hyperreal had already emerged. The difference being that the flâneur of Montecasino does not seem to experience any sense of loss or unease at this condition. It could be the hyperreality or precession of simulacra that makes it impossible for the flâneur of Montecasino to tell the difference between the territory and the map or the model and its representation. Could it also be that this flâneur chooses not to live in a real space, but chooses instead to live in the simulation?

The reactions Benjamin perceives in the arcades are all part of the 'fetishism', which, in his argument, manifests fears of decline. Sexuality is reduced to morbid exhibitionism. Prostitution, as Benjamin illustrates, reaches enormous proportions; widespread child prostitution becomes a fact of city life. In the fetid interior of the arcades, provocative dress becomes a standard feature. "Obscene" dancing, (the cancan, for example) becomes epidemic and has to be supervised by the constabulary.[37] Benjamin suggests that the real in all forms becomes unfashionable. Prostitutes reduce even pregnancy to a role played by occasionally bearing a child for two or three months before aborting it. The panoptic nature of Montecasino makes this kind of investment impossible. The future nature of 'other spaces' could be to combine the desires for sex, altered states, flâneurie and gambling in panoptic heterotopias. State and private interest collude to create spaces in which these desires can be exploited in the service of consumerism. At this stage the spaces are carefully separated: enclaves for sex and "obscene" dancing are separated from enclaves for gambling. Montecasino provides a space where the entire family can consume and the children can shop or eat while the parents gamble. Enclaves for "obscene" dancing in Johannesburg – such as The Ranch - do not provide the same benefits.

Benjamin was a declared Marxist. The first aspect of his position is political. Commentators often gloss over this, but it has a clear structuring role in his Arcades project. Not only is Benjamin's diagnosis of the ills of the age (theirs and his) Marxist. The dream that so fascinates him is the dream of commodity fetishism from the early chapters of Das Kapital. What this fetishism conceals is the commodification, under capitalism of human individuality. The dynamics of what follows are also Marxist. The dreamers of the Arcades are the proletarianised bourgeois. The modern mall makes no distinction – flâneurs and gamblers might be differentiated into distinct income brackets but they are all only consumers no matter their dream or desire or class – it is employed in the interest of consumption. Their identity as consumers is readily assumed. Their weakness is their historic failure to understand that they too are caught up in the class struggle.

---

[37] Benjamin, W. (1969/ 1973) *Charles Baudelaire: A lyric poet in the era of high capitalism.* Trans H Zohn. London. Verso. p.35-67.

In the phantasmagoric arcades Parisians see themselves as they "really" are - as reified commodities on the labour market. They are not the subjects of the market, they are its objects; the dreams of the arcades destroy all the illusions a waking consciousness tries to retain. The Parisian woman with the expensive attire or the contemporary Wonderbra is, in reality, bearing her body to market as a prostitute. The flâneur scandalizing his contemporaries with the tortoise he takes for walks on a lead is, in the end, only accentuating his own superfluity in the real world of the labour market. In the end, they are all no different from the wage slaves from the factories, however much the latter may be excluded from the palaces of consumption with their dreams and marvels. Montecasino does not exclude anybody – in fact it encourages the poorest or even the pensioner to part take in the flâneurie and gambling. The poorest of the poor and the pensioner is bussed into the enclave of consumption. If you do not have your own car to park in the huge parking lot you can take a taxi from your camp or be bussed in from your enclaved retirement village. You are welcome to stay until you have spent your last cent and even then – the Casino's "Men in Black" will not throw you out unless your behavior undermines the discipline of consumption.

An aspect of Benjamin's position is philosophical, revolving around the difficult and only very indirectly "Marxist" topic of time. Each age, Benjamin says, has a longing to "awaken". This despite Benjamin's "messianic" comments, is something to which he tries to give a secular form.[38]

Awakening, for Benjamin, is a matter of breaking free from an administered continuity, and of recognizing that the momentary now is, in relation to what comes before or after, the only true reality. One of the activities in which this insight is implicit is gambling. Gambling, though on one level futile and irrational, is on another the refusal to accept the tyranny of continuous time and the petty pace, among other things by collapsing whole segments of merely administered life into the one momentous decision of chance.

Gambling, of course, remains imprisoned within the dream. It flirts with freedom, but never finally achieves it.[39] What, then, is real awakening? In Benjamin's work, the answer to this remains elusive. Though many asking the same question, eventually conclude that awakening could never happen adequately in this world. Benjamin certainly did not subscribe to that view; though by the time of his death he probably retained little faith that orthodox socialism would bring about awakening either. So can we hope for a non-religious 'awakening'? The question remains open. Is it not the aim of government to use gambling as a form of appeasing the poorest of the poor? The ideological implication for a spatiality

---

[38] Benjamin, W. (1969/ 1973) *Charles Baudelaire: A lyric poet in the era of high capitalism.* Trans H Zohn. London. Verso.

[39] Benjamin, W. (1969/ 1973) *Charles Baudelaire: A lyric poet in the era of high capitalism.* Trans H Zohn. London. Verso. p134-138.

such as Montecasino is to keep the subject in a state of what Mary Daly[40] would call a-musement.

Benjamin suggests that the 19th century flâneur, of Paris demanded elbowroom and was unwilling to forego the life of the gentleman of leisure. The flâneur of Montecasino sees the enclaved space as his opportunity for leisure activity, his very opportunity to become the gentleman of leisure. Unlike his 19th century counterpart whose leisurely appearance as a personality is his protest against the division of labour, which makes people into specialists, the flâneur of Montecasino is trapped in a hyper reality where the 'empire' and its power is invisible.

Around 1840 it was briefly fashionable to take turtles for a walk in the arcades the flâneurs liked to have the turtles set the pace for them. In Montecasino these reactions are employed in the service of consumption. The very heterotopian nature of the space is there to replace the street on which not even wondering but the very act of walking is substituted with moving through the city in a car. If he wanted to react to the speed of the pace he could drive his turtle with him and discover that Montecasino allows no animals.

Montecasino is a hyperreal street that is indeed an interior. For the 19th century flâneur the street becomes a dwelling and he is as much at home among the facades of houses as he is in his four walls. The contemporary flâneur, however is the exact opposite as the streets are now a representation of streets, but within an interior?

"The crowd was the veil from behind which the familiar city as phantasmagoria beckoned to the flâneur. In it, the city was now landscape, now a room. And both of these went into the construction of the department store, which made use of flâneurie itself in order to sell goods. The department store was the flâneur's final coup. As flâneurs, the intelligentsia came into the market place. As they thought, to observe it - but in reality it was already to find a buyer. In this intermediary stage they took the form of the bohème. To the uncertainty of their economic position corresponded the uncertainty of their political function."[41]

In this chapter I have chosen to delimit the subject under consideration in the Lived Space to the gambler and the flâneur. I postulate that these social fictions or cultural constructs are used by the institution controlling the panoptic spatiality of Montecasino to define the subject as a postmodern flâneur and gambler. With postmodern I mean a kind of hyper real version of the gambler and flâneur, whose sense of identity is decentered by the technology of the spatiality.

---

[40] Daly, M.(1984) *Pure Lust.* The Woman's Press. London. p304.

[41] Benjamin, W. (1969/ 1973) *Charles Baudelaire: A lyric poet in the era of high capitalism.* Trans H Zohn. London. p. 35-66.

In the next two chapters we examine on which principles these technologies operate.

CHAPTER 3: HETEROTOPIA

This chapter uses Foucault's principles of the heterotopia, to explore how the spatiality of Montecasino constitutes the subject. Montecasino is also a panopticon, a space that observes, to supervise and examine subjects in the space. Foucault suggests that panoptic spatialities are a function of institutional control. The notion of control and public, private or state interests in that control will be explored in Chapter 4.

Spatiality provides us with concrete evidence with which we can explore the subject, or more specifically the chosen social and cultural fiction of the flâneur and the gambler. By conjoining the Lived Space of Lefebvre and the cultural fiction of the flâneur and the gambler I examine the otherness of the spatiality of Montecasino. We recall from Chapter 1 that Lefebvre suggests that the Lived Space is the space in which the conceived and the perceived come together in the lived.

Within the complexities of postmodern sociological, cultural and ethnographic discourses the subject becomes ever more elusive. Spatiality offers certain solidities through which we can explore the subject. Space connotes differences, distances, location, separation and limitation – these are solidities that are corporal and provide boundaries that can fix and display the subject.

The Heterotopia

"The heterotopia is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible... they have a function in relation to all the space that remains. This function unfolds between two extreme poles. Either their role is to create a space of illusion that exposes every real space, all the sites inside of which human life is partitioned, as still more illusory.... Or else, on the contrary, their role is to create a space that is other, an other real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled. The latter type would be the heterotopia, not of illusion, but of compensation, and I wonder if certain colonies have not functioned somewhat in this manner."[42]

If heterotopia means space of otherness, how is the spatiality of Montecasino other and to which use is that otherness put as a node of (dis) ordering. If the carnival or fair is as much a space of otherness as the prison, how does this (dis) ordering of the spatiality constitute the subject. By examining the specific Lived Space of Montecasino we can delimit the attributes of the space and catalogue characteristics that are attributable to similar spaces.

---

[42] Foucault, M. (1986) "Of Other Spaces", *Diacritics* (Translated from the French by Jay Miskowiec.) NY and London: Routledge. p25.27.

1. Montecasino is an enclaved space: it is separated from the rest of the city the rest of the world and the rest of the universe. With the universe I mean that it is even separated from the sun and the natural functions of light, in other words even light is simulated. This enclave is branded or themed for experiential consumption.
2. In this enclave gambling is state sanctioned. A space in which the otherwise illegal desire to take a chance is allowed. Or we can say that the otherwise economic activity of speculation, normally the exclusive domain of the wealthy, is simulated and sanctioned for the poor. This desire is also harnessed in the service of consumerism. Private interest and the state benefit from this financially and then of course so does the occasional gambler.
3. In this enclave the not so dangerous activity of loitering or flâneurie is employed in the service of consumption. The space is there for the express purpose of loitering and wondering around aimlessly without any strict aim or direction. The spatiality mirrors the ethos of a maze, a space in which the subject must linger – but linger to consume.

Thrift suggests that in space individuals are located, moving, encountering, interpreting, feeling, being and doing. [43] In a heterotopia the subject is located, moving, encountering, interpreting, feeling, being and doing in a site, through sights that are incompatible, juxtaposed and contradictory. Through Foucault's principles of heterotopia we can examine - the differences, distances, location, separation and limitation - the solidities of the Lived Space of Montecasino, that constitute these contradictions.

Foucault's essay 'Of Other Spaces'[44] also translated as "Different Spaces" [45] suggests six principles of heterotopias. In each instance I digest Foucault's principle and then relate the principle to the heterotopian aspects of Montecasino, and how it might constitute the subject.

1. I start with Foucault's third principle, which suggests that the heterotopia has the ability to juxtapose in a single real place, contradictory emplacements (spaces/ spatialities), that are incompatible in themselves, or foreign to one another.

The ethos of the spatiality of Montecasino combines contradictory elements, juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible.

---

[43] Thrift, N. J. (1983a) 'On the Determination of Social Action in Space and Time', Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 1 (1): 23-57.
[44] Foucault, M. (1986) "Of Other Spaces", *Diacritics* (Translated from the French by Jay Miskowiec.) NY and London: Routledge.
[45] Foucault, M. (2000) "Different Spaces" *Aesthetics* (Vol2). (ed.) Faubion J. (Translated from the French by Hurley, R. and others) Penguin Books. P175-185.

The spatiality of Montecasino is themed. It is a hyperreal and real-fake Italian village shopping mall and casino, combining the contradictory theme of the panoptic abbey of Montecassino with the réalité quotidienne and "local colour" of an unidentifiable time and space in an unidentifiable Italian village. In contemporary Italian a casino is a whorehouse and the expression "What a casino!" means "What chaos!". Though the spatiality is a real fake that simulates the (dis) order of everyday life and city space, it is a space carefully designed to order the activity of flanerie and gambling as forms of consumption. Montecasino is a panoptic space but it also takes as its theme Montecassino (the abbey) a classic example of a panopticon: a space of extreme discipline and control, in which there is for the subject in the space no notion of personal freedom. Time and space are strictly partitioned and controlled. The classic panopticon has no public space nor does it allow its subjects to engage in commerce. (The institute controlling the panopticon is responsible for transactions: whether in the form of commercial exchange or war looting.)

In combining the panoptic spatiality with a miniature simulacrum of city space Montecasino mirrors urban trends in spatialities such as Melrose Arch or cluster home developments east of Pretoria that include a school and church/golf course in the enclave. The Nazi concentration camps – panoptic but designed in the model of the city[46] are perhaps the first speculum of this trend.

The spatiality of Montecasino is other in that it is lit to simulate constant twilight. Not day, nor night. It is neither the brightly-lit environment of the shopping mall nor the dark streets of the inner city of Johannesburg but an in-between state, a state of 'becoming'. A state in which the subject is sanctioned to become a "body without organs"[47], but without having to push the limits of existence. The becoming a "body without organs", or being free of the limitation of the body, is under supervision. In other words De Sade's Castle under supervision: a crèche of De Sade's Castle. Herein lies a further contradiction: an enclave that actively encourages the freedom of the subject to partake in otherwise illegal activities but to do so under supervision. What does this tell us about adulthood and freedom in a broader social or cultural context? Montecasino is an adult Crèche in which the activity of gambling is state sanctioned within a panoptic space in order to tax the players.
The concluding chapter will explore who might benefit from spatialities that are a Dollhouse or a Crèche of the subject's desires and freedom, and what this can tell us about how the spatiality constitutes the subject. Spatiality is a speculum for the subjects' sense of identity and authenticity that in the case of Montecasino embodies the contradiction of freedom and confinement.

---

[46] **Night and Fog (Nuit et brouillard)**
1955/56, b/w and color, France, 32 min., in French with English subtitles Dir. Alain Resnais. Narrated by Michel Bouquet script by Jean Cayrol.
[47] Guattari, F. & Negri T. (1993) *A Thousand Plateaus* Minneapolis London, University of Minnesota Press p149-167

Montecasino simulates the classic city – the house on the hill - like Tivoli, a perfect whole, and an enclaved totality. This simulation however finds itself in the context of an excity - the decentralized exopolis of Johannesburg, in which Baudrillard's 'precession of simulacra' make it impossible and unnecessary to tell the difference between the real and the fake. Montecasino juxtaposes in a single real place contradictory emplacements that are incompatible in themselves, or foreign to one another. It wants to be a city and not. Montecasino where "life is beautiful"[48] is the embodiment of the "ex-city". It sequesters the street for those who want to stay as far away from it as possible because it is deemed dirty or dangerous or because it is no longer a street for wanderers but a street for drivers. There are no prostitutes, junkies or crackheads on its streets. There are however disenfranchised flâneurs and gamblers. The trend suggest that city planners might institute enclaved spaces that are panoptic heterotopias for the prostitute and drug addict.

The spatiality of Montecasino constitutes the subject as confined and sequestered to the 'freedom' of wandering and gambling.

2. Foucault suggests that heterotopias exist in all societies, although they take varied forms and are never universal; they are found in all cultures. Foucault identifies two categories: heterotopias of 'crisis' and heterotopias of 'deviation'. Heterotopias of 'crisis' are the heterotopias of privileged, sacred, or forbidden spaces reserved for individuals who are in a state of stressful transition. Foucault gives the examples of the nineteenth century boarding school, military service facilities but also the 'honeymoon hotel'. This can be seen as a space of ritual transition, becoming or rite of passage. Heterotopias of 'deviation' on the other hand describe the difference of spaces such as rest homes, psychiatric hospitals and prisons.

Foucault's work traces the historical modernizing transition between heterotopias of crisis and those of deviation, suggesting that in modern spatiality crisis heterotopias are replaced by heterotopias of deviation. Montecasino is an example of this modernizing transition. Montecasino combines aspects of the crisis heterotopia with the heterotopia of deviation, but the spatiality is more that of deviation. Subjecthood is constituted as deviant more than in transition.

For the actors in Montecasino, the crisis aspect of transition is nonessential. If there is any sense of transition it is not a stressful transition of ritual or metamorphosis. The metamorphosis or rite of passage seemingly requires no process. The rite promises the transition of instantaneous wealth. Of consumption producing luck. This luck does however require a personal process of consumption. Gambling relies on the potential of the next second changing the course of history without the agent's engagement with a process of stressful transition.

---

[48] The payoff line for Montecasino is taken from the Italian film – *Life is Beautiful.*

Nevertheless the spatiality disciplines the body and here the spatiality relies on the heterotopia of deviation's panoptic technologies. The spatiality of Montecasino is panoptic in that it is arranged to instill a specific form of control in order to discipline and focus the body and desires of the subject in the Lived Space. Like a worker at a machine performing the same action over and over, the gambler is trapped at the slot machine, where every chance is a new beginning, but for that chance he must put money in the machine.

3. A further principle of the heterotopia that Foucault suggests in 'Of Other Spaces' is that heterotopias can operate in different ways over time, changing function and meaning over time, according to the 'synchrony of the culture' in which they occur. The same space can take on new functions. Foucault gives the example of the cemetery. Until the late eighteenth century, the cemetery is placed at the heart of the city next to the church and deeply associated with sacred resurrection and the immortality of the soul, later removed to the suburbs in the service of improved sanitation and the individualization of the dead. A movement from sacred to sanctioned. From a small part of the whole separated to hallow the whole, to the whole enclaved and individuated to discipline, observe, control and sanction the separated. [49]

Montecasino operates in different ways within a specialized spatiality, changing function and meaning within the disjuncture of the spatiality. Firstly Montecasino simulates a miniature of the whole – a hyperreal fake of the city. It replaces the city. It is a miniature of the whole. It is a spatiality in which the traditional spatiality of the city streets or the arcades of the flâneur have taken on a new form and a new function. It is a city within the excity. It therefore constitutes subjecthood as a form of simulated activity – a form of play or imagination of an activity, such as flanerie or gambling, separated from the whole in order to sanction the separated.

Secondly Montecasino simulates the fair, but it is a panoptic fair. Herein again we find a contradiction or juxtaposition: a space for fun and games individuated and observed. It's flâneurs and gamblers might be mesmerized by the phantasmagoria of the space but they are also disciplined by it. The lighting determines the agent's focus. A concrete example of this is the gambler in front of the back lit slot machine, analogous to the back lit subject in the panoptic cell. The juxtaposition being that the subject is disciplined into flâneurie and gambling rather than being jailed for it.

Montecasino is the heterotopia of freedom and control in which both freedom and control extend beyond their boundaries and mingle with one another. The flâneur of the Lived Space of Montecasino lives in a space of contradictory spectacle

[49] This ties in again with what we will explore in more detail in chapter 4: the panoptic nature of Montecasino

and surveillance. The spatiality is that of a carnival under constant observation. The ethos of the carnival and that of surveillance is contradictory, the former intimating a sense of total freedom from control and the latter a sense of self-control within the subject under surveillance.

4. Foucault suggests that heterotopias are connected with temporal discontinuities: slices of time, termed heterochronies. Heterochronies present an intersection and phasing of space and time. The periodization of spatiality allows the heterotopia to function within a trackable historical geography. Specialized sites exist to record these crossroads of time and space. Foucault gives the examples of Libraries & Museums, which organize an infinite accumulation of time. They are specialized spaces of all times that appear themselves outside of time and its ravages. These heterotopias function when men are at a brake with traditional time. In contrast fairs, festival sites, vacation and leisure villages organize time as futile and transitory, abolishing time to regain time.

Foucault foresees a more 'Disneyed' world when he predicts the two forms increasingly converging in compressed, packaged environments that seem to both abolish and preserve time and culture. This foresees a trend in spatialities that appear to be somehow both temporary and permanent. Montecasino is such a 'Disneyed' heterotopia: a fair-library. A museum of the Tivoli's of the world for those who do not need or want to read inscriptions or legends. A museum, that is a perfect fake of an original or referent that is replaced by its model. A museum in which you can wonder though the city as a tableau: a moment of time frozen in space, suggesting that time and its players can not influence space. However this space is arranged in the service of the discipline of consumption through gambling and is therefore a spatial accumulation of time for the futile, transitory, abolishment of time. This again is a juxtaposition that instills in the subject the contradiction of time preserved and time abolished.

5. The heterotopia is established by constraints to entry, rituals and purification for permission. It conceals exclusions, and creates the "everybody can enter" illusion. It is absolutely sheltered and out of the public eye. Heterotopias presuppose a system of opening and closing that simultaneously makes them both isolated and penetrable. Entry and exits are regulated in many ways: by compulsion (the prison, the army barracks), by rites and purification's (the hamman, the Scandinavian sauna) or by illusions of freedom (the open to all bedrooms of the Brazilian farm, Motel rooms for adulterous sex), where more subtle boundary disciplines are imposed. Here the heterotopia takes on the qualities of human territoriality, with its surveillance of presence and absence, its demarcation behaviors, its protective definition of the inside and the out. Implicit in this regulation of opening and closing are the workings of power and of disciplinary technologies.

Montecasino's exterior stands out as a real-fake medieval Italian village on the strip development bypass through the excity of Johannesburg. But the interior is sheltered from the bright light of the highveld and lit in a fake twilight of ever-blue sky with orange sunset tinges. Inside you are excluded from the public eye – inside it is always twilight... always happy hour. The condensed interior and warm lighting shelters its agents from the public eye. However the subject is never sheltered from the omnipresent gaze of the surveillance camera. In Chapter 4 we consider in more detail the functioning of the omnipresent gaze and voice.

Montecasino conceals exclusions and creates the "everybody can enter" illusion. It's surveillance or control system, which includes surveillance cameras, uniformed security officers and the 'Men in Black' presuppose a system of opening and closing that simultaneously makes Montecasino both isolated and penetrable. Entry and exits are regulated: There are the paid parking entrants; the bussed in senior citizens actively canvassed by the marketing department of the casino, or those who take taxis and walk in off the bypass.

Montecasino through its system of surveillance takes on the qualities of human territoriality. The system observes presence and absence; it demarcates behaviors and carefully protects the Casino's definition of the inside and the out. Implicit in this regulation of opening and closing are the workings of power and of disciplinary technologies. These technologies are implicit in the actual policing of the space but are also imposed by the panoptic nature of the spatiality itself. [50]

6. Heterotopias function in relation to the all the space that remains – an external function that unfolds between two poles: illusion and compensation.

.

Foucault suggests that the heterotopia of illusion's role is to create a space of illusion that exposes every real space, all the sites into which human life is partitioned, as even more illusory. These heterotopias have the function of creating a space of illusion that denounces all real space. Here Foucault gives the example of the Brothel.

The heterotopia of compensation's contradictory role is to create a space that is other, another real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed and jumbled. This is the heterotopia of compensation and Foucault wonders if certain colonies have not functioned in this manner. A space of compensation as perfect as ours is muddled.

Here we are faced with the complicated question of what the spatiality of Montecasino denounces or compensates for. Is it the fact that like the America's

---

[50] Again this aspect will be discussed in chapter 4.

Africa has no mnemonic link to the classic city of Europe, what Umberto Eco likes to refer to as the historylessness of American culture? Africa's only memory of or recall to Europe is one of genocide and desecration.

Montecasino is a real fake of a Benedictine monastery, a house on a hill, set in the sprawling excity of Johannesburg. The examination concludes with the 6th principle, an examination of Montecasino's function in relation to the remaining space of the city of Johannesburg. How does Montecasino denounce the real space of Johannesburg, and how and for what in Johannesburg does it compensate?

Foucault refers to the ship as the ultimate heterotopia. " In civilizations without ships the dreams dry up, espionage takes the place of adventure and the police that of the corsairs"[51]. To further examine the phenomena of police replacing Polis, the research will employ the work of Mike Davis. His work on Los Angeles: *City of Quartz* provides interesting corollaries for Johannesburg. Like LA the spatiality of JHB brings with it a maelstrom of sociological and historical dilemmas around race and class which can not fall within the ambit off this research report, but will never the less be raised.

Montecasino is a space, shown up by the world that it excludes. To discover the spatiality that it excludes we examine the urban contradictions of the spatiality of Johannesburg. Johannesburg is a city of 'Fortresses and Camps'[52] par excellence; a spatiality that demonstrates a heritage and a new tendency to merge urban design, architecture and the police or private security apparatus into a single comprehensive security effort.

The city of Johannesburg has inherited a spatiality of: Fortresses and Camps, of walled communities and "Urban bantustans", where the race and class struggles are institutionalized in urban space. In Johannesburg this has lead to the destruction of Public Space, both as a historic apartheid project and as an ongoing trend. Municipal policy takes the lead from private commercial interest or the middleclass demand for a security offensive and increased spatial and social insulation. The crusade to 'secure' the city starts with the destruction of accessible public space and ends with "Real Fake" replacements, of which Montecasino is an example. This replacement is not strictly a public space, not in the Olmstedian vision of Public space. Montecasino simulates public space but it is part of the privatization of the public realm. If Olmstead's vision of public space was that it should be a social safety valve in which people of all races, classes and ages could mix freely and for free, can Montecasino actually be seen as public space?

---

[51] Foucault, M. (2000) "Different Spaces" *Aesthetics* (Vol2). (ed.) Faubion J. (Translated from the French by Hurley, R. and others) Penguin Books. P185

[52] Davis, M. (1992) *City of Quartz*. Vintage

Like LA, JHB is a city at war. A city that demonstrates perfectly the war of the rich on the poor, what Cary Miller[53] calls the "Revolt of the rich against the poor". Unlike Los Angeles Johannesburg is also an African city, contending with an Apartheid heritage of Fortresses and Camps as well as a burgeoning new tradition of Fortification and Camps. JHB is faced with the additional challenge of development. In 2004 the City will celebrate 10 years of its newfound democracy, contending with a maelstrom of growth and crisis.

JHB's social polarization has increased as rapidly as its population. Decades of systematic under- investment in housing and urban infrastructure, subsidies for speculators, permissive zoning for commercial development, absence of affective regional planning, and low property taxes for the wealthy have ensured the erosion of the quality of Lived Space for the middleclasses in older suburbs, the working classes from the Camps/townships as well as for the inner city poor.

The city and its business have relocated. Fear of the city and violence has prompted "The Great Trek" to the north, leaving behind a ghost city. Increasing violence in the ever further-out suburbs leads us to wonder why the violence, the fear and the insecurity went with? Was it part of the original package? Davis suggests that "The social perception of threat becomes a function of the security mobilization itself, not crime rates." [54]

Myths around the dangers of the inner city whether it be highjacking or broken streetlights, ferment the moral panics that reinforce and justify urban apartheid. Where are the democratic spaces of JHB? Montecasino and surrounding malls is reciprocally dependent upon the "camps" of the service proletariat. Is Montecasino a social safety valve, mixing classes and ethnicities in common recreations?

Montecasino is set within the new suburban separatism that has replaced apartheid planning. Mike Davis in reference to LA could be referring to JHB when he writes:

" Welcome to post-liberal LA where the defense of luxury lifestyles is translated into a proliferation of new repressions in space and movement, undergirded by ubiquitous 'armed response'. The obsession with physical security systems, and, collaterally, with the architectural policing of social boundaries, has become a zeitgeist of urban restructuring, a master narrative in the emerging built environment of the 1990s. Yet contemporary urban theory, whether debating the role of electronic technologies in precipitating 'postmodern space' or discussing the dispersion of urban functions across poly-centred metropolitan 'galaxies', has been strangely silent about the militarization of city life so grimly visible at the street level"[55]

---

[53] .Miller, Gary. (1981)*Cities by contract: The Politics of Municipal Incorporation*, Cambridge, Mass. p9.
[54] Davis, Mike. (1992) *City of Quartz*, Vintage. p224
[55] Davis, Mike. (1992) *City of Quartz*, Vintage. p223

Montecasino's contribution to its community has been to set up a police station adjacent to the casino. The dystopian realities of JHB, from the huge informal housing sector (refugee, labour and squatter camps) to the unserviced Arcades of the pavements contrast with the paranoiac scale of residential and commercial security, which almost supplant hopes for urban reform and social integration. In JHB the race and class struggle is institutionalized in urban space.

JHB demonstrates a heritage and a new tendency to merge urban design, architecture and the police or private security apparatus into a single comprehensive security effort. We have to ask what consequences this coalescence has for the social relations of the built environment? If certain activities need to be controlled and the city streets are too dangerous a place to do so, then how will urban design and architecture coalesce with state and private interest and its security apparatus to do so? Montecasino might also provide a matrix for the study of the hidden coalescence of state and private interest, in this security and placation effort.

Metropolitan policy takes the lead from the security offensive and Middleclass demand for increased spatial and social insulation, allowing the encampment of neighborhoods. De facto dis-investment in traditional public space has supported the shift of fiscal recourses to corporate defined redevelopment priorities.
Is the Adult Crèche an urban form that follows a repressive function?

The spatiality of Montecasino is an abuse of scale, proportion and composition, that denigrates the spatiality of the street to a disproportionate miniature, or crib of itself and confiscates the Lived public space and its activity, in the service of consumerism.

This brings us to the question of the city in relation to The Pedestrian.
The anti-pedestrian bias of the new-corporate citadel of Sandton for instance, sees a deliberate obliteration of street frontage. This is replaced with private streets, the mall or a space like Montecasino.

The flâneur of this city space is a poor cousin of her 19th century equivalent. Still addicted to the phantasmagoria of space, the JHB flâneur is incarcerated in a panoptic heterotopia. The flâneur can happily practice his addiction but only in a crèche. Can we then assume that the same goes for the gambler, the prostitute and the drug taker? What happens outside of the crèche? Montecasino is a streetscape devoid of fault, perfect-street, shown up only by the City Street that it excludes. What does this street look like? It is sadistic in its hardening of surface against the poor, the homeless, the prostitute and the flâneur. It has no public facilities or even bus benches. In the inner city of JHB her prostitutes stand in the dark. Sandton architecture is turned inside out in the service of security and profit, eliminating the social mixture of crowed in normal pedestrian circulation and replacing its space with panoptic heterotopias.

Montecasino is situated in a suburban JHB that is the ultimate city of capital negating every classical value of traditional European urbanity. Yet the space itself aspires to the exact opposite.

Foucault refers to certain colonies as heterotopias. Perhaps the walled community is the new colony: spaces devoid of fault perfect places, shown up only by the world that they exclude. Does this mean that for those with the means it is possible to live in heterotopic nodes exposed only by the spaces between them, distances traversed in a car? The implications for the flâneur of Montecasino is that he is fleeing the city street. The flâneur of Montecasino is animated by fear and for that reason is only to happy to have the Lived Space of his heterotopia under panoptic surveillance. In the panoptic heterotopia the flâneur is not part of a crowed that is a social mix, he is in a mix of objects like himself.

Spatialities such as Montecasino signal a spatial trend in city planning towards the elimination of public space with its democratic intoxications, risks and unscented odors. This trend uses the technologies of spatiality to pacify the city. In the panoptic heterotopia the pacification of the Lived Space and the subject is complete.

A spatiality such as Montecasino juxtaposes contradictory elements and in the case of Montecasino the contradictions are highlighted further by the extreme and complex contradictions of the spatiality of the city - JHB. The subject of Montecasino juggles a complex set of juxtapositions and contradictions that are invisible within the enclave. It is the extremeness of the contradictions of the spatiality of JHB that foregrounds and highlights all contradictions. The extremeness of the contradictions make the contradictions visible and it is that visibility which carries the germ of freedom for the subject of Montecasino.

The function of the otherness of the spatiality of Montecasino unfolds between two extreme poles: To create a space of illusion that exposes Lived Space and all the sites into which Lived Space is partitioned as still more illusory. At the other extreme Montecasino is a space of compensation, as perfect, as meticulous, with the perceived and conceived as well arranged and ordered as Lived Space is jumbled and (dis) ordered. If as Foucault contends certain colonies have functioned somewhat in this manner,[56] I would argue that the spatial trend of panoptic heterotopias is the new site of the colony, with its incumbent constitution of subjecthood as subjugated.

---

[56] Foucault, M. (1986) "Of Other Spaces", *Diacritics* (Translated from the French by Jay Miskowiec.) NY and London: Routledge. p25.27.

CHAPTER 4: THE PANOPTICON

The panopticon is a space that observes for two main purposes: supervision and examination. The spatiality of Montecasino is panoptic in that it is equipped to supervise and lure its consumers into the required activity of either flanerie or gambling as forms of consumption and then to examine these activities for market research. In this chapter we explore how the technology of the panoptic spatiality achieves this. We interrogate how the panopticism of the spatiality of Montecasino constitutes its subject.

The panopticon is spatiality designed to segment space and time for the express purpose of discipline and control. This discipline and control is in the service of 'power'. In the case of Montecasino and similar spatialities – Who wields this power? – Who is in the "Tower"? For Foucault power is everywhere: not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere. Power is not an institution, nor a structure, nor a possession. It is the name we give to a complex strategic situation in a particular society.[57] For Foucault the threefold aspects of panopticism - supervision, control and correction – are fundamental to and a characteristic of the power relations that exist in society today.

Foucault suggests that the discipline and control of modern panopticism has become an internalized function. It would follow that in a spatiality such as Montecasino this control or power of the technology of panopticism is a discursive process between the space, the power that operates through it and the subject in it.

If as Zizek suggests:

"The only real obedience, then, is an 'external' one: obedience out of conviction is not real obedience because it is already "mediated" through our subjectivity - that is, we are not really obeying the authority but simply following our judgment, which tells us that the authority deserves to be obeyed in so far as it is good, wise, beneficiant...."[58]

Is the subject of Montecasino obeying an authority or simply following their own good judgement? This brings into question the 'good judgement' – the very subjecthood and identity of actors in the space. If we view the nature of power as a complex strategic situation in a particular spatiality, the nature of power in Montecasino is one that separates: the space itself is enclaved from the rest of the world and for the subject in it, space and time are segmented. In this laboratory power is a complex interplay between the internalized and external conceptions and perceptions of Lived Space.

---

[57] Foucault, M (1994) *POWER the essential works vol. 3* ed. Faubion J.Allen Lane. The Penguin Press(London , NY, Victoria, Toronto, New Delhi, Auckland, JHB)

[58] Zizek, S. (1985.1989) *The Sublime Object of Ideology.* London, NY. Verso (5th pub)

The Panopticon of Jeremy Bentham is an architectural design of the late 18th century. Bentham describes his Panopticon[59] as a tower central to an annular building that is divided into cells. His design demonstrates clearly how each cell extends the entire thickness of the building to allow inner and outer windows. The occupants of the cells are thus backlit, isolated from one another by walls and subject to scrutiny both collectively and individually by an observer in the tower who remains unseen. Bentham's idea was that those who were subjects of the panopticon would live, eat, sleep and work in the cells.

The panoptic mechanism arranges spatial units that make it possible to see constantly and recognize immediately. Each individual has a place where he is seen but does not see he is the object of information and not a subject in communication. In Montecasino the crowd is replaced by a collection of separated individuals. From the point of view of the supervisor of the panopticon the multitude is replaced by a multiplicity that can be numbered and supervised, from the point of view of the inmates by a sequestered and observed separation, where visibility is a trap.

The major effect of the panopticon is to induce in the subject a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power. Panoptic techniques arrange space so that the surveillance is permanent in its affect, even if discontinuous in its action and the perfection of power should tend to render its actual exercise unnecessary. Panopticism is an apparatus for creating and sustaining a power relation independent of the person exercising it – so that the actors of the spatiality are caught up in a power situation of which they are themselves the bearers.

Bentham laid down the principle that power should be visible and unverifiable[60]. Visible in that the inmate will always have before his eyes the tower from which he is spied upon. Unverifiable in that the inmate must be sure that he may always be looked at, but never knows when he is being looked at. The Panopticon is a machine for dissociating the seeing/ being seen dyad. In the ring one is totally seen without ever seeing and in the central tower one sees everything without ever being seen.

This mechanism automatizes and disindividualizes power. Power has its principle not so mush in a person as in a certain concerted distribution of bodies, surfaces, lights, and gazes. The internal mechanisms of the spatial arrangement produce a relation in which the subject is caught up.

The simple and economic geometry of the panopticon produces the "house of certainty"[61]. Bentham was surprised that panoptic institutions could be so light –

---

[59] Bentham, J. (1995) The *Panopticon Writings.* (ed Miran Bozovic) London, NY. Verso.
[60] Ibid. p8-14.
[61] Foucault, M. (1991) *Discipline and Punish.* London Penguin Books. p202

requiring no chains and no force to contain the madman or the worker. This effect is achieved by the efficiency of power having passed to the other side. The agent subjected to visibility and knowing it assumes responsibility for the constraints of power – he makes them play on himself. He inscribes in himself the power relation in which he simultaneously plays both roles. He becomes the principal of his own subjection.

Panoptic technologies can reduce the number of those exercising power and increase the number of those on whom it is exercised. It is possible to intervene at any moment but constant pressure acts even before the offence. Its strength lies in that it never intervenes, because without any physical instrument other than geometry and architecture it acts directly on individuals. It gives power of mind over mind. The panoptic schema makes any apparatus of power more intense and assures its economy in material, personnel and time. It assures its efficiency and penetrative character. As Foucault suggests, its excellence consists in the great strength it is capable of giving any institution it may be thought proper to apply it to. [62]

The Panopticon, whatever use it is put to, produces homogenous effects of power; it is a laboratory of power, in which subjection is born from a fictitious relation. The panopticon is an analytical arrangement of space, for observation and analysis – a laboratory used to alter behavior and to train individuals. The panopticon makes it possible to spy on subjects. Thanks to its mechanism of observation, it gains in efficiency and in the ability to penetrate into the actor's behavior: knowledge follows this advance of power, discovering new objects of knowledge over all the surfaces on which power is exercised.

As a type of location of bodies in space, of distribution of individuals in relation to one another, of hierarchical organization, it is polyvalent in its applications. Whenever one is dealing with a multiplicity of individuals on whom a task or particular form of behavior must be imposed, the panoptic schema can be used. It is applicable to any space in which people are to be kept under inspection. Originally designed as a prison, the all-seeing panopticon was envisioned by Bentham as eventually "applicable to any sort of establishment, in which persons of any description are to be kept under inspection..." [63] Some particular applications that Bentham suggested were: factories, schools, hospitals, insane asylums and poor houses.

When Jeremy Bentham introduced his Panopticon to the world more than two centuries ago, he saw it as a necessary evil. Bentham designed his Panopticon as a reaction to the cruelties of the penal system of the time and conceived that the panoptic technology would engender constructive and disciplined behavior in inmates.

---

[62] Ibid. p206.
[63] Ibid. p206

"Whether it will stand fast, and bear the shocks of discussion, remains to be decided by experience...What would you say, if by the gradual adaptation and diversified application of this single principle, you should see a new scene of things spread itself over the face of civilized society? "[64]

Foucault suggests that Bentham's panopticon foresaw and presented a kind of diagram for a society of supervision through surveillance. Foucault calls this a society of social orthopedics. Apologizing to historians of philosophy Foucault suggests that Bentham is more important to our society than Kant or Hegel.[65] He argues that Bentham programmed, defined and described in the most exact manner the forms of power in which we live, in that Bentham's panopticon provided a model for the society of orthopedics – an architectural model that makes possible a mind-over-mind-type of power. It would give rise to a kind of society in which the individual was supervised by someone who exercised power over him or her. It would give rise to the great sciences of observation - psychiatry, psychology and sociology.

The panopticon is a form that arranges perceived and conceived space, but Bentham and others after his time have seen the creation as a model for the organization of Lived Space. Indeed, the all-seeing panopticon is omni-present in the Lived Space of the 21st Century.

Outside of the arguably public world of work, the model of the panopticon increasingly applies to areas of life previously considered private. The rise of the panopticon is evident in the case of virtual space. The most commonly cited privacy-buster is the "cookie": a small program deposited on any computer that records Internet browsing habits and reports them to a business, an institution or any entity for that matter that is unknown, unsighted and unsited to the user. Corporations occupy the central tower in this cyber-panopticon.

The state is also moving to survey Lived Space. The Echelon system[66], controlled by five Western powers, is reportedly capable of scanning all available non-military communications in real time and recording for further review those communications, which contain certain keywords. The FBI has developed a software package named Carnivore[67] which allows the agency to scoop "packets" of e-mails out of the flow of information from one terminal to another. These packets can be reconstructed into full messages and used, as was Bentham's original concern by any body. Interpersonal communication is no longer personal, but is open to any panoptic institution or entity. Interpersonal communications are also subject to the "other" eyes of an internalized panoptic system.

---

[64] Bentham, J. (1995) The *Panopticon Writings.* (ed Miran Bozovic) London, NY. Verso.

[65] Foucault, M (1994) *POWER the essential works vol. 3* ed. Faubion J.Allen Lane. The Penguin Press(London , NY, Victoria, Toronto, New Delhi, Auckland, JHB) p58.

[66] http://mediafilter.org/caq/echelon/

[67] http://www.fbi.gov/hq/lab/carnivore/carnivore.htm

The Panoptic gaze is one of power and control exerted by the institution over the subject but it is also an internalized mechanism of disciple and control in which the subject in the space is a participant by internalizing mechanisms of control and discipline. The segmentation of time and space function directly on the body. However the notion of the omnipotent gaze and voice function on the psyche.

As the sphere of the private continues to contract, it is useful to consider the historical roots of that development. Bentham's Panopticon was not only a seminal invention, but also a powerful statement of the idea that the more an individual is observed, the more that control over the individual is taken away from him- or her-self and concentrated in the hands of the observer.

In a short excerpt titled Panopticism[68] Foucault's main concern is the organization of power in terms of space. He argues that since the early 19th century spatial concepts of structuring power emerged creating a control device that he compares to the panopticon. The image of the panopticon underlines Foucault's notion of the individualization of the masses. The panopticon serves as a metaphor for defining power relations in terms of the Lived Space. He points out that hospitals, prisons, or schools are organized along the panoptic structure. The concept of the panopticon stresses the self-motivation of many power structures that discipline both small and large bodies of people, meaning that certain power structures operate without actual control by another person. For the analysis of Lived Space, the conceptual framework of the panopticon can serve as a descriptive model of how power structures operate in Lived Space.

Foucault's work is imbued with an attention to history, not in the traditional sense of the word but in attending to what he has variously termed the 'archaeology' or 'genealogy' of knowledge production. That is, he looks at the continuities and discontinuities between 'epistemes' (taken by Foucault to mean the knowledge systems which primarily informed the thinking during certain periods of history: a different one being said to dominate each epistemological age), and the social context in which certain knowledges and practices emerged as permissible and desirable. In his view knowledge is inextricably connected to power, such that they are often written as power/knowledge.

Foucault's conceptual analysis of a major shift in (western) cultural practices, from 'sovereign power' to 'disciplinary power', in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* is a good example of his method of genealogy. He charts the transition from a top-down form of social control in the form of physical coercion meted out by the sovereign to a more diffuse and insidious form of social surveillance and process of 'normalization'. The latter, says Foucault, is encapsulated by Bentham's Panopticon. A system in which subjects could never

---

[68] Michel Foucault. "Panopticism (Excerpt)" in *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory.* Neil Leach, ed.

be certain when they were being watched and therefore, over time, begin to police their own behavior. The Panopticon has became the metaphor for the processes whereby disciplinary 'technologies', together with the emergence of a normative social science, 'police' both the mind and body of the modern individual.

Foucault uses history to trace the genealogy of ideas e.g. the development of prisons to trace the emergence of disciplinary knowledge and the deployment of regulatory techniques. He challenges traditional notions of hierarchies of power and knowledge. Foucault foregrounds the body as the arena upon which disciplinary mechanisms act. He foregrounds the body as the locus of discourses of regulation and control. Contemporary inquiry seeks to problematize the taken-for-granted categories or reality within which disciplinary discourses operate and deploy power through knowledge. Observation and the increased surveillance of our bodies through ourselves as active participants is key to this development.

Foucault's book *Discipline and Punish* is a genealogy of the rise of discipline and control through the technology of the panopticon. I condense some of the ideas that Foucault traces in his genealogy in order to relate them to the spatiality of Montecasino.

The Tableaux Vivants and ordered multiplicity.
Foucault suggests that panopticism requires strict spatial partitioning. It requires the creation of a segmented, immobile, frozen space:" It is spaces that provide fixed positions and permit circulation; they carve out individual segments and establish operational links; they mark places and indicate values; they guarantee the obedience of individuals, but also a better economy of time and gesture. They are mixed spaces: real because they govern the dispositions of buildings, rooms, furniture, but also ideal, because they are projected over this arrangement of characterizations, assessments, hierarchies. The first of the great operations of discipline is, therefore, the constitution of '*tableau vivants* ', which transform the confused, useless or dangerous multitudes into ordered multiplicities. " [69]

This technology initially used to table the forces of nature or arrange the multitudes of the heterotopias of crisis or deviation are now used to arrange the crowed of the arcade or the city. The spatiality of Montecasino is segmented into spaces that have specific functions: parking, eating, shopping, film, theatre, gambling and circulation. The obedience of individuals to the functioning of the spaces is guaranteed by their specific operations and the segmentation of time, the creation of rhythms that guarantee obedience to their functions. First, time is suspended. Lighting functions to create a twilight zone. Lighting creates a spatiality that suspends real time and space. A space that perpetuates itself in which the function of time is suspended.

---

[69] Foucault, M. (1991) *Discipline and Punish.* London Penguin Books. P148

Time is segmented: rhythm and time are also employed in the creation of the discipline. Over and above the real sound of the slot machine a recording of the sounds of the machines encourages the discipline of staying in the cell and desiring the next moment as the one in which change and chance will bring fortune. This kind of sound has the authority of the omnipotent voice[70] as it comes from nowhere and everywhere, it penetrates the rhythms of the body and the mind. Time is suspended and sequestered as a function of the spatiality.

Spaces are divided or segmented to create cells, places that determine ranks and specify action. These actions are individuated at the slot machine, a singular actor is placed in front of the slot machine: he is backlit in order to focus all his attention on the slot machine. The gambling floor is dominated by slot machines as opposed to gambling tables around which the focus might be a fellow gambler or the game of taking a chance. The flirtations with chance and fellow gamblers are eliminated and the visibility of the machine sets up a trap. The tactic is specifically designed to institute the discipline of the focus on the slot machine.

In Montecasino the space is immobile and fixed. The Village Street is not only temporally fixed in that it is always in twilight it is also spatially fixed in that the Village Street is not a Lived Space but a tableau. Actions are frozen in time and space – the women at her balcony window, the duck with its head dunked into the water forever. In the same way as these 'tableaux' - set up by the space itself - are frozen and fixed, the gambler becomes part of the collection of tableaux: a subject fixed in front of a slot machine. Because of constant surveillance the space is fixed and immobile. It loses its potential, mobility and flexibility as a city street. It is no longer a possibilities machine as Lefebvre once called the city. The streets of Montecasino are not organic Lived Spaces in which the actors in the space influence the conception of the space. In this space the perceived and conceived are instituted through the imagination and play that the space sets up and that space is an immobile and fixed space. It is not going to grow and develop and order or disorder itself in the same way that the city street does. The pavements of enclaved spaces do not allow for the possibilities that were not planned for by the city planner or architect - such as the prostitute or the pavement vendor. I am suggesting that these social 'fictions' are functions that demonstrate necessities of Lived Space that are being denied and ignored and more importantly made impossible through a spatiality such as Montecasino which does not allow for the potential of the city but instead turns the city into the fixed and immobile space of the panopticon.

The spatiality is enclosed, segmented and observed at every point. In a panoptic spatiality individuals are inserted in a fixed space, in which the slightest movements are supervised and in which all events are recorded. First the crowd is individuated through spatial partitioning and secondly each individual is

---

[70] See Bentham on the Omnipotent voice. p11.
Bentham, J. (1995) The *Panopticon Writings.* (ed Miran Bozovic) London, NY. Verso.

observed. "Everyone at his window"[71] or in his place under a gaze which is alert everywhere in order for what Foucault calls "the great review"[72] to take place. In this system of power the relation of each individual to his means of consumption passes through the representatives of power, the registration they make of it and the decisions they take on it.

The spatiality of Montecasino is under the constant surveillance of a grid of surveillance cameras controlled and observed from a central "tower". All activities are recorded and can apart from being observed in real time also be played back for more detailed observation. Apart from the camera surveillance system the space is policed by uniformed officers who are placed strategically and are visible to the users of the space, instituting a real fake police force unique to the space. The second are what the casino management refer to as the "men in black" - these are men in black suits that move through the space to surreptitiously discipline unruly elements, they are the real fake crèche version of a secret service.

The subject under this kind of surveillance internalizes the functions of discipline and control. The natural co-habiting social fictions of the 'arcade' the prostitute and drug taker are dissuaded. (Though not entirely as I did observe in the parking lot a sub node of business: rent boys getting into cars and speeding off into the real light of the city.)

Subjects chose this kind of space as they internalized, for real or imagined reasons, a fear of the City Street and because the spatiality provides a safe alternative in which the entire family can participate. However the family is very clearly individuated and separated by the space, in that it caters for all age groups.

In *Discipline and Punish,* Foucault suggests that the disorder of the 'plague' gives rise to a disciplinary project of ordering, surveillance and supervision that is panoptic in its constitution. In Antonin Artaud's essay "Theatre and the Plague"[73] the Sardinian Viceroy's dream of the 'plague' instills in him enough fear to make a decision that rides rough shot over human rights and over even the most ordinary respect for human life.

Foucault proposes that against 'plague' discipline brings into play its power, which is one of analysis. Foucault writes: "A whole literary fiction grew up around the plague: suspended laws, lifted prohibitions, the frenzy of passing time, bodies mingled together without respect, individuals unmasked, abandoning their statutory identity and the figure under which they had been recognized, allowing a quite different truth to appear. But there was also a political dream of the plague, which was exactly its reverse: not the collective festival but strict

---

[71] Foucault, M. (1991) *Discipline and Punish.* London Penguin Books. p196.
[72] Ibid.
[73] Artaud, A. (1970) *The Theatre and its Double.* London John Calder Publishers.p8.

divisions, not laws transgressed, but the penetration of regulation into even the smallest details of everyday life through the mediation of the complete hierarchy that assured the capillary functioning of power. Not masks that were put on and taken off, but the assignment to each individual of his 'true' name, his 'true' place his 'true' body his 'true' disease. The plague as a form at once real and imaginary, of disorder had as its medical and political correlative discipline." [74]

The disorder of the 'plague' gave rise to disciplinary projects. It called for multiple separations, individualizing distributions, an organization of surveillance and control, an intensification and ramification of power.

The 'leper', as Foucault suggests, gave rise to a project of separation with as its desired outcome a pure community. Images of the 'plague' have come to stand for confusion and disorder. The 'plague' gave rise to a project of segmentation that had as its result a disciplined society.

The two projects of separation and segmentation are different projects but not incompatible. Foucault suggests that we see them coming slowly together, and it is the peculiarity of the 19th century that it applied to the space of exclusion of which the leper was the symbolic inhabitant (but beggars, vagabonds, madmen and the disorderly formed the real population) the technique of power proper to disciplinary partitioning. "Treat 'lepers' as 'plague victims', project the subtle segmentations of discipline onto the confused space of internment, combine it with the methods of analytical distribution proper to power, individualize the excluded, but use procedures of individualization to mark exclusion – this was what has operated regularly since the beginning of the 19th century in the psychiatric asylum, the penitentiary, the reformatory, the approval school and to some extent the hospital."[75]

In modern spatiality every individual is subjected to the constant division between the normal and the abnormal. By applying the binary branding and exile of the leper to quite different objectives; a whole set of techniques and institutions for measuring, supervising and correcting the abnormal, panoptic space brings into play the disciplinary mechanisms to which the fear of the plague gave rise. According to Foucault all the mechanisms of power which, even today, are disposed around the abnormal individual (not forgetting that the vagabond or wanderer is one instance of such an 'abnormal' individual) to brand him and to alter him, are composed of these two forms, from which they distantly derive.

Bentham's panopticon is the spatial figure of this composition. The cells of the panopticon or the slot machines of Montecasino:" are like so many cages, so many small theatres, in which each actor is alone, perfectly individualized and constantly visible. "[76]

---

[74] Foucault, M. (1991) *Discipline and Punish.* London Penguin Books. p197-8.
[75] Foucault, M. (1991) *Discipline and Punish.* London Penguin Books, p199.
[76] Ibid.p200.

With the disciplinary program power is mobilized in the case of the plague against fear. The panopticon constructs what is both a counter city and the perfect society in the face of this fear. The panopticon has become a generalized program defining power relations in terms of everyday life. It has given rise to many variations. The panopticon is the diagram of a mechanism of power reduced to its ideal form; its functioning abstracted from resistance – represented as a spatial and optical system and justified by "fear".

Destined to spread throughout the social body and become a generalized function, the aim of the panopticon is to strengthen the social forces – to increase production/consumption, to develop the economy, spread education, raise the level of public morality and increase and multiply.

The project of generalized surveillance, improves the exercise of power by making it lighter, more rapid, more effective - a design of subtle coercion for a society to come. Bentham's concern was that the panoptic technology can be operated by any institution or individual, it does not matter what their motive.

Jean Cayrol, Auschwitz concentration camp survivor wrote: " The crematorium is no longer in use. The devices of the Nazis are out of date. Nine million dead haunt this landscape. Who is on the lookout from this **strange tower** (my emphasis) to warn us of the coming of new executioners? Are their faces really different from our own? Somewhere among us, there are lucky Kapos, reinstated officers, and unknown informers. There are those who refused to believe this, or believed it only from time to time. And there are those of us who sincerely look upon the ruins today, as if the old concentration camp monster were dead and buried beneath them. Those who pretend to take hope again as the image fades, as though there were a cure for the plague of these camps. Those of us who pretend to believe that all this happened only once, at a certain time and in a certain place, and those who refuse to see, who do not heed the cry to the end of time. ..."[77]

Through panoptic technology the subject is disciplined and control, however this discipline and control is not only an external function it is also internalized by the subject. In a panoptic spatiality the subjugation of the subject is complete. The spatiality creates the subjugated colony in which the hyperreality of the space makes it impossible for the subject to tell who is in the tower. The flâneur and gambler of Montecasino is subject to the separation of the leper and the subjugation of the madman. The Lived Space of Montecasino thus allows a limited play of imagination as it functions as a leper colony of consumerism, in

---

[77] **Night and Fog (Nuit et brouillard)**
1955/56, b/w and color, France, 32 min., in French with English subtitles Dir. Alain Resnais. Narrated by Michel Bouquet script by Jean Cayrol.

which each subject is his own jailer.

CONCLUSION

In *Discipline and Punish* Foucault traces a genealogy, which proposes distinct epistemic moments, one exemplified by the figure of the 'leper' who gave rise to a project of social control via separation with, as its desired outcome, a pure community. The 'plague' on the other hand gave rise to a project of segmentation that had as its result a disciplined society.

In *Discipline and Punish* Foucault traces a genealogy, which proposes that the 'leper' gave rise to a project of separation with, as its desired outcome, a pure community. The 'plague' on the other hand gave rise to a project of segmentation that had as its result a disciplined society.

Foucault suggests that in the 19th century we see these two projects coming slowly together. Montecasino demonstrates a trend that combines the spatial techniques of separation and exclusion with those of segmentation. The leper is the symbolic inhabitant of the space of exclusion. In city space - beggars, flâneurs, prostitutes, drug takers, displaced people – the disorderly crowds are the real population of the Lived Space. Yet these characters are relegated to that space of exclusion, of which the leper is the symbolic inhabitant. In other words, panoptic heterotopias, like Montecasino demonstrate a spatial trend where these characters are firstly enclaved and furthermore the techniques of power proper to disciplinary partitioning or panopticism are applied to the space in which they are enclaved. Subjecthood in the panoptic heterotopia is sequestered to exclusion, separation and segmentation.

The Lived Space of the city is a space of infinite variables and potential but also a space that poses very real dilemmas. The phenomena of flâneurie - wondering and wandering, prostitution, gambling -taking a chance and drug taking - altering our states of being are part of the lived experience of city space. Flâneurie, prostitution, drug taking and gambling pose a dilemma for the state, city planners as well as for those who live in the streets of the city where these practices form part of the lived experience of public space. In certain cases they constitute powerful economic nodes that operate outside of State-sanctioned taxable industry. The dilemma faced by State and Public is how to manage these nodes and their specific spatiality in a way most beneficial for state, personal, private and public interest.

Montecasino or panoptic heterotopias demonstrate a spatial trend that combines techniques of separation and segmentation. In such a spatiality the subject is constituted as the excluded representative of whatever their cultural or social leprosy might be: flâneur, gambler, prostitute or drug taker and then accordingly placed under supervision. The supervision and the power it wields is justified in that firstly these activities contribute to making the street a dangerous place and secondly that these characters or social fictions themselves are in danger on the street. Like the madman or the leper they are treated as a threat to themselves

and society or the institutionalized functioning of power. Thirdly these characters have no right to business on the street, as their business is illegal. The dilemma being that business operating outside of taxable industry does not serve the state and so the state cannot serve this industry. The panoptic heterotopia demonstrates a trend in city planning to create leper colonies of consumption, to which the dystopian realities of the city can be relegated and in which each subject can be his own jailer.

Within the panoptic heterotopia these very activities that are otherwise illegal are sanctioned within an enclaved space. Within the enclave these activities are actively encouraged as the institution controlling the enclave benefits from it financially and so does the state as it is able to tax very powerful economic nodes that otherwise operate outside of legal, taxable industry. The state or the city is now also relieved of the burden of cleaning, maintaining and safeguarding the space, as this becomes the responsibility of the private interest or company that now manages the enclaved space.

In the Lived Space of the city, its most valuable variable is its characters and the culture that they produce, through their dreams and desires. The characters of the Lived space of the city produce utopian ideals of city space through their dreams and desires, but the reality of Lived Space is that these very dreams and desires of the characters of the city also produce dystopian principles and practices. The city is a utopian space in which the subjects are free to reinvent and create spatiality according to their desires. At the same time the city is also a dystopia - a nightmarish space of terrors, unemployment and the commodification of subjectivity - where the city itself is a metaphor of the divided subject. The challenge facing the state is that it has to negotiate between the contradictory utopian visions and dystopian realities of the city. Governance has to coordinate the inconsistencies between Perceived and Conceived Space. The state has to manage the discrepancies between First and Secondspace perspectives. In this challenge the state must look to incorporate the participation not only of private interest but also of personal and public interest in the creation and maintenance of the Lived Space of the city.

The characters of the city - the actors of the Lived Space - are what make the city a "possibilities machine". The spatiality of the city should therefore allow for the active and creative participation of its actors. The panoptic heterotopia institutes a spatiality that is finite, fixed and dead. Homologous to the finite, unchanging and diminutive nature of the space, the identity of actors in a spatiality such as Montecasino is finite, Lilliputian, fixed and dead. It does not encourage or allow for any activity other than that which the space dictates. Without the actor's involvement in the creation and use of city space, the potential social and cultural development of the city and the development of its actors themselves is curtailed and eroded.

First and Second space perspectives and approaches to the creation of city space, seem to operate separately from each other. Utopian visions of the city and the dystopian realities of it, operate very separately from each other. A Thirdspace approach to the creation of city space enables utopian and dystopian conceptions and perceptions of the city to come together in the creation of the Aleph of Lived Space.

Spatialities such as Montecasino, in which public space is privatized, signal a spatial trend in city planning towards the elimination of public space with its democratic intoxications, risks and unscented odors. This trend uses the technologies of the panoptic spatiality to pacify the city. In the panoptic heterotopia the pacification of both the Lived Space and the subject is complete. It is the new dehistoricised site of the colony in which subjecthood is subjugated and colonized.

Furthermore the Hyperreality of the space makes the "empire" invisible to enemy empires, to the empire itself and to the characters in the space who actively participate through their own desires in their colonization and subjugation.
In the panoptic heterotopia of Montecasino subjecthood is subjugated to the discipline and control of consumption, in a simulacrum of public space. Montecasino is not a public space but a privatized scamscape of public space. Because of globalization, "good business practice" dictates the state's priorities. Yet the state, government and city planners still have a responsibility to create and maintain public space.

Johannesburg is a city of extreme contradictions, so extreme that differences – the utopian and dystopian realities of its spatiality - are highlighted at every turn and intersection and therefore impossible to ignore. The managers of city space in Johannesburg are faced with multiple challenges. Johannesburg is a complex spatial agglomeration that can redefine the very concept of the city and what it means to be a city dweller. The identity and ethos of the city can inspire and challenge its actors. In city space it is not the space itself but the unplanned, unimagined use its agents put it to that allows for cultural development. The contradictions of Johannesburg and its spatialities make it one of the most exiting and crucial places for urban research and development.

I return to Hamlet's words:

"O God! I could be bounded in a nutshell, and count myself a King of infinite space were it not that I had bad dreams."

Guildenstern calls these dreams - ambitions, desires or drives. Spatiality should allow the dreams, ambitions, desires and drives of its players to find a way into manifestation. A nutshell can not house our ambitions and desires. Confounded to a nutshell or a Crèche, a panoptic heterotopia, what happens to our dreams, ambitions, desires and drives?

Lived Space and the desires of the actors in the Lived Space are the variables that allow for infinite possibility. If the actor is confounded to a nutshell there is no way they can live out their dreams or desires. We have to create spaces in the city in which the dreams and desires of the actor are able to flourish: Spaces that are possibility machines, spaces that are open enough to allow anything to happen, because it is in that potential that freedom is born.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barba, E.1994. *Paper canoe: a guide to theatre anthropology.* London: Routledge.

- Barthes, R. 1972. *Mythologies*. London: Vintage.

- Baudrillard, J. 1983. "The Precession of Simulacra", *Simulations*, tr. P. Fross, P. Patton and P. Beitchman, New York: Semiotext(e) p1-80.

- Benjamin, W. 1969/ 1973. *Charles Baudelaire: A lyric poet in the era of High Capitalism.* Trans H Zohn. London: Verso. Blackwell.

- Borges. J.L. 1971. *The Aleph and Other Stories.* NY Bantam.

- Bourdieu, P. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London, Routledge. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Davis, M. 1992. *City of Quartz*. Vintage.

- Eco, U. 1987. *Travels in Hyperreality*. London: Picador.
- Field, R & Bunn, D. (eds.) 2000. *Trauma and Topography.* From the Landscape and memory project. Johannesburg.

- Foucault, M. 1977. *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* (Translated by Allan Sheridan). London: Penguin Books. French original published in 1975.

- Foucault, M. 1980. "Questions on Geography", in *Power/Knowledge*: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972 –1977, C. Gordon (ed.) NY: Pantheon.

- Foucault, M. 1986. "Of Other Spaces", *Diacritics* (Translated from the French by Jay Miskowiec.) NY and London: Routledge.

- Foucault, M. 1994. *POWER the essential works vol. 3* ed. Faubion J.Allen Lane. The Penguin Press(London , NY, Victoria, Toronto, New Delhi, Auckland, JHB)

- Foucault, M. 2000. "Different Spaces" *Aesthetics* (Vol2). (ed.) Faubion J. (Translated from the French by Hurley, R. and others) Penguin Books.

- Foucault, M. "Panopticism (Excerpt)" in *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory.* Neil Leach, ed.

- Gane, M. (1991*) Baudrillard's bestiary.* London NY: Routledge.

- Gottdiener, M. 1995. *Postmodern Semiotics.* Oxford UK & Cambridge USA.

- Harvey, D. 1988. *Social Justice and the City.* 2nd Ed Oxford: Blackwell.

- Harvey, D. 1989.*The Condition of Postmodernity.* Oxford: Blackwell.

- http://mediafilter.org/caq/echelon/

- http://www.fbi.gov/hq/lab/carnivore/carnivore.htm

- Ivan Karp and D.A. Masolo.(Eds) 2000. *African philosophy as cultural inquiry.* Bloomington : Indiana University Press.

- Judin, H. & Vladislavic, I. (Eds.) 1998. *blank_ Architecture, apartheid and after.* Nai Publishers, Rotterdam.

- Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The Production of Space.* Oxford, UK and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

- LeGates, R. T. & Stout, F. (eds.) 1996 *The City Reader.* London & NY: Routledge

- Montecasino the casino: http://www.tsogosun.co.za/montecasino/index.html

- Montecassino the abbey: http://www.officine.it/montecassino/

- Mumford, L. 1938. *The Culture of the City.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

- Olsen, D. G. 1986. *The City as a Work of Art.* London: Edward Arnold.

- Said, E. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism.* NY: Vintage Books.

- Shields, R. 1991. *Places on the Margin.* London: Routledge.

- Soja, E. W. 1996. *Thirdspace.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

- Soja, Edward W. 1989. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory.* London & NY: Verso.

- Stewart, S. 1984. *On Longing.* Baltimore & London: The John Hopkins University Press.