2. Heterotopologies: A Remembrance of Other Spaces in the Citadel-LA

Edward W. Soja

Let me draw again on Michel Foucault (with just a little help from Jean Baudrillard) to set the scene for another interpretive look at the 'spatial text' of contemporary Los Angeles.[1] My focus here is on the sites and sights which compose the Citadel-LA, the urban fortress found in the controlling center of the Los Angeles region. The Citadel-LA is remembered as it was commemorated, alongside the Place de la Bastille, in a mnemonic exhibition I helped to organize at UCLA in 1989 to celebrate the bicentennial of the French Revolution. As I have done before, this contextual reading, this remembrance of 'other spaces,' will be used to open up and explore a post-Foucauldian 'interpretive analytics' located in the rebalanced conjuncture of space and time, spatiality and historicity.

Behind this abbreviated introduction is another scene-setting intonation from Foucault that begins the first chapter of my *Postmodern Geographies* (1989). Looking back at a century in which time and the making of history were privileged in critical discourse over space and the making of geography, he asks: 'Did it start with Bergson or before? Space was treated as the dead, the fixed, the undialectical, the immobile. Time, on the contrary was richness, fecundity, life, dialectic.' The present essay begins with an assumed contemporary erosion of these privileging distinctions.

HETEROTOPOLOGIES

Foucault's writing is perfect in that the very movement of the text gives an admirable account of what it proposes: on one hand, a powerful generating spiral that is no longer a despotic architecture but a filiation en abyme, *coil and strophe without origin (without catastrophe either), unfolding ever more widely and rigorously; but on the other hand, an interstitial flowing of power (where the*

relations of power and seduction are inextricably entangled). All this reads directly *in Foucault's discourse (which is* also *a discourse on power). It flows, it invests and saturates, the entire space it opens.*

Baudrillard, *Forget Foucault*

I don't deny history. It's an immense toy.

Baudrillard, *Forget Foucault*

A whole history remains to be written of spaces *– which would at the same time be the history of* powers *(both these terms in the plural) – from the great strategies of geopolitics to the little tactics of the habitat.*

Michel Foucault, 'The Eye of Power'

Just before his death, an old batch of lecture notes prepared by Foucault in 1967 were released into the public domain for an exhibition in Berlin. These notes, generated in part by an invitation from a group of architects to do a 'study of space,' were never reviewed for publication by Foucault and thus were not recognized as part of the official body of his works until their appearance, under the title 'Des Espaces Autres', in the French journal *Architecture–Mouvement–Continuité* in 1984. Subsequently published in English as 'Of Other Spaces' in the Texts/Contexts section of *Diacritics* (Spring 1986; translation by Jay Miskiewic), they contain a collection of insite-full ideas on how to interpret human geographies as texts and contexts, how to see the 'other spaces' hidden in the more obvious and diverting multiplicity of real-world sights and situations. I propose here to celebrate their rediscovery.

Foucault's compass pointed to what he called *heterotopias*, real existing places that are 'formed in the very founding of society,' as part of the presuppositions of social life. He saw them as 'something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted' (1986: 24). These combinatorial, microcosmic, concretely abstract heterotopias were placed in contrast not only to the 'real sites' themselves but also to their apparent reflections in *utopias*, sites with no real place, nowhere lands, fundamentally unrealized spaces which present society in either a perfected form or else turned upside down. Foucault qualifies the opposition between utopias and heterotopias through a lateral glance into the *mirror*. The mirror represents both 'in a sort of mixed, joint experience,' at once a placeless, virtual, unreal place in which I see myself where I am not, over there where I am absent (utopia); and a real, counteracting space in which I discover my absence from the place where I am since I see myself over there, a realization that makes me come back toward myself, to reconstitute myself there where I am (heterotopia).[2]

These 'curious' sites are socially constructed but they simultaneously recreate and reveal the meaning of social being. Conventional formal descriptions of them, as empirical geometries or as sites for the storage, circulation, marking, classification and encoding of areally differentiated human elements (the characteristic template of the spatial scientists), tend to miss their meaning, to hide the revealing tensions and contra-

dictions that exist between them and all other real sites. The brilliant illuminations of Bachelard and the spatial phenomenologists opened to view the heterotopias of internal space, 'the space of our primary perception, the space of our dreams and that of our passions' (Foucault 1986). But this too was not quite the space Foucault had in mind. For Foucault (1986: 23), heterotopias represent 'the space in which we live, which draws us out of ourselves, in which the erosion of our lives, our time and our history occurs, the space that claws and gnaws at us'. To get to these 'other' spaces requires a different way of seeing, a different interpretive analytics.

Heterotopias are thus *des espaces autres*, those 'other' spaces and places that are often obscured from view by excessive emphasis on their empirical opaqueness or their ideational transparency. To help us discover and find meaning in this hidden and revealingly 'different' human geography, Foucault casually invents a new knowledge, *heterotopology*, and outlines, with examples, some of its principles.

First: heterotopias are found in all cultures, every human group, although they take varied forms and no single one is ever universal. Two broad categories, however, are identified by Foucault for our particular attention, one consisting of privileged, sacred, or forbidden spaces reserved for individuals who are in some way in a state of stressful personal transition ('crisis' heterotopias such as the nineteenth-century boarding school, military service facilities, the 'honeymoon hotel'); the other outlining more modern heterotopias of 'deviation,' such as rest homes, psychiatric hospitals, and ('of course,' he adds) prisons. Tracing the historical, 'modernizing' transitions between heterotopias of crisis and those of deviation has, of course, been central to nearly all of Foucault's major works.

Second: heterotopias can change in function and meaning over time, according to the particular 'synchrony of the culture' in which they occur. The example given is the 'strange heterotopia' of the cemetery, until the late eighteenth century placed at the heart of the city next to the church and still deeply associated with sacred resurrection and the immortality of the soul, later removed to the suburbs in 'bourgeois appropriation' aimed at improved health and the individualization of the dead, with each family possessing its dark resting place in 'the other city.' Each heterotopia thus carries with it a revealing genealogy to go along with its revealing geography.

Third: the heterotopia is capable of juxtaposing in one real place several different spaces, 'several sites that are in themselves incompatible' or foreign to one another. Here Foucault looks at places where many spaces converge and become entangled, using as a model the rectangular stage of the theatre and the cinema screen as well as the oriental garden, the smallest parcel of the world that, since antiquity, has been designed to represent the terrestrial totality. It is this complex juxtaposition and cosmopolitan simultaneity of differences in space that charges the heterotopia with social and cultural meaning and connectivity. Without such a charge, the space would remain fixed, dead, immobile, undialectical.

Fourth: heterotopias are typically linked to slices of time, termed *heterochronies* 'for the sake of symmetry.' This intersection and phasing of space and time, this periodization of spatialities, allows the heterotopia 'to function at full capacity' within a trackable historical geography. In the modern world, many specialized sites exist to record these

crossroads of time and space. Foucault argues, for example, that museums and libraries have become 'heterotopias of indefinitely accumulating time,' specialized spaces of all times that appear themselves outside of time and its ravages. In contrast, there are also more fleeting, transitory, precarious spaces of time, such as festival sites, fairgrounds, and vacation and leisure villages. In a foresighting of a more Disneyed world, Foucault sees both forms increasingly converging in compressed, packaged environments that seem to both abolish and preserve time and culture, that appear somehow to be both temporary and permanent.

Fifth: heterotopias always presuppose a system of opening and closing that simultaneously makes them both isolated and penetrable. Entry and exit are regulated in many ways: by compulsion (the prison, the army barracks), by rites and purifications (the Muslim *hammam*, the Scandinavian sauna); or by illusions of freedom (the supposedly open-to-all bedrooms of the great farms of Brazil, the famous American 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, of disciplinary technologies.

Last: heterotopias have a function in relation to all the space that remains, an 'external' almost wraparound function that '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 (perhaps that is the role that was played by those famous brothels of which we are now deprived). Or else, on the contrary, their 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 later type would be the heterotopia, not of illusion, but of compensation, and I wonder if certain colonies have not functioned somewhat in this manner. In certain cases, they have played, on the level of the general organization of terrestrial space, the role of heterotopias. (Foucault 1986: 27)*

Here the spaces extend from the body and the boat to all the widening scales that range from the 'little tactics of the habitat' to the 'great strategies of geopolitics.'[3] In each arena the occupant is tugged by the simultaneous pleasures of accentuated illusion and delusion.

These musings on heterotopology remained virtually unseen by Foucauldian scholars, yet they flow through all his major works as a subtle but persistently spatializing undercurrent. In *Postmodern Geographies*, I tried to explain the near invisibility of Foucault's critical spatialization (and the parallel projects of Henri Lefebvre, John Berger, and others) as a product of a persistent residual historicism that continues to blinker contemporary critical social theory to the emancipatory insights embedded in the construction of human geographies. To recapture these arguments, I re-present here some passages from Foucault's introduction to 'Of Other Spaces,' where he is most straightforward about the contemporary interplay between the historical and geographical imaginations.

> *The great obsession of the nineteenth century was, as we know, history: with its themes of development and suspension, of crisis and cycle, themes of the ever-accumulating past, with its preponderance of dead men and the menacing glaciation of the world . . . The present epoch will perhaps be above all the epoch of space. We are in the epoch of simultaneity: we are in the epoch of juxtaposition, the epoch of the near and far, of the side-by-side, of the dispersed. We are at a moment, I believe, when our experience of the world is less that of a long life developing through time than that of a network that connects points and intersects with its own skein. One could say that certain ideological conflicts animating present-day polemics oppose the pious descendants of time and the determined inhabitants of space.*

Foucault continues at this point with an interesting aside on structuralism as a means of effectively spatializing history and historiography.

> *Structuralism, or at least that which is grouped under the slightly too general name, is the effort to establish, between elements that could have been connected on a temporal axis, an ensemble of relations that makes them appear as juxtaposed, set off against one another, in short, as a sort of* configuration.[4] *Actually structuralism does not entail a denial of time; it does involve a certain manner of dealing with what we call time and what we call history.*

He concludes his notes with a cautious admission.

> *In any case I believe that the anxiety of our era has to do fundamentally with space, no doubt a great deal more than with time. Time probably appears to us only as one of various distributive operations that are possible for the elements that are spread out in space.*

Foucault thus brings us up to date in space and time, enabling this narrative emplotment to proceed to another field of geographical remembrances.

1789/1989, PARIS/LOS ANGELES: THE CITY AND HISTORICAL CHANGE

In spring 1989, a heterotopological exhibition of sorts took place within the spaces of the Graduate School of Architecture and Urban Planning at UCLA as part of the school's participation in a multi-year celebration on campus of the bicentennial of the French Revolution. Associated with the exhibition were a series of public lectures and a colloquium, both of which featured interventions by Jean Baudrillard and other explorations of the nexus of place and power in Paris and Los Angeles over the past two centuries.[5] No catalogue for the exhibition was ever prepared. In its place, I will reconstruct some pictures of the exhibition while finding both the time and space to explore further the heterotopology of the Citadel-LA.

From the Power of Place to the Places of Power

All things were changed; all those places that were so well known to me presented a different fact, and appeared to be recently embellished; I lost myself amidst grand and beautiful streets, that were

built in straight lines; I entered a spacious square, formed by the termination of four streets, where there reigned such perfect order, that I found not the least embarrassment, nor heard any of those confused and whimsical cries that formerly rent my ears; I saw no carriages ready to crush me . . . the city had an animated aspect, but without trouble and confusion.

Louis-Sebastien Mercier, *Memoirs of the Year 2440*

It is interesting, if not useful, to consider where one would go in Los Angeles to have an effective revolution of the Latin American sort. Presumably, the place would be in the heart of the city. If one took over some public square, some urban open space in Los Angeles, who would know? A march on City Hall would be inconclusive. The heart of the city would have to be sought elsewhere.

Charles Moore, quoted in Von Eckardt, *A Place to Live: The Crisis of the Cities*

Opposite a wall embedded with a great rectangular chunk of Louis Sullivan's masterful ornamental façade for the old Gage building in Chicago is a glassed-in display cabinet containing a mini-exhibit of 'The Power of Place,' the name and restorative aim of a non-profit, design-oriented, memory-preserving organization whose most recent accomplishment is the recreation of Biddy Mason's Place in the history and geography of Los Angeles.[6] Biddy Mason was a midwife and nurse, an ex-slave who became a founder of the first Black church in Los Angeles (in 1972) and was the first Black woman to own property in the city. Her old place is now redesigned as a designated urban mnemonic, an architectural madeleine for a very particular *recherche du temps perdu*.

The Power of Place project locates its remembrances not only at the intersection of space and time but also at the crossroads of several movements shaping the looks of downtown Los Angeles and other American cities: the promotional development of Art in Public Places provided much of the funding, the now well-established efforts to preserve the historical and cultural heritage of the city helped empower the project, and the struggle for more visible representation of the under-represented (mainly workers, women and minorities) gives it force and direction. Its memorial orientation arises from the revelatory existentialism of the question *What Time is This Place?*, the title of an evocative book by the urban designer, Kevin Lynch, author of *The Image of the City* (1960), and a conceptual source for the radical political aesthetic of 'cognitive mapping' that features so prominently in the recent work of Fredric Jameson, to whom we will shortly return in our circuit around the exhibition.

From the boxed-in window, visually displaying the creative plans for the reconstitution of Biddy Mason's particular place, is inflected a fretwork of additional lines of more general inquiry about the curious concatenation of space and time, spatiality and historicity: Whose history is to be preserved in these acts of commemoration? In what places is this history most appropriately encased? What forms shall the memories take? How can choosing a past help us to construct a future? Through preserving urban history, can we help explain the current design of the city and its political economy? Can such historical understanding enable us to change the design and political economy in significantly beneficial ways?

Other questions can also be asked: By redesigning the built environment can we, must we, reinterpret the past? Given what Foucault called the synchrony of culture, is what we

construct now only a false representation of history, a simulation that accrues to itself only its own immediate contemporary meaning? Can we ever recapture and preserve an historical site when its set of relations to other real sites has been erased by time? What is it that we are preserving when we engage in cultural and historical preservation? Would not a deeper understanding of the contemporary dynamics of urban design and political economy serve us better than exploring the past in constructing a better future?

These two sets of questions differentially privilege history and geography, the past and the present. They emanate from two different ways of looking at places and spaces, the first informed by an emancipatory sense of the power of archeology and genealogy, by an emplotment within a meaningful historical narrative; the second by an emancipatory sense of the cartography and heterotopology of power, an emplotment within a meaningful interpretive geography. Both can be described as spatio-temporal perspectives, but one (the first and most familiar) historicizes geography while the other (more difficult to grasp) spatializes history. Keep this difference in mind as we turn the corner into the second sight of the exhibition, 'Remembering the Bastille, 1789–1989.'

Here a long illuminated wall guides the viewer through a chronological corridor picturing the richly heterotopic site of the Place de la Bastille, from its revolutionary storming to its various commemorative redesigns and monumental punctuations (including a short-lived *papier-maché* elephant of gargantuan proportions) to the newly completed Opera House, where the photo-narrative peaks in a spectacular videotape presentation (auteured by Robert Maniquis) set opposite to a huge hanging satellite reproduction of 'Los Angeles – From Space,' a semi-permanent fixture in the central open enclosure of the building. It is a heady walk along this bridge of sights, from that translucent moment when the fourteenth-century fortress disappeared brick by brick, through its many different preservational reappearances, each in different ways trying to recapture the past in the present. Today, all the memories boggle as a freshly commodified fortress of culture replaces and reconstitutes the historical site as one of several spectacular bicentennial implantations into the space of Paris.[7]

The video screen provides both immediacy and transition, juxtaposing in one place several sights and sites that are themselves incompatible. Nostalgic music plays as the just-seen photo-narrative blends into old cinematic representations of the revolutionary Bastille (complete with a hell-hag Madame La Farge) to retrace the transformation of historical memory into heroic (and anti-heroic) modern imagery. Then, as we listen to the fulsome contemporary debates over the Opera House and its leadership – and see what has been happening elsewhere around the Place – we suddenly begin to realize at the video's end (just before the rolling tape beings at the beginning again) that even the familiar modernist images are themselves being displaced by an entirely new set of time-eroding simulations, forcing the past into the heterochrony of the present. As Foucault noted, 'the heterotopia begins to function at full capacity when men arrive at a sort of absolute break with their traditional time' (1986: 26). Perhaps this is also when the power of place is neutralized or inverted (again, Foucault's words) into places of power; and, writ larger, when nearly all of modern history is forcefully collapsed into a contemporary, postmodern geography.

Places of Power: Symbolizing the Citadel in Los Angeles

This is the end of art 'as we know it'. It is the end of the art of art history. It is the end of urban art with its dialectical struggles. Today this simulated art takes place in cities that are also doubles of themselves, cities that only exist as nostalgic references to the idea of city and to the ideas of communication and social intercourse. These simulated cities are placed around the globe more or less exactly where the old cities were, but they no longer fulfill the function of the old cities. They are no longer centers; they only serve to simulate the phenomenon of the center. And within these simulated centers, usually exactly at their very heart, is where this simulated art activity takes place, an activity itself nostalgic for the reality of activity in art.

Peter Halley, 'Notes on Nostalgia'

We arrive now at the central place of the exhibition, the center of centers, moving just beyond the video monitor into the entrance to a small gallery, where a spotlit bird of paradise (the city's official flower)[8] announces present-day Los Angeles.[9] At this point the narrative breaks down into a cluster of revealing emplotments in imitation of the splintered labyrinth that is set before us. Each tells its own story. They should be read simultaneously but, alas, this is not possible.

Entrancement

To tell you where you have been as well as where you are going, a massive sculptural form dominates the gallery space and powerfully catches your eye. Half of it rises from a billowy base of matted brown butcher paper to the crenellated turrets of a simulated Bastille. The other half sits atop a slightly cracked bunker of grey concrete upholding the gleaming bronzed-glass towers of the Bonaventure Hotel, the chosen microcosmos of postmodernized Los Angeles. The two sides of the soaring sculpture, dubbed the 'Bastaventure,' blend into one another in brilliantly executed adjacencies that highlight the epochal transition between crumbling old fortress and resurgent new citadel.[10]

The Bonaventure Hotel symbolizes and simulates the geographical experience of postmodernity just as the Bastille symbolizes and simulates the historical experience of the French Revolution. This is made most clear when the Bonaventure (or, for that matter, the Bastille) is seen as a contemporary heterotopia, as an evocative 'counter-site' in which all other (and absolutely different) real sites within the synchronous culture are 'simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted.' Like most other heterotopias, it functions at full capacity within a specifically periodized slice of time and after a break with historical tradition. Architectural stylists might label it Late Modern (and it can be 'read' as such), but its life-space and its relation to all other real sites, its simultaneities and juxtapositions, signify a noticeable departure from the modernist traditions of the past century.

Jameson (1984: 53–92) was the first to read the Bonaventure heterotopologically, as a figurative con-text of postmodernism's most absorbing cultural logic, and his global reading of the shining site has stirred extensive controversy, especially from more local readers.[11] For Jameson, this 'populist insertion into the city fabric' has become a

'hyperspace' of both illusion and compensation, a new kind of cultural brothel and colony (combining Foucault's separate allusions) that exposes such archetypical postmodern conditions as depthlessness, fragmentation, the reduction of history to nostalgia, and, underlying it all, the programmatic decentering of the subject, the rattling awareness that the individual human body has been losing 'the capacity to locate itself, to organize its immediate surroundings perceptually, and cognitively map its position within a mappable external world' (1984: 83). Seen through the 'real pleasures' of the Bonaventure is a mutated cityscape of seductive simulations, a built environment in which an aesthetic becomes politically anaesthetic, enticing both the subject and object of history under a numbing amnesiac blanket of exact copies for which no original ever existed.

In the bunkered fortress of the Bonaventure, entrance and exit ways are curiously unmarked and appear at many different levels, as if 'some new category of closure [was] governing the inner space of the hotel itself' (Jameson 1984). Inside and out, one is lost in a 'placeless dissociation,' an 'alarming disjunction between the body and the built environment' that Jameson compares (and links) to the experience of Los Angeles itself and, even more pointedly, to the increasing incapacity of our minds to cognitively map another hyperspace, 'the great global multinational and decentered communicational network in which we find ourselves caught as individual subjects.' I have covered similar tracks in my own depiction of the Bonaventure, written some time after strolling through the microcosmopolois with Jameson and Henri Lefebvre.

> *Like many other Portman-teaus which dot the eyes of urban citadels in New York and San Francisco, Atlanta and Detroit, the Bonaventure has become a concentrated representation of the restructured spatiality of the late capitalist city: fragmented and fragmenting, homogeneous and homogenizing, divertingly packaged yet curiously incomprehensible, seemingly open in presenting itself to view but constantly pressing to enclose, to compartmentalize, to circumscribe, to incarcerate. Everything imaginable appears to be available in the micro-urb but real places are difficult to find, its spaces confuse an effective cognitive mapping, its pastiche of superficial reflections bewilder coordination and encourage submission instead. . . . Once inside . . . it becomes daunting to get out again without bureaucratic assistance. (Soja 1989: 243–4)*

Jameson's intentionally spatializing interpretation of the Bonaventure Hotel has occupied the eye of a still-unsettled storm of historical criticism that vividly illustrates those present-day polemics and ideological conflicts Foucault predicted would arise between 'the pious descendants of time and the determined inhabitants of space' (1986: 22), between the historicizers of geography and the spatializers of history. Given the continuing hegemony of historicism in contemporary critical studies, even sympathetic critics of Jameson, who themselves have been struggling with spatiality in their own writings, have tended to be perplexed by Jameson's assertively spatialized new agenda for history and criticism, seeing its Bonaventure-ous interpretations as blithely ahistorical or worse, as anti-history. Characteristically, the response of these critics is an almost nostalgic defense of the nineteenth-century privileges of historicism.

Thus Mike Davis, in an otherwise illuminating interpretation of the 'decadent tropes' of modernism in Los Angeles, berates Jameson for presenting a present 'deprived of historical coordinates.' To find them, Davis (1985) seeks what he calls the 'true temporalities' that can be read from the spatial text of Bunker Hill and the Bonaventure Hotel (which Jameson incorrectly identified as 'Beacon Hill' and the 'Bonaventura' in 1984). Jameson's stated attempt at establishing historical coordinates, derived from the heterochronies of Mandel, is then criticized for missing the right dates and thereby for misapprehending the politically correct meaning of the urban 'renaissance' of downtown Los Angeles. Davis's alternative reading is brilliantly executed and much more directively and confidently political than Jameson's. But it remains strait-jacketed by a lingering diachronomania drawn too uncritically from that most historicist of epistemes, '*post hoc, ergo propter hoc*.' With the present so unproblematically a product of the past, the possibility that postmodernity poses a new challenge to radical discourse and politics virtually disappears.[12]

In the inaugural issue of *Strategies*, Donald Preziosi (1988) approaches Jameson's Bonaventure from an entirely different point of view. Turning Davis's critique upside down, he blames Jameson for not escaping enough from historicism, for being 'supremely historical,' for never moving outside 'that grand master narrative plot,' that 'commonplace, totalizing historicism central to art historical discourse since the nineteenth-century institutionalizations on both sides of the Atlantic.' Here a sort of exochronomania reigns, demanding that we 'position ourselves *outside* or beyond not simply 'postmodernism' itself, but outside of time, space, and *history*.' Rather than Jameson's 'rhetorical overcomplications of the relatively simplistic Bonaventure Hotel,' we are ultimately guided to 'metacommentary on architectonic representation itself,' wherein all the devilish faults of 'the historical canon(s)' have already been sublimely exorcised. History is thus stripped of its problematics and becomes little more than what Baudrillard called it: 'an immense toy.'

Moving in opposite directions, both Davis and Preziosi, despite interesting forays of their own, miss the meaning of the marked spatial turn that was signified in – and indeed instigated by – Jameson's discoveries in the Bonaventure. By entering the debate on postmodernism and the city, Jameson became absorbed in a new and different project that he himself was not at first fully aware he had entered. Neither a total denial nor a fulsome celebration of historicism, this new spatialized project began with just the metacommentary on the architectonics of representation that Preziosi applauds. But it did not stop there, for the windows of the Bonaventure opened onto more challenging possibilities for the construction of a rebalanced spatio-temporal narrative, a reconfigured critical historiography and political aesthetic that is simultaneously and inseparably a geography.

The Jamesonian shift was clumsy at first and perhaps leaned too much on the Lynchian proxy rather than the more profound inspiration of Henri Lefebvre. After all, it was Lefebvre more than anyone else who made the author of *The Political Unconscious* (1981) change his mind about the slogan that is proclaimed in the book's first words as the 'one absolute and . . . "transhistorical" imperative of all dialectical thought': *Always*

historicize! In the continuing debate on the theorization of the contemporary, the Bonaventure deserves to be remembered as the site which, with Lefebvre's assistance, landmarked Jameson's first published reflections on a new dialectic: *Always spatialize as you historicize!* In other words, the plot thickens!

Centropolis

Everything else at the exhibition of heterotopological symbols converges around the Citadel-LA, the expanded civic center of Los Angeles that is colorfully mapped on the gridded main wall of the gallery. Amidst the dense clustering of footprints (gold for government buildings, bright red-orange for cultural structures), a boldly written placard announces another reading of the spatial text of Los Angeles:

> *The first cities appeared with the simultaneous concentration of commanding symbolic forms, CIVIC CENTERS designed to announce, ceremonialize, administer, acculturate, discipline, and control. In and around the institutionalized locale of the CITADEL (literally, a 'little city') adhered people and their spatially focussed social relations, creating a CIVIL SOCIETY and an accordingly built environment.*
>
> *The city continues to be organized through two interactive processes, surveillance and adherence, looking out from and in towards the citadel and its panoptic eye of POWER. To be urbanized means to adhere, to be made an adherent, a believer in a collective ideology and culture rooted in the extensions of* polis *(politics, policy, polity, police) and* civitas *(civil, civic, civilian, citizen, civilization).*

The Citadel-LA, the little city at the civic center of the sprawling, polynucleated Los Angeles region, is at first glance an unremarkable site: a rectangular band of buildings just minutes away from the Elysian fields, where the city is being born again.[13] Surely the centralized powers described in the proclamations above no longer apply here, of all places, the world's most symbolic space of urban decentralization, of dissociated neighborhoods, of the decentered idiocy of urban life.[14] Yet the centrality of the citadel exists, in part as an historical residual (lest we forget, this has been the center of the region for more than two hundred years) but also as an imposing contemporary accretion of the powers associated with new modes of urban surveillance and adherence. Even as things fall apart, the center holds.

A few details: Nowhere else outside the federal citadel in Washington, DC, is there a larger concentration of government offices and employees. The County Board of Supervisors, a fiefdom of five white males for as long as anyone can remember, deliberates here over a constituency of more than eight million, the largest local government unit in the country. The County Courthouse is reputed to be the busiest anywhere, churning incessantly to feed the country's largest urban prison system, with more inmates than New York City and Cook County (Chicago) combined. The City Hall complex administers the second largest city and projects its Dragnet-image televisually all over the world. Its imagery is bolstered by the nearby Parker Center, headquarters of the Los Angeles Police Department, which makes up for its relatively

limited manpower with a vast arsenal of crack-house ramming tanks and other specialized weaponry. If one looks hard enough, a revealing inscription can be read on the facade of City Hall: 'The city came into being to preserve life, it exists for the good life.'

Bumping up against the government fortresses north of First Street (many of which are arrayed around an old Beaux Arts backbone) are additional centers of effulgent power. The burgeoning and now mostly foreign owned financial center reaches to global heights, inviting the prediction that it will surpass all others in the new millennium. Now the only major daily newspaper, the *Los Angeles Times* already dominates its urban information field like no other metropolitan news source. Not far away from its press rooms, the first estate looms large: St Vibiana's Cathedral rules over four million adherents in one of the world's largest Catholic archdioceses. It presses up against Skid Row, the absolute inversion of empowerment, with its concentrated encampments of the homeless, reputed to be larger than in any other American city. Moving ever outward around the center, a procession of cellular ethni-cities contains residential populations from nearly everywhere, building into the fabric of the inner city the world's largest theme park of urbanized cultures, obediently employed to make everything work smoothly and cheaply. And there is still more to be seen in this centropolis of surveillance and adherence, especially when its second surface is explored.

Cultural Crown

Across from the citadel wall is a futurist scene. On the ground sits what the architects call a massing model for the newest jewel to be added metonymically to the 'cultural crown' of downtown Los Angeles, the Walt Disney Concert Hall, competitively designed by the current king of California architects, Frank Gehry. In the background is posted a collection of working drawings and promotional text dreaming the tomorrows of the contemporary Acropolis, the 'topmost city' of the Citadel-LA, the fortress of fine arts that has put Bunker Hill squarely in the center of the map of American urban imagineering.

Compared with the new Opera House in the Place de la Bastille, Disney Hall (future headquarters for the Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra) is meant to be primordially indigenous, Cali-casually informal, a sort of vegetative climax perfectly adapted to local conditions, a celebration of home-grown inhabitants and heroes. The glassed-in foyer is described as 'the city's living room' open to the mixed use of the masses, the sprawling plazas are the 'culmination' of the city's public space, the plants and trees celebrate the locale – no exotics here. Even the most Pritzkerly prestigious outsiders (Böhm of Cologne, Hollein of Vienna, Stirling of London) did not have a chance against the indigenous competition.

A more symbolic pairing than Gehry and Disney is scarcely imaginable. Together, their dreamworlds will complete the reconstitution of Bunker Hill from the 'old town, lost town, crook town' described by Raymond Chandler to what the archly anarchic architect Arthur Erikson predicted would be a 'center of centers of the western world.' A series of placards around the future site of the Walt Disney Hall on the citadel wall traces this transformation. First there is Chandler from *The High Window*:

Bunker Hill is old town, lost town, crook town . . . In the tall rooms haggard landladies bicker with shifty tenants. On the wide cool front porches, reaching their cracked shoes into the sun, and staring at nothing, sit the old men with faces like lost battles . . . Out of the apartment houses come women who should be young but have faces like stale beer, men with pulled-down hats and quick eyes that look the street over behind the cupped hand that shields the match flame; who look like nothing in particular and know it, and once in a while even men that actually go to work. But they come out early, when the wide cracked sidewalks are empty and still have dew on them.

Erasing this past, literally sheering it off, has been an avalanche of developments down Grand Avenue, from the Music Center complex that first injected culture into the rectangular Citadel-LA in the 1960s to the vast, mixed-use California Plaza project that now contains the celebrated Museum of Contemporary Art (MOCA), skyscraping office towers, pockets of good and bad (appropriately capitalized) Public Art, and the site of the future Disney–Gehry extravaganza of performance spaces.[15]

The Music Center is the cultural crown of Southern California, reigning over orchestral music, vocal performance, opera, theatre and dance . . . It tops Bunker Hill like a contemporary Acropolis, one which has dominated civil cultural life since it was inaugurated in 1964. (Extract from a pictorial map of downtown Los Angeles produced by Unique Media Incorporated)

Walt Disney Hall will capture the axis of the old Music Center buildings and bend it directly towards architect Arata Isozaki's understated Hollywood bonsai.

[The Museum of Contemporary Art is] a temple . . . in which the gods cavort, amuse, and delight, even as they inspire . . . [Its] ambience invokes the power and wonder of the Roman Pantheon, though Isozaki has replaced cylinder and dome with cube and pyramid. The result is an equally uplifting space whose awesome splendor invites contemplation and joy . . . Isozaki's design embodies the exquisite shape and proportion of Marilyn Monroe – classic, voluptuous, and sensuously draped to enhance and tantalize . . . [just as] Frank Gehry's Temporary Contemporary [his nearby prelude to MOCA] proclaims the inimitable bone structure of a Katherine Hepburn, magnificently lean and rugged yet indisputably regal, even in work clothes . . . Two goddesses of a very different sort – yet both cast an aura that transcends mere physical presence and hovers somewhere closer to the realm of pure energy. (Sherry Geldin, MOCA's Associate Director)[16]

California Plaza on Bunker Hill will become the center *for all these other centers [of culture, government, commerce, ethnic life]. Los Angeles [can thus] express what is unique about itself and at the same time begin to fulfill its future role as a center of centers of the western world. (Arthur Erikson, architect)*

Looking up, a floating sky of chicken-wire netting can be seen linking up the entire exhibition. From it dangles a collection of volunteered symbols of Los Angeles 1989:

surfboards, palm trees, bumper stickers, cameras, the Hollywood sign, traffic signals, insignia from past Olympics, signposts saying 'Trespassers Will Be Shot,' and other signatures on the contemporary landscape donated for commemoration by faculty and students in the Architecture and Urban Planning Programs. The cloud of symbols infects the space with a hovering sense of unity that is both temporary and contemporary. One can look forward to the Gehry display and back to the citadel map, reflecting all the time upon the curiously revealing and concealing juxtapositions that compose the contemporary cultural Acropolis.

Palimpsest

Another wall in the exhibition has been created to carry the burden of history on its surface. There is a space behind it that has not yet been explored, for the wall is actually a partitioning of the gallery constructed purposefully to conceal. On the surface facing what we have already seen is a giant replica of the French tricolor, flag of the revolution, tall columns of blue, white, and red across which a time-line moves eventfully in a dated path of francophonic turning points: 1789–1830–1848–1871–1889–1914–1940–1968–1989. The historical display runs from right to left, synchronically and symbolically reconnecting Paris and Los Angeles via the story of El Pueblo de Nuestra Senora la Reina de Los Angeles, the Urban birthplace of the regional metropolis and now an historic park, state monument, and tourist mecca. The rising time-line ends in an arrow pointing to the current site of El Pueblo on the map of the Citadel-LA, where it fittingly belongs.

There are many histories and heterotopologies to be plumbed at El Pueblo, for it is as deeply and deceptively charged with cultural and political meaning as any other place in the region. The Yang-Na greeted the first Spanish explorers here (as did several small earthquakes, one of which Father Crespi reportedly described as 'half as long as an ave maria'). In 1781, 44 settlers (more than half with some African blood) built willow-reed huts around a common plaza, constructed the first irrigation ditch, and officially established (Afro?) Spanish Los Angeles. By the time of the French Revolution, *ranchos* had been allocated to soldiers guarding the thriving agricultural settlement and trading center, and a Christianized Indian was appointed as the first mayor.

In 1830, El Pueblo was part of the Republic of Mexico and the era of the Californios had begun, centered on the new plaza and Catholic church built at their present-day sites and dominated by families whose names echo still in the contemporary landscape: Pico, Sepulveda, Carillo. After years of resistance and struggle between Yankees and Californios, bandits and thugs, the Californios were defeated in 1848 and the victors brought 'Hell Town' into the Union to begin a new era of extraordinary violence, lawlessness, and interracial conflict. This 'vile little dump,' as it was called, averaged a murder a day as it was Americanized by Yankee hustlers and cattle thieves, hispanophobic vigilante groups and lynch mobs, and the armed force of the Los Angeles 'Rangers.'

In the year of the Paris Commune (1871), El Pueblo broke into world headlines for perhaps the first time, as a rampaging mob of 500 capped the Americanization of Los Angeles by slaughtering more than 20 Chinese along the Calle de los Negros leading in to the Plaza. Little is remembered of these events, for the site of El Pueblo was afterwards

left behind in space and time. A new Citadel-LA was constructed just to the south and the past was romantically reconstructed to fit the mythology of *Romona*, Helen Hunt Jackson's idyllic novel and play of early Los Angeles, still performed in revival meetings today to reassure forgetfulness. By 1889, when the French were celebrating the revolution's centennial, the Calle de los Negros had been renamed Los Angeles Street and the decaying El Pueblo was recreated as the City's first official facility of the just created Parks and Recreation (sic) Department.

Over the next century, the Plaza and the La Placita church, along with the few remaining sites of the Californios, functioned like Foucault's mirror in the formation of urban consciousness, a sort of mixed, joint experience, at once utopia and heterotopia. Until the onset of the Great Depression, the Plaza sheltered free-speech rostrums that spawned Mexican revolutionaries struggling against dictatorship in their homeland and American socialist workers fighting for empowerment closer by. Today, La Placita provides sanctuary for the homeless and for political refugees from Central America, resisting growing efforts to expel them from the center of the city. El Pueblo thus survives as a residual gathering space for political and cultural assertion, commemorating not so much the original colony as a much larger expressive heritage that continues to be eaten away by the explosive growth of the metropolis around it.

Intertwined with this continuity, however, is another, even more resilient, tradition, drawing selectively upon the past to crack open and invert the heritage that is preserved at other local sites and spaces. As a counter-site, El Pueblo has maintained and innovatively reinforced its ability to Americanize the un-American and destroy undesirable alien images, thus serving the traditional aims of the citadel to 'ceremonialize, administer, acculturate, discipline, and control.' It was a focal point for the 'repatriation movement' that aimed to deport Mexicans around the time of the 1932 Olympic games and a primary 'nativist' hunting ground during the anti-*pachuco* Zoot Suit riots of World War II, when the United Services Organization occupied a central place in the plaza. It has also memorably served the ideological state apparatus in another way, by being among the first testing grounds for a new kind of heterotopia created around a combination of cultural simulation and dissimulation (pretending to have what one has not while simultaneously pretending not to have what one really has).

In 1926, a dedicated woman, Christine Sterling, approached Harry Chandler, kingpin of the *Los Angeles Times*, with an inspired plan to rejuvenate the seedy El Pueblo along the lines of the City Beautiful movement that was then cosmetically refacing the Citadel-LA. Four years later, a little urban 'theme park' was opened to the public, ostensibly built as a monument to the founding of Los Angeles and represented in the form of 'an important Latin American trade and social center.' Along Olvera Street (cleaned up and lowered three feet by gangs of prison labor provided by the City), a 'picturesque Mexican market place' provided the appropriate commodification. With amendments over the years, this reconstituted space (located in between the now similarly reconstituted spaces of Chinatown and Little Tokyo) attracts three million visitors a year.[17]

Looking back, El Pueblo has been the primordial urban palimpsest of the City of Angels, prepared from its origins to be written upon and erased over and over again in the evolution of public consciousness and civic imagination.[18] In Foucauldian terms, it

resembles that 'new kind of temporal heterotopia' which combines the fleeting time of the festival site or vacation village with the indefinitely accumulating time of the museum or library. As such, like its Disneyfied descendants, it simultaneously serves to abolish history and culture and to discover them anew in 'other spaces.'[19]

Panopticon

Our final stop in the exhibition need not take long, for its rudiments have already been sighted, sited, and cited. It is an attempt to evoke in a more direct way the carceral city that underlies all urban histories and geographies, that everywhere concentrates and projects the citadel's powers of surveillance and adherence. We enter it through the time-line wall where it approaches the plotted Citadel-LA, a map which extends inward from roughly the site of El Pueblo to display the enclosures containing the largest urban prison population in the country, sites which violently intrude upon the unbarred *barrio* of East Los Angeles, where another form of spatial enclosure is practiced.

A takeaway fact sheet provides you with some information: 18,000 inmates fill four county jails, including Men's Central and Sybil Brand, the nation's largest women's prison. In 1988, another 23,000 'non-threatening' prisoners were released early to free up space, provoking Governor Deukmejian (who is determined to build more prisons in this downtown wedge against the resistance of its other residents) to proclaim that criminals are Los Angeles's 'principal export.' A newspaper headline tells of neo-Nazi and Ku Klux Klan terrorism within Men's Central aimed at intimidating Black deputies and inmates alike with cross-burnings, gang-baiting taunts, and Nazi memorabilia. One is never free from the legacy of racism in Los Angeles, even when behind bars.

By now, you are in a dark, cell-like room lit by a bare red bulb. The chicken-wire cloud that floats Gehrishly over the rest of the gallery spills into the enclosure and tightly meshes an interior wall. On all sides are ominous photographs of the newest addition to the obviously carceral city, the Metropolitan Detention Center, a federal 'administrative' facility squeezed into the Citadel-LA near the Federal Building and US Courthouse, just across the freeway from El Pueblo.[20] The only visible bars are hung on the outside of the building in a perfect dissimulation of the carceral, feigning not to have what it most certainly has.

The obvious allusions are referenced in bold-faced lettering in a quotation adapted from Gwendolen Wright and Paul Rabinow, 'Spatialization of Power: A Discussion of the Work of Michel Foucault,' published in *Skyline* (1982).

> *For Foucault, SPACE is where the discourses about POWER and KNOWLEDGE are transformed into actual relations of power. Here, the knowledge in the forefront is that of aesthetics, of an architectural profession, of a science of planning. But these 'disciplines' never constitute an isolated field. They are of interest only when one looks to see how they mesh with economics, politics, or institutions. Then both architecture and urban planning offer privileged instances for understanding how power operates.*
>
> *The PANOPTICON, Jeremy Bentham's proposal for radially planned institutional buildings, is by now the most famous instance of a concretization of power applied through*

architecture. Foucault came upon Bentham's 1787 plan while studying reforms in eighteenth-century hospital and prison architecture, and took it as the paradigmatic example of the interworkings of SPACE, POWER and KNOWLEDGE in disciplinary society. The PANOPTICON is the 'diagram of a mechanism of power reduced to its ideal form', a combination of abstract schematization and very concrete applications.

Every city is a carceral city, a collection of surveillant nodes designed to impose a particular model of conduct and disciplinary adherence on its inhabitants. This agglomeration of the spatial means of social control, these centers of power, is what differentiates the urban from the rural, adherents from the not yet adherent, *polites* from *idiotes*. But one must not assume that urban incarceration operates simply and directly along the extended visual lines of Bentham's Panopticon or that its disciplinary technologies and heterotopologies remain constant over time. Too much happens in the city for this to be true.

In the modern world, the primary scale of surveillance and adherence, of *citi*zenship and *poli*tics, shifted dramatically from the city to the state, recentering the locus of power outside the direct gaze of the citadels and into a more invisible process of 'normalization' that pervades patriotic allegiance and representative rather than participatory democracy. It is no surprise then to find modern political theory and critical social science abandoning its roots in the polis and denying the specificity of the city, its centrality as an object of knowledge. The discourses on power and knowledge in the constitution of society continued to acknowledge that things took place *in* cities (an unavoidable though inconsequential coincidence) but were not (or no longer) *of* cities, directly imbricated in the urban. For the past century at least, the urban become epiphenomenal to the constitution of modern societies and the making of modern histories.

Foucault and, in his parallel project, Henri Lefebvre both capped this modern discourse in the late 1960s and significantly turned it around by rekindling attention to the specificity of the urban via an explicitly spatializing strategy. For both, socially produced space (which at least since the rise of industrial capitalism has been an imperatively urbanized space) is where the discourses about power and knowledge are transformed into actual relations of power (to re-use Wright and Rabinow's words). In this view, the modern state (national and local) thus does not reduce the city's social power as much as it expands and extends it in scale and scope, preserving the urban as a contested space for a politics that is simultaneously based on the reproduction of state and society and on its potentially revolutionary transformation *in situ*.[21]

This assertive emplacement simultaneously inscribes the interworkings of space, power, and knowledge into both a socio-spatial and an historico-geographical dialectic, a meshing of ontological and epistemological fields that were kept apart for most of the past century in what I have described as the subordination of space in critical social theory. In the spatializing strategies, the incipient postmodern geographies of Foucault and Lefebvre, the city is brought back into focus through the 'eye of power' that sees not only the past but also the present revolving around the politically charged spatiality of social life. Seeing the city as carceral is only the beginning.

Retrospective?

What has been pictured at the exhibition is teasingly incomplete and preliminary, only a few small steps into the debates on postmodernity, a mere tweaking here and there of the lingering pretensions of High Modernist historiography, cultural criticism, and critical social theory. Merely remembering Foucault's spatial turn (and Jameson's) is not enough to be fully convincing about the importance of postmodern geographies or the insights to be derived in learning from Los Angeles. And it all sounds so modernist in the end, does it not, especially to those categorical umpires who chalk off the foul lines of discourse? To postmodernize more effectively what has been pictured in the exhibition, it is ultimately necessary to remember Baudrillard.

In Biddy Mason's memorial place, the remembrances of the Bastille, the Bastaventure entrancement, the Citadel-LA, the cultural Acropolis, the El Pueblo palimpsest, the Panopticon prisons, there are contained the seeds of a contextual deconstruction that reverses the tapestry of modernist interpretation by attempting something new and different, a decidedly post-marked exploration of 'other spaces.' Neither Foucault nor Lefebvre succeeded in getting there himself, although they brilliantly demonstrated a way out of the dishevelled discourses of late modernity. To explore the spaces of postmodernity another map is needed, one that is marked by a new legend and requires new viewfinders to help explain the meanings of being there, *être*-LA.

I conclude therefore by briefly commemorating Baudrillard for his s(t)imulating 'post'-enlightenment. And, as with so much that has been commemorated here, I will do so in quick strokes that punctuate rather than elaborate the argument. The scene with which I leave the text is one that requires three sets of lenses to be seen, each envisioning a different mode of epistemic representation, a way of looking at and learning from the relation between thoughtful image and empirical reality, or if you prefer the signified and the signifier.

The first lenses focus on a picture that has dominated (for good reason) western philosophy and science since the beginnings of the Enlightenment, a picture of the mind as a great *mirror–map* of 'good appearances,' of potentially accurate representations of reality that must be sifted through methodically to separate the good from the bad. What is seen is an empirically discoverable, accurately mappable life-world. These time-worn lenses, even today, remain in constant use, albeit with slightly different disciplinary tints. Many have never used any other.

A second, 'corrective' pair of lenses has allowed us to see through the *masking map* of appearances, many of which Baudrillard argues are perceived as 'evil,' to discover a whole new life-world filled with generative essentials, hidden signifiers, and deeper meaning. Exploration and epistemology here take on the representational task of unmasking, demystifying, exposing this second semiological surface. Various forms of structuralism have searched the territory most methodically, but it has also been revealingly explored for its emancipatory potential by virtually every branch of modern critical thought. Creative artists were probably there in the first place, individually probing behind the scenes and the seen, but the space became most densely occupied after the various

modern movements in the human sciences that arose in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Foucault's heterotopology provides a brilliant guidebook to unmasking the 'other spaces' concealed in this modernist landscape of hidden signifiers. But he also had on order another set of lenses that he never really wore. Baudrillard filled his prescription with wild new spectacles that did not simply invert the images but introduced a radically different way of seeing. Through these lenses, images no longer either reflected or masked a basic reality; they revealed instead its protracted absence in a postmodern, poststructuralist landscape of absorbing simulations and hyperrealities. Then, in a delirious optical allusion, Baudrillard bifocalized the lens to allow the possibility of seeing an emerging fourth life-world of 'pure' simulacra, filled with places where images bear no relation to any reality whatever, where good and bad appearances have dis-appeared, where the real and its representations are not what they used to be. In this life-world, we can no longer test pretence against reality for we cannot tell which is which. We thus approach becoming eye-less, I-less, and aye-less.

I have tried to peek through Baudrillard's lenses in looking with him at Los Angeles, but I still do not know how to describe what I saw or to know that I saw it. He smiled and nodded at my efforts in the Bicentennial symposium at UCLA to see the postmodern world through his eyes, but later claimed, still smiling, that what I saw was still intrepidly pre-postmodern, insufficiently hyperrealistic. Is there really (or hyperreally) another way that we can see to engage in a politically committed critique of postmodernity that is itself thoroughly postmodernized? Can we create an effective postmodernism of resistance that involves more than bovine immobility or sitting on the fences like parodic Humpty Dumpties playing with words? In the end, I do not know – but neither, I think, does Baudrillard. Meanwhile, let us not forget Foucault.

NOTES

1 For some earlier contextual readings, see Soja (1989, 1990). Also worthwhile looking at is Michael Shapiro and Deane Neubauer (1989).

2 These brief, essentially ontological reflections on objectification, subjectification, and emplacement illuminate with some new twists the interesting debate on the existential spatiality of being. See Soja (1989: 131–7).

3 Foucault ends his lecture with a passionate tribute to the boat, a floating piece of space, a place without a place, the greatest reserve of the footloose imagination. 'In civilizations without boats,' he writes, 'dreams dry up, espionage takes the place of adventure, and the police take the place of the pirates.' One wonders what Foucault would have thought about the now rigidly docked *Queen Mary*, spectacularly placed in Long Beach harbor alongside the equally grounded *Spruce Goose* (Howard Hughes's enormous folly and still the largest airplane ever built). Today, filled with dried up dreams of mobility, both are unmovingly imagineered by the Disney Company, their present owners.

4 I emphasize the term *configuration* to trigger a connection with the essentially historicizing use of the same term, adapted from Ricoeur (in White 1987), and in other creative attempts to defend critical historiography against its critics. Although cognizant of the

importance of space and 'geography' (as he sees it) in history and in the narrative, White persistently misses the point being made by Foucault (and perhaps by Ricoeur as well?) that such concepts as 'configuration' and 'emplotment' demand a profound and iconoclastic spatial turn to the writing of history, an explicit spatialization of the narrative rather than just a celebration of its explanatory historicity.

5 The public lectures included James Leith (Queen's University, Canada), 'La Bastille and Paris: 1789 to 1989'; Dora Weiner (UCLA), 'Sacred and Secular Space: Transformations of Religious into Medical Buildings, 1789 to 1820'; Jean Baudrillard (University of Paris IX), 'Revolution and the End of Utopia'; and Josef W. Konvitz (Michigan State University), 'Spatial Change and the Centralization of Power: Paris Before and After the Revolution.' The colloquium featured Richard Lehan (UCLA), 'The City and Literature: Pre-modern Paris and Post-modern Los Angeles, Cities at the End of Time'; James Leith, 'Planning for the Louvre: A Case for the *Longue Durée*'; Dolores Hayden (UCLA), 'The Power of Place Project: Planning for the Preservation of the Urban History of Los Angeles;' Edward Soja (UCLA), 'Taking Los Angeles Apart: Fragments of a Postmodern Geography'; Jean Baudrillard, 'From Beaubourg to the Arche de la Défense: Architecture, Urban Space, and the Power of Simulacra: A Commentary.' All the events were organized through the auspices of the UCLA Bicentennial Program and its chair, Robert Maniquis, with financial assistance from the National Institute for the Humanities.

6 The organization is the brainchild of Dolores Hayden. For an introduction to its aims, see Hayden (1988: 5–18). The small exhibition of its recent work was curated by Donna Graves.

7 Others include the intrusively imposing Arche de la Défense, the wackily postmodern Parc de la Villette (with its planned garden designed jointly by Peter Eisenmann and Jacques Derrida), and the Pei-emplaced pyramid puncturing through the heart of the Louvre. Will Paris – or the French Revolution – ever be the same again?

8 Floreal was also the eighth month of the French Revolutionary (Republican) Calendar. It extended from April 20 to May 19, coinciding almost exactly with the UCLA exhibition.

9 Many people helped to put together this portion of the exhibition with me, but there from the beginning to end were Taina Rikala de Noriega and Iain Borden.

10 The sculptors of the Bastaventure are Ali Barar and James Kaylor.

11 See Fredric Jameson (1984: 53–92). See also the critical responses from Mike Davis (1985: 106–13) and Donald Preziosi (1988: 82–99).

12 Davis's subsequent essays on Los Angeles and his recent book *City of Quartz* (1990) are much more successful in avoiding this diachronomaniacal historicism. See Davis (1987, and 1990).

13 At the North Broadway entrance to Elysian Park, a monument marks the first white sighting of Los Angeles, the place where Gaspar de Portola and Father Juan Crespi made camp on August 2, 1769, during the first European expedition through California. By the time of the French Revolution, the indigenous Yang-Na Indians had virtually disappeared without a trace of commemoration from what were once their primary hunting grounds and water source. Nearly two centuries later, the nearby Chavez Ravine was cleared of its rebellious residents – many distant descendants of the old Californios – to make room for Dodger Stadium, one of the most profitable sports sites in the world. Elysian Park today

also contains California's first botanic garden, filled with exotics from all over the world, and the much more domestic Los Angeles Police Academy, where young recruits are taught contemporary hunting and gathering skills.

14 Such idiocy derives from the Greek root *idios*, one's own, private, separate, apart, as in 'idiosyncratic,' acting in a way peculiar to oneself; originally, unlearned in the way of the traditional *polis*, as in the 'idiocy of rural life.'

15 The largest of the performance plazas will eventually span across Olive Street in a dramatically ambivalent public space. A giant water fountain designed by WET, the company responsible for the water fantasies of both Disneyland and Walt Disney World, will dialogue with the public, at times flooding the plaza with its wet tricks, at other times parching it to permit spectacular displays of local ethnic artistry. Good timing will be necessary.

16 Quoted in Berelowitz (n.d.). For more on MOCA, see Berelowitz 1990.

17 A celebration was held at the Plaza in 1989 to commemorate the centennial of the Recreation and Parks Department (which changed its name to put recreation first during the same year). As reported in the local press, there were performances by the Asian American Ballet, the Xipe Totec Aztec Indian dancers, and Somebody Special, Inc., 'a drill team of teen-age girls who boogie to Motown sounds.' A time capsule was also buried under Olvera Street containing representative ethnic arts and crafts, feathers from the endangered California condor, a preserved grunion, and park-sponsored T-shirts.

18 Today the area is again a center of controversial re-evalution, as competing redevelopers eye its prime location and dream of alternative land uses as the Central City bulges northward.

19 Plans abound to construct a symbolic 'gateway' extravaganza surmounting the freeway at this precise spot to commemorate Los Angeles's extraordinary pull as an immigrant entrepôt – a local and very contemporary version of Ellis Island and the Statue of Liberty rolled into one. The winning plan proposed a 'steel cloud' grill-work filled with restaurants, museums, gift shops, and aquaria floating above the traffic below and set between the prison and the Pueblo. Whether it will be built is still up in the air.

20 I waved back once, after entering a fern-filled atrium that is just to the right of the main entrance. Out of nowhere, guards appeared to shoo me away from such open communication with the one-armed inhabitants. Despite its location and its involvement in such sensitive local issues as immigration control and financial fraud, the Metropolitan Detention Center was built with remarkably little local awareness and even today few law-abiding downtown workers or visitors know of its existence.

21 Foucault and Lefebvre problematized revolution spatially around the politics of the urban, the struggles for power over the governing of space and territory that are centered in cities but extend well beyond them into the 'urbanized' countrysides and peripheries. For Lefebvre, see *Le droit à la ville* (1968) and *La Revolution urbaine* (1970) (forthcoming as *Writings on Cities* (1994)), as well as *La survie du capitalisme* (1973) and *La production de l'espace* (1974). No one has yet explored in detail the fascinating similarities and differences in the spatializing projects of Lefebvre and Foucault, in part because few have been able to comprehend their expanded vision of the urban and their politicized views of the 'making of geographies,' or what Lefebvre was the first to call *spatial praxis*.

REFERENCES

Baudrillard, J. 1987: *Forget Foucault*, New York: Semiotext(e).

Berelowitz, J.-A. 1990: 'A New Jerusalem: Utopias, MOCA, and the Redevelopment of Downtown Los Angeles', *Strategies*, 3: 202–26.

Berelowitz, J.-A. (n.d.) 'The Jewel in the Crown: Bunker Hill, MOCA, and the Ideology of Urban Redevelopment', unpublished manuscript.

Davis, M. 1985: 'Urban Renaissance and the Spirit of Postmodernism', *New Left Review*, 151: 106–13.

Davis, M. 1987: 'Chinatown, Part Two? The "Internationalization" of Downtown Los Angeles', *New Left Review*, 164: 65–86.

Davis, M. 1990: *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*, London: Verso.

Foucault, M. 1986: 'Of Other Spaces', *Diacritics*, Spring: 22–7.

Hayden, D. 1988: 'The Power of Place: A Proposal for Los Angeles', *The Public Historian*, 10: 5–18.

Jameson, F. 1981: *The Political Unconscious*, London: Routledge.

Jameson, F. 1984: 'Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism', *New Left Review*, 146: 53–92.

Lefebvre, H. 1973: *La survie de la capitalisme*, Paris: Anthropos.

Lefebvre, H. 1974: *La production de l'espace*, Paris: Anthropos.

Lefebvre, H. 1994: *Writings on Cities*, eds E. Kofman and E. Lebas, Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Lynch, K. 1960: *The Image of the City*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lynch, K. 1972: *What Time is This Place?*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Preziosi, D. 1988: 'La Vi(ll)e en rose: Reading Jameson Mapping Space', *Strategies*, 1: 82–99.

Shapiro, M. and Neubauer, D. 1989: 'Spatiality and Policy Discourse: Reading the Global City', *Alternatives*, 14: 301–25.

Soja, E. 1989: 'Taking Los Angeles Apart: Towards a Postmodern Geography', ch. 9 in *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*, London: Verso.

Soja, E. 1990: 'Inside the Orange County Exopolis: A Contemporary Screen-Play', in M. Sorkin (ed.), *Variations on a Theme Park: Scenes from the New American City*, New York: Pantheon.

White, H. 1987: *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*, New York: Johns Hopkins.