

From Power to Power: Strydom Square and the Security Park

Derek Hook & Michele Vrdoljak.

Prologue: Strydom Square.

On the 16th November 1988, in a self-declared attempt to start the 3rd 'Boer war', 'Wit Wolf' and right-wing Afrikaner nationalist and extremist Barend Strydom went on a racially-motivated shooting spree in downtown Pretoria. Strydom had carefully picked the site of event such that it would amplify his actions, and hopefully incite a resurgence of the powerful racial division of South Africa that Strydom believed was under threat. He began his killings at the cultural epicenter of the city - Strydom Square. The Square was a whole city block devoted to Afrikaner heritage and accomplishment, and built to depict Prime Minister (1954-1958) J.G. Strydom's vision of freedom – that of South Africa's independence by secession from the Commonwealth (Graves & Viglieno 1992). Linked to this resolve was his following of an apartheid ideology with his view that "if the white man can not be ruler he loses his identity" (Diphane 1999).

Built on the site of what had been, until the 1960's, the economic heart of a thriving Indian market, which was cleared by forced removals and then demolished, Strydom Square epitomized, even in its basic conditions of possibility, the principles of racial superiority through the power of repressive physical force. For much of the apartheid regime, the Square was the nucleus of arts and culture in South Africa. It was (and in fact still is) the domicile of the State Theatre, a large and imposing building, which operated as the National

Opera House, and that frequently also played host to visiting exhibitions. The State Theatre functioned as something of a social rallying point for the Afrikaans and white elite during much of the apartheid era.

More than a nodal point of arts and culture, the Square also served as home to the head office of South Africa's largest Afrikaans-owned and operated bank: Volkskas. The financial powerhouse of Afrikaans South Africa, the architecturally celebrated Volkskas building was designed by the foremost Afrikaans architect of the time. Like the majority of the Square, the Volkskas building was built from materials indigenous to the country, such that the form of this architectural statement of Afrikaner Nationalism and independence, would, quite literally, follow the content of the vision it was thought to embody.

A concern with indexical materials is similarly visible in the gardens of the Square: four separated tracts of flora, each embodying the characteristic plant-life of the country's then four provinces. These provinces were themselves monumentally symbolized in an iconic statue of four powerful horses connoting the national unity of joint provincial strength. The fountain in the Square represented Strydom's vision as floating and extending to the future while the horses were a symbol of the inspiration for freedom. The signature image for many of Strydom Square however remains the gargantuan and disembodied head of the former apartheid statesman which stands just to the west of the center of the Square, and which one can never but be 'looked down upon' by. An ominous and foreboding monument, the floating head appears as a severe concretization of both the unbending authority of apartheid's power, the unquestionable presence and

prerogatives of its supremacy, and of the extreme warrants of surveillance and control that were its alone to operate.

Although the head was originally designed to look 'towards the future' and the rest of the Square, in a westerly direction, this was later changed by the late President's partner, who refused to have Strydom's gazing toward a series of Indian shops across from the Square (Diphane 1999). Part of the rationale behind the monument had been to give some stature of size and scale to a man who was of normal height and it was decided that the monument should be that of his face only, thus depicting his strong chin as an image of power (Diphane 1999). Granite was chosen as the material for the monument to depict the visage of this 'hard' and uncompromising man.

More than a salute to power, or a naturalization of racial-cultural superiority, the head, to many, was an embodiment of political intimidation. Inaccessible, 'unbudging' and never-changing, not to mention disproportionately massive, the head made for a positively foreboding icon, a 'monument of threat', a warning against the consequences of disobedience to apartheid doctrine. Indeed, the disembodied head itself seems somehow indicative of the violence so intrinsic to this political order, an unconscious conation of the brutal physical outcomes that would necessarily follow any challenge to the sovereignty of the newly independent apartheid state.

An assemblage of economic power, idealized cultural values, indexical natural elements, austere monument, and the marker of actual physical and material

measures of power, Strydom Square both epitomized the values of apartheid Afrikaner nationalism, and presented an implicit threat to those who would challenge it. There could, in short, hardly be a more ideologically appropriate site from which Barend Strydom could begin his killing spree. A year later, to the day of the shootings, an identified 'vandal' surreptitiously injected an amount of red dye into the Square's fountain, powerfully and iconoclastically inverting an element of the Square that had been meant to project a future vision for Afrikaner freedom into a morbid reminder of whose freedoms had been excluded from this vision. In total, Barend Strydom killed eight and wounded fourteen black South Africans in his rampage, which he legitimized in his bid for amnesty as an act of war to protect the Afrikaner nation (Truth Commission, 14 March, 1997). (Incidentally, in a city noted for its high population of police and and civil servicemen, it was only ultimately a black civilian who heroically disarmed Strydom and brought his shootings to a stop).

Could this act of murderous political violence be considered to be endemic, somehow 'in built' within this structure, whose agendas of racial superiority and dominance are so explicit? In fact, one wonders whether this architectural and spatial arrangement is not *itself* a form of violence, which, for as long as its concretized values hold any real social currency, may continue to engender violence, both in the form of a fanatical extension of the meanings it so idealistically symbolizes, or as exactly a violent reaction to them and the politics of subordination they assert. In short, how does *the place* of a site like that of Strydom Square inform the political practices and discourses surrounding and occupying it? And, in turn, how do certain political regimes come to be so effused

with place, how do they come to so colonize and determine the characteristic practices of certain places?

In a single motif, this piece of Strydom Square history perfectly dramatizes the over-riding concerns of this paper; it emblematically links the *interpenetrating* themes of space and power, and points to how they may function in a mutually reinforcing manner. Although not chiefly within the terms of this example, this paper will hope to provide the non-too-frequent opportunity to think power-as-space, and space-as-power.

Spatiality: political regimes and space-as-discourse.

Beyond the schematic interests sketched in the opening illustration above, this paper has three basic aims. It hopes, firstly, to characterize the South African phenomena of the ‘Security Park’. Secondly, it hopes to relate this spatial form of power to Foucault’s theoretical notion of the heterotopia. It also hopes, thirdly, to utilize this means of thinking power-in-terms-of-place as a way of asserting a series of general conclusions about regimes of power in post-apartheid South Africa. These speculations on power in post-apartheid South Africa will be briefly contrasted to apartheid regimes of ‘spatial power’ as exemplified by the Strydom Square illustration provided above.

It is important here to qualify the differences between ‘space’ and ‘place’. For the purposes of this discussion, and following Chaney (1994), ‘place’ will be understood as spaces that have become imbricated with social values, meaning and identity. A second important pragmatic concern here resides in identifying an

important prospective methodological drawback in this study: the very difficulty of speaking about space. Indeed, without the training or expertise of the architect or geographer, one does not necessarily have an appropriate vocabulary of space, or a properly formed matrix of measurement and dimension through which to conceptualize the qualities of space, a concern that Harvey (1990) has treated as paramount. In order to in some ways sidestep this difficulty, this paper will engage with space principally *as an element of discourse*. Space will be engaged with principally *as an element of discourse*. Just as language is a dimension of political activity via discourse, so is space through its various constructions, characteristic meanings and practices. Discourses and power may well be realized in texts, as Parker (1992) suggests, but as Foucault (1981) is at pains to point out, discourse is by no means exhausted by the text but heterogeneously realized in a variety of forms, for example in material practices, architectural structures, in the regulating principles and actions of institutions. In this sense a focus on the discursive by no means precludes the spatial.

Spatiality is a conception of space that Soja (1989) uses to oppose what he refers to as "the dominance of a physicalist view of space [which] has so permeated the analysis of human spatiality that it...[has] distort[ed] our vocabulary" (Soja 1989, 80 (f)). Soja (1989) points to a separation between space *per se*, space as a contextual given and socially based *spatiality*, the created space of social organization and production. Rather than imagining space as a white page on which the actions of groups and institutions are inscribed, Soja (1989) warns of *the social production of space*, and argues that the organization, meaning and functioning of space is a product of social translation, transformation and

experience. “Socially-produced space is a created structure comparable to other social constructions” he claims (1989, 79-80), before going on to quote Lefebvre:

“Space is not a scientific object removed from ideology and politics; it has always been political and strategic... Space has been shaped and moulded from historical and natural elements, but this has always been a political process. Space is political and ideological. It is literally filled with ideologies” (Lefebvre, cited in Soja 1989, 80).

Soja (1989) hence operationalizes *spatiality* as that socially constructed and socially practiced spaces intricately intertwined with socio-political relations of power, meaning and ideology and thus amenable to discursive forms of analysis. Spatiality then will be the term used to refer to those discursive forms of space implicated in the operation of power, and it will be the spatiality of the security park that this study will hope to describe.

URBAN FORTRESSES: THE SECURITY PARK

‘Separate development’

The security park, a fairly recent addition to the urban landscape of the affluent suburban Johannesburg. A large walled-in and security-riddled community living space, the security park accommodates the homes of a typically elite and demographically homogenous group. According to Bremner (1999) the transformation of local government resulted in a lacuna in bureaucratic procedures of planning, leaving the control of development to the entrepreneur that quickly identified the security park as an important growth market for the building industry. The autonomy, which the security park so seemingly strives to realize, is

indicated in the fact that to a very large extent, these areas of development maintain not only their own bylaws, but also the 'architectural mandate' over their own areas. Unlike the vast majority of building projects scattered across the city of Johannesburg, the city council has only limited powers of intervention within such security park complexes.

An indication of the autonomy of the security park is given in their lack of engagement with national architectural and city-planning debates on how best to restructure Johannesburg in a way that will facilitate the de-segregation, racial integration and overall urban renewal of the city. The priority of security park developers is to build on the ever more northerly outskirts of Johannesburg, beyond the traditional limits of the city, to escape by as far as possible the feared urban center. Although the division of those living in better protected environments from those living in more exposed settings is increasingly along economic rather than merely racial lines (Kruger, Meyer, Napier, Pascolo, Qhobela, Shaw, Louw, Oppler, & Niyabo 1997).

The agenda of security park developers is the creation of a perception of staunch and inviolable security, where one's rights to property and personal privacy will remain sacrosanct. The zeal of the attempt to fortify against the threat of crime has meant that security park developers have placed an inordinate emphasis on familial and personal security, on efficient and fail-safe crime prevention. It is true in this sense to say that these collaborations of local governance and building industry innovation have thus far outstripped any contribution by the state in respect of successful crime prevention (Kruger et al 1997).

A 'culture of security' and its status symbols.

The guards employed as part of such security measures are typically well-trained, and are often attired in para-military garb, prepared to offer a pro-active policing of the security park space and to rebuff crime in an 'armed response' capacity. Private security personnel in South Africa now outnumber the police by two to one (Bremner 1999). The separation of the security park from the rest of South African suburban/urban society is also a 'concrete' question of barred-off roads, unpassable walls, electrified fences, booms and razor-wire. This is a situation whereby suburban fortification has become highly desirable and has faded into fantasy and pastiche (Bremner 1999).

Aware of both the security benefits and the 'consumer fetishism' attached to security park real estate, developers have wasted little time in adding to this 'appeal' with the addition of stylized quasi-pastoral designs and imagery. The idyllic imaginary of eco-sensitive architectural styles and evocative names are viewed as strong means of broadening the market-appeal of the security park. The security park is reminiscent of the game lodge in its attempt to 'get closer to nature' and by virtue of its electrified fences and patrolling guards - in the way it attempts to ensure that an inner core of cleared space is sealed off from the country at large (Ndebele 1999). The stark contradictions of nature against sophisticated surveillance technology, of safety despite urban detachment (its closer to nature in here, but its a jungle out there) start to manifest here. Security, manufactured and computerized to the utmost degree, becomes synonymous with this "natural environment", and along with it, a prerequisite for peaceful living.

'Theme parks' of the rich and famous.

These words and images conjure up lifestyles that are increasingly divorced from reality; Tudor, Mediterranean, Medieval and Modern styles frequently subsist in the security park, in a mishmash of colliding architectural genres. Style, as Bremner (1999) notes, becomes the vehicle for denying the violent context of the city, ever more detached from the reality of the asymmetrical socio-economic conditions lying beyond their parameters. The unstated agenda being that most recreational activities can be catered for within the security park, hence an ever-decreasing need to go outside the premises.

Fragmented City.

Virtually impenetrable to the outsider, highly-stylized and effectively cut-off from the rest of the socio-economic and geographical reality of Johannesburg, the security park represents an increasing privatization of potentially public activity, and an increasing independence and autonomy from the general civic life of the city. A privatized form of development, such living spaces make for security-riddled fortresses of luxury and detachment. Despite this, it is difficult to deny their efficacy. No doubt, security parks appear to have been successful in consolidating a sense of safety, security and commonality within their confines. The fortification of suburbs comes at a cost however,

and their necessary consequence in terms of the greater community is that "freedom of movement is restricted, chance contact is eradicated and public interaction limited to that between self-defined, homogenous groups" (Bremner 1999, p. 11). The gap between the 'has' and the 'has-nots' grows ever wider to the extent that each group has an increasingly diminished sense of how 'the other half' lives.

Divisions are secured through the ever advancing exclusivity of privatization. The prospects of a truly democratic and demographically representative sense of community space are dashed. The spatial logic of Johannesburg becomes increasingly fragmented, dispersed and divided, to the point where the security park or privatized city substitutes the democratic public real, denying citizens of any power of resistance (Sorkin, 1992).

The politics of space in South Africa is both proactive, and liberal. The politics of space are predicated on highly individualized and specified *rights* of admission. The exorbitant costs of security park housing ensure that they are effectively the abode only of the high-earning upper class. Similarly, the placement of security parks, in the extreme north of

Johannesburg (which is also the factor which allows them to boast their near rural, country-side 'retreat' value) effectively ensures that the poor and criminal elements of society will remain largely out of the picture and out of range. Discourses and practices of privilege are based rather in the practicalities of economic superiority.

The Heterotopia: real utopias, effectively realized political sites.

Foucault's (1997) notion of the heterotopia, is, at its most basic, a way of conceiving social space, a model, as Lees (1997) puts it, of contemporary (or historical) socio-spatial life. It acts as a spatial frame for analysis, from which larger commentaries may be drawn about the values, practices and discourses of a particular social site. It will be helpful, so as to inform the analysis to come, to provide a brief characterization of this spatial-political concept.

The heterotopia is an extraordinarily pliable notion; as Soja (1995, 15) notes, the heterotopia is always variable and culturally-specific, changing in form, function, and meaning according to the particular "synchrony of culture" in which it is formed. Similarly, its meaning and function may change over time. The heterotopia, furthermore, is also a universal element of human societies, 'a constant feature of all human groups' (Foucault 1997). Foucault (1997) is similarly categorical about the fact that the heterotopia *posses a precise and well-defined function within society*. It stands to reason then that one should be able to study the

discourses and characterizing practices that 'institute' the place of the heterotopia and solidify its social identity. Indeed, this seems central to Foucault's suggested project of 'heterotology' which "would have as its object the study, analysis, description and 'reading'...of those different spaces, those other places [that enable]...both mythical and real contestation of the space in which we live" (Foucault 1997, 352-353). For Foucault then (1997), the study of heterotopias leads the analyst back to the over-arching schema of political practices and discourses of the society in which it is localized and makes for a viable theoretical tool for linking space and power, politics and place; *an analytic node through which one might deduce greater networks of power.*

A further characterizing feature of the heterotopia is that it is importantly related to other spatialities. Although the heterotopia is notably distinct from the spaces around it, it does connect and link with other spaces, even if such connections more than anything work to create effects of contrast and difference. Following Foucault (1997), the role of the heterotopia is either to create "a space of illusion that exposes real space as still *more* illusionary", or, 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" (1997, 356). The heterotopia then, by definition, is a *differential space*, importantly similar to, but always fundamentally different from, the places that surround it. Given this quality, it is unsurprising that, as Foucault (1997) insists, the heterotopia "has the power of juxtaposing in a single real place different spaces and locations that are incompatible" (Foucault 1997, 354). Suffice to say that the analysis of the heterotopia typically yields a variety of contradictions not necessarily perceived at first. Reasserting the

variability of the heterotopia, as Soja (1995, 15) notes that “[T]his complex juxtaposition and cosmopolitan simultaneity of differences in space...charges the heterotopia with social and cultural meaning”. The incompatibility of the heterotopia’s various internal combinations, in short, makes for important focal points of a critical analysis.

The next characterizing feature of the heterotopia its ‘pure symmetry of heterochronisms’, its linkage to ‘bits and pieces of time’, enabling visitors to enter ‘a total breach of traditional time’. Heterotopias also presuppose a system of opening and closing (Foucault, 1997). The question of accessibility is central here and Foucault (1997) is concerned with how a place is open or closed to public entrance, how it maintains boundaries, barriers, gateways and disallows thoroughfare, loitering or anonymous entrance. It is at this dimension of space that power becomes, arguably, most palpable, and Foucault (1997) is adamant that all heterotopias involve a system of opening and closing that, at the same time, isolates them and makes them penetrable. One does not generally access a heterotopian location purely by the force of one’s will alone, access is rather accompanied by a form of submission or by a variety of a rite of purification (Foucault 1997). One enters the heterotopia only on the basis of a series of completed gestures, which typically appear to become ritualized.

The last major characterization Foucault (1997) supplies us with is to suggest that there are two fundamental forms of the heterotopia: one of crisis, and one of deviance. The later are those places occupied by individuals who exhibit behavior which deviates from current or average standards of a society: the asylums,

psychiatric clinics, prisons, rest homes, schools for delinquents, old people's homes, etc. (Foucault 1997). The heterotopia of crisis is generally recognized as that privileged or forbidden place reserved for the individual or society in a state of upheaval, difficulty or breakdown with reference to the greater environment in which s/he or they live. We have already noted that heterotopias are *differential spaces*; the fact that they are typically sites of crisis and deviance only strengthens this differential quality. Indeed, it is from this difference, their very 'otherness' that stems their ability to offer critical perspective on other places. Similarly, the heterotopia is "a place that lies outside all places and yet is localizable" (Foucault 1997, 352). One surmises from this that the heterotopia is a place able to transcend its basic social function and to thereby subversively mirror the typical kinds of social intercourse of a society.

As both places of 'otherness' and highly specified social function, it would seem that the heterotopia should be able to demonstrate a certain amount of friction between its *normative* and *extraordinary* identities. This would seem to be exactly the condition underlying its ability to represent a point of slippage, or destabilization, for current socio-political or discursive orders of power. It is this factor of the heterotopia that would seem to make *realizable* the prospects of meaningful forms of resistance and political action. Hence, in Lees's (1997) terms, the heterotopia is a spatially discontinuous ground that opens a critical space that provides a real site of practical resistance. More directly yet, Genocchio (1995, 36) speaks of heterotopias as "socially-constructed counter-sites embodying...form[s] of 'resistance'".

In this way one may start to see how the heterotopia stands as Foucault's (1997) theoretical conversion of the idealized notion of *the utopia* into pragmatic, 'real-world' terms. For him (1997), both utopias and heterotopias "have the curious property of being in relation with all the other sites... in such a way as to suspect, neutralize, or invert the set of relations they happen to designate, mirror, or reflect" (Foucault 1997, 352). However, whereas utopias are ideal sites with no real place, and remain fundamentally *unreal*, heterotopias are "real sites" of "effectively enacted utopias" (Foucault, 1997, 24). Heterotopias are the potentially transformative spaces of society from which meaningful forms of resistance can be mounted. These are the places capable of a certain kind of social commentary that may be *written into* the arrangements and relations of space. Following on this, Lees's (1997) claims that the practiced politics of the heterotopia would not be merely *analogies* or *figurative comparisons* of resistance, as in the case of the imagined space of the utopia, but would instead constitute *real-world interventions* within the political fabric of society, *acted upon* rather than simply *spoken* forms of criticism *commensurate with the realized and actual field of political action and power*.

For Foucault (1997), there can be little doubt then that the heterotopia certainly has the capacity to fracture and fragment the political inscriptions and or meaning of certain specific places. However, importantly, this 'recycling' of the meaning and functioning of other spaces need not be used solely towards laudable or progressive political goals. Indeed, this means of forming space, of perfecting disordered; arranging ill-conceived and ordering chaotic spaces makes for an apt description of colonizing activity. With this sobering warning Foucault (1997)

reminds us that we should have suspected all along, that although the heterotopia may be a vehicle of progressive political aims and agendas, it is just as easily a site and means of reactionary, or ideologically-questionable political activity.

Security park as heterotopia.

Given that the heterotopia arises around points of crises (particularly those of living space), the security park qualifies as heterotopic, at least in that upper-class South Africa perceives the current crime problem as of attaining crisis-proportions. The characteristic of the heterotopia, as 'a spatial answer to a problem' is, seemingly, exactly what provides the security park with a pragmatic rationale for its extreme and elaborate control of space. The security park also qualifies as heterotopic by virtue of its precise and well-defined function within society, typically linking it to presiding structures of power; i.e. the security park, as a place of formidably secured community domicile, certainly serves a necessary function. This obvious function is compounded of course by the way in which the security park serves a well-defined socio-political function, in particular, that of housing a homogenous class demographic in a residential complex where that demographic maintains a large degree of self-governance and autonomy. Similarly, this is a social grouping growing increasingly (if not discretely) non-participatory in schemes of national unity, reconstruction and reconciliation. In this connection, the spatial autonomy of the security park goes a long way to removing this elite grouping from a sense of equitable political responsibility.

If it is the case that the heterotopia allows one to mount general commentary on the discourse and practices of those within its cultural domicile, and that in many

ways its functioning is a marker of broader networks of power, then the security park again qualifies as heterotopic. In many ways the privatization of this security park domain, and the prerogatives it accordingly cedes to its inhabitants (to exclude undesirables, to protect oneself with force, to choose a removed geographical location) suggests the extent to which the upper-class has decided that national (or macro) politics is no longer the route of choice through which to pursue its own interests. Indeed, as Foucault indicates (1997), the functioning of the heterotopia may well be indicative of more wide sweeping changes across a social sphere. In this connection the security park seems to serve as a model to how the elite plans to engage with (their) political concerns from now on.

Foucault's criterion of 'juxtaposed incompatibilities', furthermore, draws attention to the ways in which the security park is a paradoxical balancing of lethal with safe spaces, communal with private, accessible with impenetrable. The security park makes these contradictions somehow reasonable, and hence the pairing off of the technological and the rustic, the militarized and the luxuriant, the idyllic and the anxious, appears immanently and pragmatically rational. It is seemingly here alone that threats of protective violence subsist in such intimate proximity with promises of escapist fantasy, where spaces of status and affluence are so intricately tied to those of fear and fortified seclusion.

More difficult perhaps is to qualify the security park with reference to the prospective heterochroneity those Foucault (1997) views as intrinsic to the heterotopia. Given the extent of its broad and ample recreational facilities, one does get the sense of security park time as markedly leisurely in nature. This

variety of time is sharply contrasted by the stringent regulation and ritualization of time controlled by the documentation and technology of the security park's security measures (here again then a 'juxtaposed incompatibility'). That is the accurate recording of times of arrival and departures collected and analyzed so as to assuage concerns of predictability, security and order. This surveillance and control is accompanied by the unrelenting chronicity of an unceasing vigilance - 24-hour security. In this sense the time, like the space of the security park, is rigorously patrolled and controlled - 'domesticated' such that the control of the environment may be ever more permeated by power, ever more under the thumb of the holders of privilege.

The idea that the heterotopia maintains a strict or ritualized system of opening and closing is so obviously manifest in the security park that it barely warrants mentioning. Its vigilant prohibition of general public access and its variety of boundaries, barriers and gateways disallowing thoroughfare have already been established. Indeed, its rituals and gestures of admission are so well defined as to be automatic on the part of most visitors. It is interesting to note here, in line with Foucault's (1997) warning that one should pay special attention to the details and concealings of heterotopic systems of inclusion, that security parks often also feature *internal* divisions of space. These point to no absolute class uniformity within such spaces, and that they themselves are fragmented with multiple divisions and levels. The imperative of privacy extends itself to individual homes and dwelling spaces with the barring of access of unwelcome neighbors. Shy of automatically assuming a 'communality of community' with security parks, one would do better to assume that the regulation of their systems of admission and

inadmission revolve, more than anything else, around individualized rights of seclusion, privacy and protection.

In relation to Foucault's (1997) suggestion that the heterotopia finds its function in reference to alternate spatialities, it is important to note that the heterotopia makes overt the problematics and vulnerabilities of 'other' external and surrounding spaces. In this respect the differential space of the security park makes one pressingly aware of the treacherous and crime-ridden urban spaces of greater Johannesburg, whilst nonetheless presenting its own sanitized relations of 'acriminability' and safety as a preferable, 'more natural' living environment. The spatiality of the heterotopia, in short, is most certainly a counter-site, a zone of resistance against the inefficacy of governmental measures, which have failed to properly protect certain sectors of South African society from crime.

In effect, security parks operate a micro 'governmentality' of space. In this respect the security park appears, very overtly, to be a 'potentially transformative space of society', albeit a politically conservative one. In a heterotopic manner, the security park performs the job of inverting social relations manifest in external societal contexts; reflecting them in a fundamentally re-inflected manner.

The security park may certainly be read as utopian in the sense that it is the realized compromise-formation of utopian ideals. In fact, in many ways, the heterotopia is the closest permissible version of a homogenous and sequestered mini-society. One should be wary however of pushing such comparisons too far; security parks do not always exhibit as homogenous cultural and demographic

make-ups as one might imagine, furthermore, they seem to bring together far less explicit political objectives and agendas.

In this respect it becomes clear that the security park is a particularly reactionary variation of the heterotopia, that is if by 'heterotopia' one is assuming some kind of progressive politics of space. In many ways, the security park is an embodiment of exactly the kinds of spatially infested power, of exactly the increasingly surveyed, segregated and simulated socio-spatial order that Foucault (1997), and more progressive heterotopic spaces take as their object of criticism.

Conclusion: from power to power.

In a brief, precursory and experimental manner, this improvisation around the theoretical notion of the heterotopia has enabled the researchers to draw out a series of hypothetical qualities of the security park as a powerful form of space. Via the notion of the heterotopia, as utilized in the initial speculations above, one has the promising beginning points of a means to think space-as-power, and power-as-space. Similarly, one has in the heterotopia a basic theoretical construct with which to begin to consider how, on one hand, *place* informs political practice and discourse, and, on the other, how political regimes come to so invest certain specified places.

This paper has furthermore broached Soja's notion of spatiality, in the guise of space-as-discourse, and it is interesting to speculate what methodological models might stem from this basis - a form of spatial discourse analysis, or, perhaps, a critical discursive geopolitics. Certainly the research to follow from this paper

would do well to extend this notion of spatiality beyond the frame of a general 'holding category' for theoretical experimentation, and to explore the epistemological limits and possibilities of this understanding in various multi-disciplinary contexts. Ultimately this paper has been something of an 'experiment in theoretics', a sketching of a series of hypotheses about the workings of space and power in the South African security park. The paper is admittedly schematic, selective and less than definitive in its analysis; however, its researchers would argue that it is no less critically useful because of these drawbacks, particularly in view of the fact that it may be able to open new vistas for research with reference to further South African heterotopias.

In closing it seems a useful exercise to return, by way of contrast, to the Strydom Square illustration that opened this paper and to plot schematic divergences between the security park and the 'political regime of space' operated by Strydom Square. In fact, these two spatialities are both more similar and dissimilar than we may at first have thought. Indeed, their architectural elements are alike in material; both share heavy stone, concrete and granite exteriors which suggests their unmoving, unchanging permanence. Similarly, both, in their own ways, are monumental and intimidating.

The security park however, unlike Strydom Square, does not adopt a personalized face of power, but rather enforces *anonymous* and depersonalized threats of protective violence. Eschewing the embodiment of a powerful persona or figurehead of power who, unless guarded, can only warn of the consequences of opposition in abstract, the security park disengages itself from political rhetoric

and cultural valorization, and exudes the threat of immanent reprisal. In some ways the potential immediacy of the security park's reprisal to threat, its direct recourse to weaponry and guards, makes its spatiality *more* intimidating than that of Strydom Square.

By the same token, the security park is both less and more ostentatious than the Square in its show of power. Although one cannot walk into its space to be 'stared down upon', to be properly informed of the magnitude of the power in whose gaze you exist, the security park never leaves any doubt as to the ability of its ability to repel intruders. The security park avoids where possible external visibility, and attempts to keep potential opponents out altogether; an external modesty is in its best interests, for it most certainly does not want to entice for criminals. Its ostentation is turned inward, so that the wealth it contains is on view to insiders, to its inhabitants.

With respect to their abilities to foster identity, the security park is less entwined with cultural heritage, values and history than Strydom Square in a way that denies it the prospect of unique identity. In fact, one might contend that specified individuality is lost in the faceless community zones of the security park. The protective violences operated by the security park are likewise anonymous, carried out by depersonalized guards with no personal investment in their professional actions. In this sense, the power of security park spatiality, unlike that of Strydom Square, is power without a face, and without identifying cultural emblems. It is also a power, relatively speaking, with no clear lines of accountability.

The security park hence operates a spatial regime of power that relies to a far less extent on the formation of identity as a necessary and correlative condition of possibility for its functioning. (Here the violence of Barend Strydom's acts, performed out of a professed personalized identification with the ideals of his namesake, makes for a strong point of contrast). Although depersonalized in this way, and devoid of overt political doctrine, these measures of power within the security park engender a far greater individualization *of the personal responsibility for the implementation of power*. One has to take care of one's self in this sense, imperative of responsive, pro-active personal action, is what is called for if one wishes to maintain one's level of privilege in society. (This facet of the argument would suggest that Barend Strydom's acts, rather than being characteristic of this type of spatiality (and this type of power) were in fact something of an aberration).

This conversion of highly visible, oppressive and violent forms of power into liberal forms of politics reliant on discourses of rights and entitlement and predicated upon only anonymous and depersonalized forms of violence, fits perfectly into Foucault's (1979) conceptualization of modern power. Such a change in form without a corresponding change of effect (except of course for an increased efficacy) is the characterizing feature of how power adapts to a modern setting where it needs to continually absolve and rationalize itself, whilst nonetheless growing in proficiency. This understanding of a modern and adaptive power which assumes acceptable and liberal forms of implementation, which divorces its stakeholders from accountability, and which does not require the ideological basis of a valorized cultural heritage, is a perfect caricature of the functioning of neo-liberal power within the security park.

In this connection, perhaps the greatest use of Foucault's notion of the heterotopia here is that it has focussed our attentions on a small differential site of *spatial* politics (i.e. the security park) which in many ways is indicative of both greater logics of space and greater forms of power currently practiced within South Africa.

References.

Bremner, Lindsay. 1999. "Crime and the emerging landscape of post-apartheid. In *blanc_architecture, apartheid and after*, edited by Hilton Judin & Ivan Vladislavic. Rotterdam: Nai Publishers.

"Buyers can design their own homes".

<http://bday.co.za/specials/collage/z5.htm>.

Chaney, D. (1994). *The cultural turn*. Hong Kong: Routledge.

Diphane, Pule (1999). *Strydom Square*. Films2People Production for e.tv. Midi TV & Primedia Productions.

Foucault, Michel (1979). *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*. London: Penguin.

Foucault, Michel (1981). "The order of discourse". In *Untying the text: a post-structural anthropology*, edited by Robert Young. Boston: Routledge.

Foucault, Michel (1997). Utopias and heterotopias. In *Rethinking architecture: a reader in cultural theory*, edited by Neil Leach. London: Routledge.

Genocchi, Benjamin (1995). Discourse, discontinuity, difference: the question of 'other' spaces. In *Postmodern cities and spaces*, edited by Sofie Watson & Katherine Gibson. Oxford: Blackwell.

Graves, F.E. & Viglieno, E. (1992). History for today. Cape Town: Juta & Co.

Harvey, David. 1995. *The condition of postmodernity*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Kruger, Tinus, Meyer, Tiaan, Napier, Mark, Pascolo, Elena, Qhobela, Mabela, ~~Shaw~~, Mark, Louw, Antoinette, Oppler, Sarah & Niyabo, Luzuko. 1997. "Safer by design: towards effective crime prevention through environmental design in South Africa". *ISS Monograph Series*, no. 16. ISS: Halfway House.

Lees, Loretta. (1997). "Ageographia, heterotopia and Vancouver's new public library". *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 15: 321-347.

Ndebele, Njabulo (1999). Game lodgers and leisure colonialists. In *blanc_architecture, apartheid and after*, edited by Hilton Judin & Ivan Vladislavic. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers.

Parker, Ian. 1992. *Discourse dynamics*. New York: Routledge.

Soja, Edward. 1995. *Postmodern geographies the reassertion of space in critical social theory*. London: Verso.

Sorkin, M. (1992a). Introduction. In M. Sorkin, (Ed.). Variations on a theme park: the new American city and the end of public space. New York: Hill and Wang.

Stamper, Noel. 1999. "At the forefront". *Golf Course Living, the South African launch issue*.

Truth Commission. 1997. "Wit Wolwe leader seeks amnesty". *Mail and Guardian*, 14 March.