*SDÜ Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*
*Ağustos 2015, Sayı: 35, ss.175-196*

*SDU Faculty of Arts and Sciences Journal of Social Sciences*
*August 2015, No: 35, pp..175-196*

# Subjectivity and Spaces of Interaction*

**Şule OKUROĞLU ÖZÜN****

ABSTRACT

Political, national, and cultural subjectivities are constructed through experiencing, living in, and trading in time and space; therefore, time and space are the most important ingredients in the formation of the self as well as in the evocation of diasporas as spaces of interaction. Although originally the term diaspora was used to define the Hellenic and Jewish communities living in exile, over the years, with its implications and applications, the employment of the word has been stretched to voluntary or forced migration, or to people dislocated from their homeland for reasons of slavery, genocide, political conflicts, exile or education. Diaspora is now a controversial term, including here and there, now and then, deterritorialization from and reterritorialization into a space; thus, it is difficult to define the term only through its classical association with a forced displacement in relation to nostalgic exile from the native homeland, a pride of a place and a longing for the past. Diaspora, like Foucault's heterotopia, refers to a liminal space between difference and sameness, an ambiguous break which enables new possibilities. In this space, foreignness, rather than being an inscrutable otherness and rather than approaching from a distance, can breathe a new dialogic life into the Enlightenment concepts like superiority of time over space and being over becoming. Instead of regarding space merely as conventional, passive, geographical or physical forms of place, or as a dead backdrop, in this article it is treated as a heterotopia which encapsulates not only physical location but also abstract conceptual space offering multiplicity and fluidity and time is considered to be non linear but heterotemporal. By focusing on Foucault's heterotopia, self and power technologies, this article, instead of concentrating on a traditional homeland-centred definition of diasporic identity, aims at discussing diasporic subjectivity as dynamic, deconstructed and reconstructed negotiations.

Key Words: Foucault, Subjectivity, heterotopia, technologies of power, technologies of the self

**Özneleşme ve Etkileşim Uzamları**

ÖZET

Politik, ulusal ve kültürel özneleşme süreci zaman ve uzam içerisinde yaşama, yer alma, ve uzamlar arası ilişki kurma yoluyla devam eder; bu sebeple zaman ve uzam hem "kimlik" hem de uzamlar arası etkileşim alanları olan "diaspora" (kopuntu) tanımlarının yapılmasında temel rol oynayan iki kavramdır. Diaspora kelimesi kökeninde sürgün hayatı yaşayan Yunan ve Yahudi toplulukları için kullanılmışsa da, seneler içerisinde anlamı ve kullanımı bakımından gönüllü veya zorunlu göçü ya da kölelik, soykırım, politik anlaşmazlıklar, sürgün veya eğitim gibi nedenlerle vatanından ayrılan insanları kapsayacak şekilde genişlemiştir. Diaspora burası ve orası, şimdi ve sonrası, yerinden olma ve tekrar yer edinme kavramlarını içerdiğinden kesin tanımı olmayan, aksine üzerinde tartışılan bir terimdir; bu yüzden diaspora kelimesini artık zorunlu göç ve vatan hasreti, terk edilen yerin üstünlüğü, zorunlu göçle gelen geçmişe duyulan

---

* *This article is based on the unpublished dissertation "Rethinking Diaspora as Heterotopia in Works of Anita Desai, Kamala Markandaya and..... Meera Syal" submitted by the author to Middle East Technical University.*

** *Assist.Prof., Süleyman Demirel University, Department of Western Languages and Literatures,suleozun@sdu.edu.tr*

özlem gibi terimin klasik atıfları ile tanımlamak imkansızdır. Diaspora, tıpkı Foucault'un heteretopyası gibi, üyeleri için farklılık ve aynılık arasındaki yeni olanakları mümkün kılan muğlâk bir uzam yaratır. Bu alanda yabancılık; anlaşılmaz bir ötekilik olmaktan veya bir mesafeden yaklaşmaktan ziyade, zamanın uzam, varoluşun ise oluş üzerindeki üstünlüğü gibi Aydınlanma düşüncelerine yeni bir diyalojik boyut kazandırabilir. Uzam yalnızca geleneksel, pasif, coğrafi veya fiziki mekân formları veya cansız bir arka plan olarak görülmekten ziyade, bu makalede, Foucault'nun heterotopyasında olduğu gibi, bir üretim alanı olarak, fiziksel mekânla birlikte çoğulluk ve akışkanlık sunan soyut, kavramsal mekânları da kapsayan alanlar olarak ele alınmıştır. Bununla birlikte, zaman doğrusal değil, çok zamanlı olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Bu çalışmanın temel savı; Foucault'un herteretopyasını, benlik ve güç teknolojilerini temel alarak diaspora kimliğini geleneksel anayurt temelli tanımı dışında dinamik, yapı bozumuna uğramış ve tekrar yapılandırılmış olarak ele alarak tartışmak üzerinedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler, Foucault, Özneleşme, heterotopya, güç teknolojileri, benlik teknolojileri

## Introduction

Time and space are two significant categories that have occupied the minds of scholars from different disciplines from the later decades of the 19th century onwards. Since theories of modernist view considered man as a historical being and societies as collections of historical events, social, psychological and cultural perspectives and their relation to different dimensions of space were disregarded for the sake of studying the superiority of time over space[1]. In most of such studies any type of change was associated with time not with space, owing to the fact that the mythic spaces such as colonized ones and their boundaries were regarded as dead and unquestionable. In the second half of the twentieth century, with the emergence of diaspora and post-Cartesian space theories, studies focusing on spatiality enabled a better understanding of subjectivity offering alternative approaches to power relations, new spaces for struggle and the spatial myth of colonial order. As Foucault explains:

> *The great obsession of the nineteenth century was history: with its themes of development and of suspension, of crisis, and cycle, themes of the ever-accumulating past…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.*[2]

Foucault with these words starts his spatial discussion in "Of Other Spaces" and he lays emphasis on the past obsession with time and the contemporary spatial turn which raises more questions in current debates about simultaneity, time and space. For Foucault, a spatial outlook is necessary since "a whole history remains to be written of spaces – which would at the same time be the history of powers"[3].

---

[1]Not surprisingly such theories were framed during the "height of empire and spatial violence" (Upstone 4). As a result of several hundred years of extreme violence, especially according to theories examining colonial power, colonialism was considered as "a claiming of territory in the name of religious evangelism, economic development" and "the appropriation of space for empire – often via correlative appropriation of the hearts and minds of indigenous population"; colonial accomplishment was evaluated "in terms of the magnitude of space acquired" (Upstone 4).

[2] Foucault, "Of Other Spaces,", p.22.

[3] Foucault, ibid. p.22.

With the coinage of the term chronotope, a new space-time contextualization was first introduced by Mikhail Bakhtin in 1940. In his metaphor of chronotopes – *chronos* (time) and *topos* (space) – dwelling upon the equal importance of time and space, Bakhtin emphasized that time and space are interwoven[4]. In his analyses of different chronotopes Bakhtin treated self as a "becoming" which fuses different time and space constructions:

> *[Self] reflects the historical emergence of the world itself. He is no longer within an epoch, but on the border between two epochs, at the transition point from one to the other. This transition is accomplished in him and through him....What is happening here is precisely the emergence of a new man. The organizing force held by the future is therefore extremely great here – and this is not, of course, the private biographical future, but the historical future. It is as though the very foundations of the world are changing, and man must change along with them.... The image of the emerging man begins to surmount its private nature…and enter into a completely new, spatial sphere of historical existence.*[5]

Besides Bakhtin two other important names Henri Lefebvre (1991, 2003), and Michel Foucault (1972, 1977, 1982, 1986, 1988) worked on these concepts in a number of innovative ways, exploring the spatio-temporal matrix from postmodern perspectives and with different epistemological and ideological agenda.

As explained by these post-spatial theorists and scholars, "space is a practiced place[6]"[7] and existence presents "a new image of a person with an organic sense of creativity" embedded in "the inner linkages with temporality and locality and in the interplay between individual and social changes".[8] Diasporas are the best examples for the study of space and time relation and how relational spaces give way to new self positions. Diasporic experience like Foucault's heterotopia refers to a special kind of heterogeneous space within which a wide range of heterotemporal emplacements can be defined.

---

[4]Bakhtin uses this spatio-temporal view in aesthetic practices; however, his critical reflections on the subject have inspired many scholars from diverse fields of specialization such as psychology, philology, biology, physiology and cultural anthropology. The chronotope is clarified by Bakhtin as "the substantial interconnection of time and space relationships which literature artistically appropriated" (231). Chronotopes function in literature to capture and reveal to readers particular historical and biographical features of language. Bakhtin relates the term to specific generic types that accordingly correspond to specific historical time periods and cultural knowledge.

Chronotope is the term Bakhtin envisioned to describe the spatio-temporal matrix functioning as the infrastructure of all human activities and also being dialogic in nature, chronotopes provide the necessary frameworks and means for understanding all human experience (Bakhtin 231). In the chronotope "the blending of features of time and space takes place in a single whole, endowed with sense of concreteness. Time here is solid and compact [and] becomes artistically visible; space is intensified and enters into the movement of time…Time features are manifest in space, to which time gives sense and measure. This intertwining of planes and blending of features characterize the…chronotope" (Bakhtin 231-2).

[5] Mikhail Mikhailovitch Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, (Texas: U of Texas P, 1986), p.23-4.

[6]Place for Lefebvre embodies the idea of a designated place for everything and "implies an indication of stability." A space on the contrary is more dynamic, as there are many ways of practicing space. It takes into account, time, movement, flows and going back to a linguistic analogy.

[7] DeCerteau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), p.117.

[8]Hongyu Wang, "The Chronotopes of Encounter and Emergence," *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, vol.25, 2009, p.2.

Although originally the term heterotopia derives from the Greek words *hetero* (another) and *topos* (place) referring to a Greek medical expression of the "other spaces" used for the "parts of the body that are either out of place, missing, extra", in short for displacement or place of otherness[9], Foucault uses the term heterotopia for real or unreal spatial counter-sites that are other, relational, contested and liminal. Foucault claims that utopias are spaces without real place. They are sites that have a "general relation of direct or inverted analogy with the real space of society" and such emplacements "present society itself in a perfected form, or else society turned upside down, but in any case [these sites are] 'fundamentally unreal'". Heterotopias, on the other hand, are emplacements "that have the curious property of being in a relation with all the other sites, but in such a way as to suspect, neutralize, or invert the set of relations that they happen to designate, mirror, or reflect" [10]. According to Foucault, sites of Otherness are spaces whose existence set up unsettling juxtapositions of incommensurate objects which challenge the way we think, especially the way our thinking is ordered. Heterotopias disturb and dissolve our myths and at the same time have the capacity to challenge fixed and predetermined orders. Hence

> *rather than narrativizing the ways of being human, we need to spatialize being. Such a spatialization would render being intelligible in terms of the localization of repertoires of habits, routines and images of self-understanding and self-cultivation within specific domains of thought, action and value – libraries and studies, bedrooms and bathhouses, markets and department stores, living rooms and coffee houses.*[11]

A spatio-temporal manifestation provides various vantage points that question inequalities, signifying practices and hegemonic discourses at home and in the diaspora; furthermore, it puts forward modes of resistance to colonial, neo-colonial, Westernized and homogenizing representations. Thus, the main argument in this study is framed around the idea that diasporas, as spaces of interaction between Foucauldian power technologies and self technologies, create new heterotopias where subjectification is based on relational heterotemporal standpoints, rather than one which is dominant.

**Subjectivity, Power and Self Technologies in Foucault**

Subjectivity is individuals' own experience of life, shaped by power, knowledge, social structures, history and by the interaction of individuals as well as the culture in which they live and with the others sharing the same cultural space. In his genealogical outlook[12], Foucault criticizes the conception of identity which is a fixed essence attributed to a thinking and feeling rationalized subject[13]. Foucault in his analysis of

---

[9]Hetherington, *The Badlands of Modernity: Heterotopia and Social Ordering*, (London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Press, 1997), p.42.

[10]Foucault, "Of Other Spaces", p.24

[11]Nikolas Rose, "Authority and the Genealogy of Subjectivity," *Detraditionalization: Critical Reflections on Authority and Identity, Oxford Spatialities of Globalisation Ash Amin Environment and Planning A*, vol.34, 2002, p.304.

[12]Foucault's genealogy seeks to reestablish the various systems of subjection: not the anticipatory power of meaning, but the hazardous play of dominations (Rabinow 83).

[13]In *The Order of Things* Foucault uses the word man as "subject" which is harmonious fusion of subject and object.

the genealogical layers of subjectification, including Greco Roman Antiquity, early Christianity, the fourth and fifth centuries of the late Roman Empire and the modern period, historicizes the questions of identity as effects of power and knowledge. As a consequence, in his *Madness and Civilization*, *Birth of the Clinic, Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of the Prison*, and *History of Sexuality*, Foucault discusses how disciplinary mechanisms and power operate on the process of individuals' subjectification[14]. Foucault explores how in Western societies the particular "truth games" played in the social sciences such as medicine, sociology, economics, biology, and psychiatry have cultivated knowledge and techniques to enable people to understand themselves.[15] He especially opposes the Kantian subject, who is centred, homogenized, unitary and consistent evolving through universal principles. The decentred subject of Foucault, not being a signifier of a stable signified, produces subject positions or, put differently, modes of identity through "technologies of the self", "technologies of power" and "governmentality".

While discussing the notion of subjectification, Foucault firstly focuses on Antiquity, the "periods when the effect of scientific knowledges and the complexity of normative systems were less".[16] Foucault compares Antiquity with the present epoch, underlining that the era in which we live is an age of governmentality, in which subjectivity refers to a complex experience calling for an active partaking, engagement and construction. Thus, it can be asserted that Foucault's notion of subjectivity is highly a spatio-temporal one. For Foucault, the history of power and its wielding mechanisms should be studied in a more broad contextualization "[s]tarting from its infinitesimal mechanisms, which each have their own history, their own trajectory, their own techniques and tactics, and then see[ing] how these mechanisms of power have been – and continue to be – invested, colonised, utilised, involuted, transformed, displaced, extended".[17] Power structures constitute particular spaces, and spaces produce certain sets of power relations. Then space, rather than being a stable tabula rasa, has the capacity to produce power structures and it is also being produced through the relations of power-knowledge. Practices of power in specific spaces are active in the fabrication of particular subjectivities, so Foucault's vision of how the subject emerges is highly spatialised. As claimed by Hall "[w]e all write and speak from a particular place and time, from a history and a culture which is specific. What we say is always 'in context', positioned".[18] Subjectification is thus a performative act in relation to particular discourses and social practices implemented in specific places and times.

---

[14] Michel Foucault employs "technologies", as a well-built system of techniques employed on the body so as to transform it into something else than before. Foucault introduces four inter-related 'technologies': technologies of production, technologies of sign systems, technologies of power (or domination) and technologies of the self. However, in this study two types will be taken into consideration while discussing subjectivity.

[15]Foucault, *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault* (Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988).

[16]Foucault, "Space, Knowledge, and Power". *Power: The Essential Works 3*. Ed. J. Faubion. (New York: Penguin, 2000), p. 204.

[17]Foucault., ibid., p.99.

[18]Foucault, *History of Sexuality Volume I: An Introduction*, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1990), p.222.

In his historical analysis Foucault claims that modern understandings of governmentality are different from those of the past which were based on the implementation of an ultimate sovereign power. Technologies of power and technologies of the self are explained through the concept of governmentality as a product of Foucault's attempt at "a history of the organization of knowledge with respect to both domination and the self".[19] Governmentality, through setting truths and acceptable norms, makes a kind of link between the technologies of the self and the technologies of power. Foucault's governmentality refers to "the whole range of practices that constitute, define, organize, and instrumentalize the strategies that individuals in their freedom can use in dealing with each other".[20] Governmentality determines the manuals for acceptable norms and practices; in Foucault's own words, the normalization mechanisms of governmentality are "concerned with subjugating individuals in the very reality of a social practice by mechanisms of power that appeal to a truth".[21]

Modern power mechanisms operate through institutions, laws, and procedures which are rationalized in time in order to normalize collective existence. Modern governmentality, through a multiple range of institutional activities, monitors and verifies the conformity of individuals. This governmental processing brings an utterly new level to the constitution of the subject and to how the self is formed in connection with the authoritative discourses that define normal and pathological, "as well as trying to drive us back towards a norm; to make our sense of self align with a rational model in a process of normalization".[22] To illustrate, the normalization process includes the ways in which expert systems constitute sexuality, marginality and the objectification of the Other.

Societies, cultures, or practices cannot be thought of existing without power since the standards, which are presented as essentials for the order, are determined through power strategies. Therefore, a subject can come into being only as a construct of a regime of power/knowledge. Governmentality sets the "fictional" standards as realities for the "normal" by means of the "technologies of power". The relationship between power and subjectivity shows how power technologies upon subjects making them the objects of power systems. The Panopticon is a good illustration of political subjugation and how a subject turns into the object of a certain knowledge/discourse. While dealing with a multiplicity of individuals with the intention of imposing a task or a desired form of behaviour the panoptic schema may be put into practice.[23] This knowledge is not "simply accumulated"; instead, "it is used to refine structures of power so as to optimize controls and adjust the handling of" subjects.[24] The different modes of objectivation of the subject appear through several practices which are correspondingly important in analysing the technologies of power and governmentality:

---

[19]Foucault, *Technologies of the Self*, p. 18.
[20]Paddy Dolan, "Space, Time and the Constitution of Subjectivity: Comparing Elias and Foucault," *Foucault Studies*, vol.8, 2010, p.9.
[21]Dolan, ibid., p.16.
[22]Simon Clarke, "Culture and Identity," *Handbook of Cultural Analysis*, (London: Sage, 2008), p.514.
[23]Foucault, *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of the Prison*, (New York: Vintage, 1977), p.205.
[24]Foucault, ibid., p.138.

> *It is a matter not of examining "power" with regard to its origin, its principles, or its legitimate limits, but of studying the methods and techniques used in different institutional contexts to act upon the behaviour of individuals taken separately or in a group, so as to shape, direct, modify their way of conducting themselves, to impose ends on their inaction or fit it into overall strategies, these being multiple consequently, in their form and their place of exercise; diverse, too, in the procedures and techniques they bring into play. These power relations characterize the manner in which men are "governed" by one another, and ... the mad, the sick, the delinquent subject is objectified.*[25]

For Foucault neither "power" nor "discipline" is negative since there is no power without resistance. Operating power relations open spaces for "self-positioning" which, in Foucauldian terms, are "technologies of the self". Technologies of the self are the means and methods that individuals use to define what constitutes oneself and how individuals think about themselves. For this reason, power is not a negative and totalizing term in Foucauldian terminology; instead, it "exerts a positive influence on life, endeavours to administer, optimize, and multiply it"[26]. Then, dominant practices determine critical spaces for individuals to question their relation to this possible knowledge.

Technologies of the self refer to "the formation of procedures by which the subject is led to observe himself, analyse himself, interpret himself, recognize himself as a domain of possible knowledge". While technologies of power, "determine the conduct of individuals and submit them to certain ends or domination, an objectification of the subject", technologies of the self "permit individuals to effect by their own means or with the help of others a certain number of operations on their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct, and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection, or immortality"[27]. Therefore, subjects are active agents who are self-determining and who can challenge and change the strategies of domination in modern societies.

To sum up, power technologies, while positioning individuals within social, political and cultural systems, also craft a field of experience; in other words, they also create counter-hegemonic sites for subjects. A subject is "[b]ound to seek recognition of its own existence in categories, terms, and names that are not of its own making, the subject seeks the sign of its own existence outside itself, in a discourse that is at once dominant and indifferent".[28] In a Foucauldian sense the subject is both the producer and the product of discourse and power. A subject is a support on which discourse is erected but that it is, at the same time, dominated and controlled by the same discourse: it is both an active agent and an object acted upon. Foucault's subject is neither a passive receiver nor a dupe one but, instead, it is someone "capable of

[25]Foucault, *Aesthetics, Method and Epistemology*, (New York: The New Press, 1998), p.463.
[26]Foucault, *History of Sexuality Volume I: An Introduction.* Trans. Robert Hurley. (New York: Pantheon Books, 1990), p.137
[27]Foucault, ibid, p.3.
[28]Judith Butler, *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection*, (Palo Alto: Stanford UP, 1997), p.20.

knowing, analysing, and ultimately altering reality"[29] . It can be concluded that the self may be constituted as a political subject, sexual subject, mother subject or diasporic subject which is spatially and temporally situated. The self is continually located, dislocated and relocated in different power schemes and discourses. Thus, self-formation is a process which never ends.

**Subjectivity on the Margins**

In the last decades, with the rise of a postcolonial and diasporic questioning of space, territorial roots, cultural difference, cultural contact, border, and identity issues have been re-evaluated and problematized. Essentializing research carried out in the field of post-colonial studies has emphasized the identity formation of immigrants as a linear process in which non-Western European immigrants reconstitute their identities as citizens of the First World. This directs its attention to colonial discourse and Western style of thinking about and studying the Orient and how the colonizer and the colonized evolved within an unequal power relationship. One of the common themes of this approach to immigrant identity studies is to display firm national and ethnic boundaries set by colonial and neo-colonial practices, and to analyse representations of newcomers within the dominant discourse as outsiders or aliens. However, due to increasing global interactions and border crossings, cultural and personal positions of diasporic communities have led to construction of hybrid identities.

Nation, border, home, authenticity and nostalgia are some of the key concepts of diaspora theories and analysing such terms in relation to heterotopic framework, power and self technologies would be an innovative way of studying the diasporic subjectivity. In this respect, the first challenging point of other spaces is that against the utopia of "nation" and its fixed borders heterotopic diasporas "could emerge…as categories of alternative being, living and feeling challenging the dominant one".[30] In social sciences the Enlightenment and the era of high modernity concerns based on colonial encounters accept the space and border relation as the major organizing principle when it comes to explaining nation, community, culture, cultural difference and identity. As can be observed in world maps, the spatial division of the world as a collection of countries presents it as an "inherently fragmented space, divided by different colours into diverse national societies, each rooted in its proper place"; thus, such an alleged natural division is taken for granted, since "each country embodies its own distinctive culture and society [so] that the terms 'society' and 'culture' are routinely simply appended to the names of nation-states".[31] This proposition describes stable national identities and fixed territorial differences within such geographical perimeters; in other words, maps are hegemonic ways of fixing space and the base of governmentality. A human group defined as a nation, "forming a community, sharing a common culture, is attached to a clearly demarcated territory, having a common past and a common project for the future and claiming the right to

[29]Foucault, *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault,* ( Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988). p. 463.

[30] Eleni Sideri, "The Diaspora of the Term Diaspora: A Working-Paper of a Definition," *Cultures in Transit.*, vol.4, 2008, p.40.

[31] Gupta Akhil – James Ferguson, "Beyond Culture: Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference," *Cultural Anthropology*, vol.7, iss.1, 1992, p.6.

rule itself'.[32] Especially centuries of high colonialism, nation-building and territorial differentiation are of greater importance and their effects are not easy to reverse. In such essentializing theories the difference between nations, along with their spatially determined cultures, is founded on unquestioned divisions of space which are considered "natural" and unchanging.

It is believed that an essentializing connection with a bordered culture labelled as "nation", "national homeland" or "native land" is considered the material basis for the identity construction of the people occupying that space, and these individuals feel safe under that spatialized collective identity which builds up a sense of having roots in a defined space attached to an origin and having a developing sense of belonging. Growing up in a cultural space, inhabitants of that space internalize a certain system of governmentality: cultural traits, norms, knowledge and a shared social time characterized by regularities, rituals and repetitions. Thus, nations are viewed as bordered spaces that are believed to provide homogeneous, totalizing cultural and political identities for their dwellers. As boldly claimed by Robert Sack, such territoriality attempts to "affect, influence, or control actions and interactions (of people, things, and relationships) by asserting and attempting to enforce control over a geographic area"[33]. This way of imagining through language, symbols, histories, leitmotifs, customs and values makes a community accept all these created truths as real. Especially, according to colonial and patriarchal theories, any category or group needs borders that may be real, illusory or metaphorical, in order to define and distinguish itself and its difference from the others (these may be body borders, nation borders, or racial and ethnic borders). National borders underline differences making people feel connected to each other, and attached to the space they are sharing, and force them to have stable cultural identities to define their existence and obey the technologies of power that are routines and practices of that particular space. This kind of mapping of cultures via borders creates contact and conflict zones where difference, collective memory, shared identity and collective organization are extolled. Technologies of power by means of national discourses legitimize certain norms and inequalities in such spaces. The authoritative totalizing power governing the nation state dominates the institutions and sets the standards for a so-called homogenizing or assimilating of "normal" standards by the citizens, disregarding diversities. That is, the recognition of the stranger as not belonging and out of place permits the policing and enforcement of various social, political and geographical boundaries about this place and the deciding of who has the right to dwell or belong there.

Due to increasing movements of people across borders any homogenized view of space is a mere utopia. Homi Bhabha discusses that both "the people" and "national identity" are products of a continuous and repetitious discourse and process of signification; and he defines nation as "liminal", "vacillating", "ambivalent" and "metaphorical".[34] In the face of high geographic mobility, according to Benedict Anderson, nation "is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will

[32] Montserrat Guibernau, *Nationalisms: The Nation-State and Nationalism in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996), p.47.
[33] Robert Sack, "Territorial Bases of Power", *Political Studies from Spatial Perspectives* (New York: John Willey Press,1983), p.55.
[34] Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994), p.293.

never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion". In the case of deterritorialized people, a nation is a kind of "imagined political community" constantly invigorated through "imagining"[35]. This leads up to the conclusion that the subjectification of diasporians performatively creates new positions in relation to the diverse conjuring up of nation. As put by Peter Johnson, diaspora experience "not only contrasts to but also disrupts the utopia" of the nation and fixed borders.[36] Clifford raises key questions by asking "what does it mean, at the end of the twentieth century, to speak of… 'a native land'? What processes rather than essences are involved in present experiences of [nation and] cultural identity?".[37] It can be asserted that there is no single static understanding of nation while studying diasporic experiences.

In contrast to the conventional homogenizing view of national space and the production of hegemonic discourses, heterotopic diaspora is relational and at the same time open to the questioning of any kind of borders. Diasporic experience starts with deterritorialization from a nation space and reterritorialization in another space and it includes experience of a plurality of contact zones; thus, both physical and symbolic borders are essential parts of diasporic identities; that is, the transnational movement of diasporic people embodies a number of border crossings starting from dispersion from "home", including a dislocation of identity, and resulting in a settling down elsewhere. Diasporic spaces are hybrid by their nature. For Avtar Brah, diasporic space is where "boundaries of inclusion and exclusion, of belonging and otherness, of 'us' and 'them' are contested" and this space always presumes the idea of border crossing, fusing diverse emplacements and spatio-temporal flows.[38] She defines borders as "arbitrary dividing lines that are simultaneously social, cultural and psychic; territories to be patrolled against those whom they construct as outsiders, aliens, the Others; forms of demarcation where the very act of prohibition inscribes transgression" and spaces in which "claims to ownership" are contested, "defended and fought over".[39] In a sense, the diasporic space exists as a Foucauldian heterotopic mirror since it represents a spaceless space. Moreover, "the diasporic space is a space that is 'everywhere' and yet 'nowhere'".[40]

By juxtaposing and relating many spaces in one site, heterotopic diaspora problematizes received knowledge by undermining the ground which knowledge is built on.[41] This diasporic spatiality includes a wide range of contesting multi-axial

---

[35] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, (London: Verso, 1991), p.63.
[36] Peter Johnson, "Unravelling Foucault's 'Different Spaces'," *History of the Human Sciences*, vol.19, iss.4, 2006, p.87.
[37]James Clifford, *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*, (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1997), p.275.
[38] Avtar Brah, *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities (Gender, Race, Ethnicity)*, (London: Routledge, 1996), p.208.
[39] Brah, ibid., p.194.
[40] Gopalan Ravindran, "Transnational Tamil Cinema as a Foucauldian Heterotopia: Diasporic Narratives, Identities, and Malaysian Indians," *Proceedings of the whither the Orient: Asians in Asian and Non-Asian Cinema Conference*, (Seoul: Asia Culture Forum, 2006), p.428.
[41] Robert J. Topinka, "Foucault, Borges, Heterotopia: Producing Knowledge in Other Spaces," *Foucault Studies*, no.9, 2010, p.54.

locationality and dislocationality in which geographical, social, cultural and political borders are constantly deconstructed and reconstructed; and this heterotopic spatiality is where the idea of border serves as a metaphorical extension for ethnicity, gender, class, age and sexual orientation, that are themselves deformed and reformed. There is no spatially stable source of power technologies and complete domination. In heterotopic diaspora space "the new topography and practices of citizenship, which are multi-connected, multi-referential and post national" are foregrounded.[42] Diasporas as heterotopias are "obviously relative since they presuppose a space and a time with respect to which they are experienced as being not only different but also alien in the sense that other rules apply and form a new conceptual universe to which one has to adapt"[43]. Heterotopias always presuppose a system of opening and closing; therefore, boundaries establish a wide range of rules identifying the openings and closures or access to and inaccessibility of heterotopic spaces, and the relations of vicinity between given points or elements like bodily places in space.[44] This new heterotopic texture challenges the totalitarian territorial thinking that we are accustomed to inhabiting, since "heterotopias as 'a space of alternative ordering…organize a bit of the social world in a different way to that which surrounds them" and "that alternative ordering makes them out as Other and allows them to be seen as an example of an alternative way of doing things".[45]

Flanked by the borders of home and host nations, together with the idea of nationalism, diasporic in-betweenness also questions the idea of citizenship and belonging. Diasporic subjectification, which is an uncompleted process always producing multiple self-positions cannot be discussed only through homeland/nation centred definitions of diaspora. In other words, heterotopic "diaspora space" blurs the authenticity of nation, and problematizes the sense of belonging to a fixed place. As claimed by Benedict Anderson, "nation, nationality, nationalism all have proved notoriously difficult to define, let alone analyse"[46] and according to Anh Hua, the question of belonging to a nation space, and citizenship allowing access to that bordered spatiality, should be re-evaluated since

> *migratory subjects, both women and men, heterosexual and non-heterosexual, perform citizenship as personhood for creative survival. In the process, they rewrite the (symbolic) nation as an exclusionary site or uneven social-human geography, laying claim for more "dissident citizenship" (Sparks, 1997), "nomadic citizenship" (Joseph, 1999), "flexible citizenship" (Ong, 1999), or transnational cultural citizenship.*[47]

---

[42]Yasemin Soysal, "Citizenship and Identity: Living in Diasporas inPostwar Europe?" *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol.23, iss.1, 2000, p.14.

[43]Paul Bouissac, "Space and Time as Cultural Artefacts: Blackpool as Heterotopy and Heterochrony", *Place as Material Culture: Objects, Geographies and the Construction of Time*. Eds. Dragoş Gheorghiu and George Nash, (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013), p. 2.

[44]Machiel Karskens, "Homeland and Heterotopia. The Place of the Stranger in Multiculturalism," *The New Europe at the Crossroads*, (New York: Peter Lang, 1999), p.113.

[45]Kevin Hetherington, *The Badlands of Modernity: Heterotopia and Social Ordering*, (London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Press, 1997), p.viii.

[46] Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, p.3-4.

[47] Anh Hua, "Homing Desire, Cultural Citizenship, and Diasporic Imaginings," *Journal of International Women's Studies*, vol.12, iss.4, 2011, p.54.

Heterotopic diasporas as "spaces of otherness" and "spaces of liminality" craft dialogic sites where subjectivity and citizenship are both hybrid and fluid since heterotopias are "ambivalent places of the other which is at the same time excluded and included" involving various border crossings.[48]

In defining diasporas from the former colonial lands the terms nation, border and the diasporic experience should be discussed within the frame of the interconnectedness of experiences of colonialism and its power technologies. As a result of the spatial extension of powerful nations like Britain, the land colonized falls under the control of the centre which is believed to be the legitimate source of power and authority. Colonization refers not only to physical domination but also to the production of specific forms of knowledge and discourse to justify this colonization process; for instance, San Juan defines this as "the "White Man's Burden of civilizing barbarian natives into free, English-speaking, forever adolescent consumers".[49] Without exploring the colonial exercise of the disciplinary power "as a discourse, one cannot possibly understand the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage – and even produce – the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment era".[50] To illustrate, the colonial past for the South Asian diasporic communities offers mythic localities that rely on an ordered colonial spacing which is imposed as natural, fixed and under absolute control. In this so-called natural and indisputable utilization of space, spatiality is overshadowed by history. The violence of colonialism is more than fixing the colonized people in the inferior "other". In Fanon's words, "colonisation is not satisfied merely with holding a people in its grip and emptying the native's brain of all form and content. By a kind of perverted logic, it turns to the past of oppressed people, and distorts, disfigures and destroys it".[51]

During the normalization process of the colonial expansion the authoritative colonizer creates truths, justifies the spatial expansion and defines particular roles for the colonized people for the sake of governmentality. Being internalized by the indigenous people these truths then turn into stereotypes of colonial discourse. Colonial discourse focuses on the "concept of 'fixity' in the ideological construction of otherness" which is considered as the "sign of cultural/historical/racial difference".[52] The Western desire for homogeneity and stability of identity based upon the Occident and Orient or the civilized West and inferior Other opposition facilitates the silencing of the colonial subjects and this silencing is seen as a kind of violence against these people. The tendency of the Western discourse to constitute a stable identity through appropriating and assimilating the other is part of European ethnocentrism. In this process, colonial homogenization is made possible (and plausible) through stereotypical discourse.[53]

---

[48] Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1991), p.138.
[49] Epifanio Jr. San Juan, "Transforming Identity in Postcolonial Narrative: An Approach to the Novels of Jessica Hagedorn," *Post-Identity*, vol.1, iss.2, 1998, p.6.
[50] Edward Said, *Orientalism*, (New York: Random House, 1978), p.3.
[51] Franz Fanon, *The Wretch of the Earth*, (New York: Grove Press, 2004), p.170.
[52] Bhabha, "The Other Question The Stereotype and Colonial Discourse," *Screen*, vol.24, iss.6, 1983, p.18.
[53] Bhabha, ibid., p.18-9.

Subjectification of formerly colonized diasporians is not a homogenous procedure nor do these people have a stable self as claimed by such binaries. The ways in which diaspora people "were positioned and subjected in the dominant regimes of representation were the effects of a critical exercise of cultural power and normalization"; in short, Western knowledge and regimes "had the power to make [immigrants] see and experience [themselves] as 'Other'".[54] This logocentric claim at the same time yields to a kind of resistance, an "access to the recognition of difference in the symbolic". It is this probability that would liberate the "signifier of skin/culture from the signifieds of racial typology, the analytics of blood, ideologies of racial and cultural dominance or degeneration".[55] In the case of the diasporians from formerly colonized sites, their in-between existence opens a niche for heterotopic questioning of the workings of the Western discourse, its power technologies, as well as the ways of being in relation to master discourse and its normalizing truth claims. This hybridity represents an ambivalent space where the discriminated subject questions the images and presences of authority.[56] It is when these objectified others use the diagnostic methods that have formerly been used to silence them, and when the validity of colonial discourse is revealed as "ambivalent, split between its appearance as original and authoritative and its articulation as repetition and difference"; both the colonizer and the colonized undergo a splitting of their identity positions in Lacanian sense.[57]

Besides nation, border and citizenship issues, the concept of "home" is one of the significant dimensions of the diasporic existence. At the heart of diasporic experience there lies the nostalgic image of a past home left behind recently or generations ago which stands at a distance both temporally and spatially. In a conventional approach the definition of diaspora enunciates an origin of belonging to a "home" space and this initial space is considered as a secure point of reference for the immigrant identity; at the same time a hope for reunion for the immigrants. Classical definitions of diaspora revolve around this homeland orientation, and immigrants' relation to this mythic, unchanging space. The homeland, according to the essentialized definitions of diaspora, is a static space which remains one of the most powerful unifying symbols for mobile and displaced people.[58] Home

> *is implicitly constructed as a purified space of belonging in which the subject is too comfortable to question the limits or borders of her or his experience, indeed, where the subject is so at ease that she or he does not think. Such a construction of home as too familiar, safe and comfortable to allow for critical thought has clear resonance in some postcolonial literature. This narrative of home space draws a line between being at home and being away from home presupposing a secure, comfortable site away from movement.*[59]

---

[54] Hall, "The Spectacle of the 'Other'," *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, (London: Sage, 1997), p.225.
[55] Bhabha, ibid. p.27.
[56] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, p.174.
[57] Bhabha, ibid., p.169.
[58] Akhil, Ferguson, "Beyond Culture: Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference," *Cultural Anthropology*, p.39.
[59]Ahmed Sara, "Home and Away Narratives of Migration and Estrangement," *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, vol.2, iss.3, 1999, p.339.

However, diasporic experience does not dwell upon a simple definition of movement from home to a not-home. As defined by Gilroy, diaspora is "the tension between roots and routes".[60] Diasporians not only belong to a home culture but also belong to a host culture. Today the idea of home is moving away from its static definition especially for those living here but at the same time being related to there. The home space, "the place of origin", is the main heterotopia which fuses real and unreal spaces and times offering alternate orderings for the migrants. As emphasized by Avtar Brah, "[t]he concept of diaspora places the discourse of 'home' and 'dispersion' in creative tension, inscribing a homing desire while simultaneously critiquing discourses of fixed origins".[61]

Feeling frustrated in an alien space, people of diaspora are seen as desiring for a "home", a mythic space in which they feel secure and comfortable just like the Real in a Lacanian sense. This myth is a "desire to return to the fullness of the mother[62], a desire for an unbroken and undifferentiated line of vision and origin".[63] Heterotopias are spaces that are both utopic and real having the potential to challenge other relational spaces in their spatial and temporal implications. Heterotopic diasporas are at the crossroads "of the 'utopian' imagination concerning the distant/lost homelands and the real/settled places"; and they "contest, transform and invert whatever other real spaces that come into the social networking of the diasporic members".[64] In the case of an immigrant, the homeland is a heterotopia far from the local space; it is another space which offers a compensative and critical function underlining on-going interactions in the construction of multiple subject positions. In some sense, "the narrative of leaving home produces too many homes and hence no Home, too many places in which memories attach themselves through the carving out of inhabitable space", and "hence no place in which memory can allow the past to reach the present. Immigrants when they are away from home lose stability; find themselves in a new exterior and interior space".[65] The point of departure and memories of the past home do not stand as factual replicas of a stable past; instead they are closely related to the present spaces and positions of the migratory subjects and how they perceive home in the present space. In most cases, as explained by Foucault, through heterotopias of compensation and illusion, the recreated 'home' is an illusion which is "as perfect, as meticulous"[66], from which harsh realities have been stripped away. This remembering is a dialogue between the new conceptualizations of other spaces, changing parameters and the state of living in a diaspora. Due to its lack of a definite signified, Avtar Brah calls home the "subtext of diaspora" harbouring spaces in the past, present and future.[67] So, the utopian heterotopic home travels with the immigrants, interplays with the chronotopical organizations of the new place and moves between

---

[60] Paul Gilroy, "Diaspora," *Paragraph*, vol.17, iss.1, 1994, p.133.
[61] Brah, *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities (Gender, Race, Ethnicity)*, p.192-3.
[62]M(other) is the ultimate object of desire for fullness and it represents the lost unity of the real.
[63]Bhabha, "The Other Question The Stereotype and Colonial Discourse," *Screen*, vol.24, iss.6, 1983, p.34.
[64] Ravindran, "Transnational Tamil Cinema as a Foucauldian Heterotopia: Diasporic Narratives, Identities, and Malaysian Indians," p.426.
[65] Ahmed, "Home and Away Narratives of Migration and Estrangement," p.330.
[66] Foucault, "Of Other Spaces", p.6.
[67] Brah, *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities (Gender, Race, Ethnicity)*, p.190.

multiple cultural spaces and histories. Then, the question is what home is, where home dwells and whether we can define a stable home or physical locality in a highly globalizing world.

All the above mentioned arguments reveal that another significant characteristic of heterotopic subjectification is the temporal dimension. For Foucault, the fatal characteristic of other spaces is their ultimate connection with temporality which is heterochronic. While some heterotopias try to freeze time, some capture fleeting times. Foucault accentuates that temporality refers to accumulation of cultural practices in a certain space celebrating discontinuity as a productive concept which he considers as breaks, liminal spaces and thresholds. For Foucault, "things are no longer perceived, described, expressed, characterized, classified, and known in the same way" since discontinuity encompasses "overlapping, interaction, and echoes" [68] between old and new times and spaces that "opened the way to…differences" [69]. According to Foucault's metaphor of "the archaeology of knowledge", knowledge is multi-layered and these layers are formed by precipitation in a certain space over time. In a time of a metaphorical earthquake, what he calls an "epistemic rupture" or "redistribution of the episteme"[70] , while new discursive formations redefine the boundaries some prior knowledge continues to dominate space; one or more layers of the past may get visible to archaeologists in the present.

Robert Clair lays a claim on Foucault's explanation of history and change, by asserting that "dynamics of change" in a given space are related to various times; that is, change "occurs in the co-present, a place where the reconstructed past is linked with" the present; furthermore, "just as the present is embedded in the past, the future is [also] embedded in the present".[71] In this new present, past events are retained, remembered, reconstructed or redefined creating new planes of consciousness and associations. The past never dies but still it cannot be created fully either; however, its layers occur in the present forming new structures, associations, perspectives and with newer concepts they become part of the future. The past is always assembled through "memory, fantasy, narrative and myth" and "identities are the points of identification, the unstable points of identification or suture, which are made, within the discourses of history and culture".[72] Thus, the gap between the re-presented layers of the past in the present and the actual patterns of the past gives way to a new present, to new perspectives and new meanings. This fresh awareness also provides a growing critical perspective on the tenets of the present and its conflicting values with the past as well. This new present consciousness involving the past brings up new originals, practices and perspectives of the future as well. Thus, there is no linearity in temporal terms; on the contrary, the flow of time is quite digressive between the past, present and future.

The "archaeology of knowledge" metaphor of Foucault, more than being an explanatory theory for historical events, is supportive in the understanding of

---

[68]Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, p.149.
[69]Foucault, ibid., p.217.
[70]Foucault, ibid., p.345.
[71]Robert N. Clair, "The Sedimentation Theory of Cultural Time and Space: The Present is Embedded in the Past. The Sedimentation Theory of Cultural Time and Space," *Circulo de Lingüistica Aplicada a la Comunicacion*, vol.31, 2007, p.52, 67.
[72] Hall, "Cultural Identity and Diaspora," p.226.

heterotopic diaspora. Diasporic movements "occur in space as well as in time, and the mechanisms and processes according to which movements are orchestrated and actuated in both dimensions are of crucial importance".[73] The heterotopic understanding of diasporic subjectification prompts a process focusing on removal from not only a space but also a particular time-space construction through which "a community conceptualizes its surroundings".[74] Setting a new life in a new space, along with the conflicting values between the past and the present experiences of diasporians, gives way to new challenges, formations and perspectives in terms of nationality, ethnicity, race and gender. The new forces of the present situation, including past layers, provide the necessary base for the future formations as well. Once an individual sets her country space back in the past, she moves into a new cultural space and into a new present. In the country left behind "the present was embedded in the past. In the new host country, however, the cultural past is different. This means that [their] cultural identity has been compromised".[75] Diaspora communities while wishing to participate in the new culture mostly hold their cultural past. This problem is "resolved by transporting components of the cultural past and relocating it in the new homeland". Thus, diasporic subjectification "looks both to the past and to the future".[76] The result is a heterotopic culture where hybrid cultural transformations take place according to the dominant and recessive traits of the cultures. Diaspora space "demands an encounter with 'newness'" which "renews the past, refiguring it as a contingent 'in-between' space, that innovates and interrupts the performance of the present".[77]

Memories of the national homeland, especially nostalgic images of that space and its cultural practices, are crisscrossed by the "present places embroidered with the recreated social and cultural practices of another" space and time.[78] For the diasporic communities who leave their "cultural space and move into a new intercultural context, their past is transported and recreated as a new cultural space in which other members of their diaspora reside and have imbued themselves with symbols of the cultural past" and they "want to look out on the landscape of their host country and see residue of their old cultural space".[79] It is in this present space that the past and its practices are recollected, recreated and this present gives way to the future expectations and layers of cultural spaces for the future generations. Compounded by the awareness of multi-locality, the "fractured memories" of diaspora consciousness produce a multiplicity of histories, "communities" and selves. To illustrate, in the dialogic negotiation undertaken in diaspora there may be " I-positions that may be relevant at some point in an individual's past but no longer hold any importance in the

---

[73] Suzan Spearey, "Spatial Odysseys in Diaspora Writing," *Shifting Continents/Colliding Culture: Diaspora Writing of the Indian Subcontinent*, (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000), p.151.
[74] Esther Peeren, "Through the Lens of the Chronotope," *Diaspora and Memory: Figures of Displacement in Contemporary Literature, Arts and Politics*, (Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi, 2006), p.58.
[75] Clair, "The Sedimentation Theory of Cultural Time and Space: The Present is Embedded in the Past. The Sedimentation Theory of Cultural Time and Space," p.83
[76] Stephane Dufoix, *Diasporas*, (Berkeley: U of California P, 2003), p.34.
[77] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, p.7.
[78] Teresa Davis, "Third Spaces or Heterotopias? Recreating and Negotiating Migrant Identity Using Online Spaces," *Sociology*, vol.44, iss.4, 2010, p.667.
[79] Clair, ibid., p.69.

present so they are backgrounded…it is also possible that a particular I-position of an individual's past is foregrounded and used in a present state".[80]

As well as the mythic vision of homeland, the essentialist connection between identity and authenticity and mythic leitmotifs come under change in the heterochronic subjectification. When nostalgic diasporians try to handle the present situations and make sense of the past they constantly deconstruct and reconstruct the past times and spaces in the present. These fictional remembrances at the same time deconstruct the authenticity of the actual past, practices and traditions belonging to that past. Nostalgic remoteness recreates the past in the present with new associations and interpretations when migrants "long for the past, [they] long for what might have been as well as what was; it is only by incorporating such longing into [their] narratives that [they] can suspend the past and ultimately change its meanings in the present".[81] Authenticity of the myths and home practices that are used to define old diasporas may turn into newly created modified myths and spaces. While members of diaspora communities try to preserve a "vision or myth about their original home" it remains as a utopic space like the virtual site of the mirror.[82] As persuasively suggested by DeCerteau

> *what this walking exile produces is precisely the body of legends that is currently lacking in one's own vicinity; it is a fiction, which moreover has the double characteristic like dreams or pedestrian rhetoric, of being the effect of displacements and condensations. As a corollary, one can measure the importance of these signifying practices (to tell oneself legends) as practices that invent spaces.*[83]

In the course of surveillance and normalization individual time fuses with the history of the community and the personal space of individuation becomes involved in spaces of the collective living and its practices. The imagined homeland with its memories and myths along with the newly settled foreign land and how it is perceived can produce various and never ending identity positions for the immigrants.

Being "a kind of contestation both mythical and real of the space in which we live"[84], heterotopias while problematizing existing knowledge also shatter the myth of origin or, in Foucault's words, they "dissolve our myths". Due to their heterochronic nature, heterotopias always emphasize "the possibility of possibilities" and allow "for the presence of constant change and improvisation".[85] If so, never ending social, cultural and historical transformation can also reorder existing spatial leitmotifs and, like Foucault's comment on Borges' spatial arrangement, it dissolves nation myth, the myths of a nation, or authenticity. Shared cultural codes and common historical frames of a static understanding of nation have a tendency to impose mythic oneness. As Cohen reasons

> *the myth of a common origin acts to 'root' a diasporic consciousness and give it legitimacy. The more ancient and venerable the myth, the more useful it is as a form of social*

---

[80] Bhatia, "Acculturation, Dialogical Voices and the Construction of the Diasporic Self," p.71.
[81] McDermott, ibid., p.405.
[82] Franoise Kràl, *Critical Identities in Contemporary Anglophone Diasporic Literature*, (Palgrave: Macmillan, 2009), p.13.
[83] DeCerteau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, p.107.
[84] Foucault, "Of Other Spaces", p. 23.
[85] Robert F. Reid-Pharr, "Disseminating Heterotopia," *African American Review*, vol.28, iss.3, 1994, p.348.

> *distancing from other ethnic groups and a means of affecting an air of difference, perhaps superiority, even in the teeth of dispossession and discrimination.*[86]

Rediscovery of this nostalgic knowledge of shared identity – pure otherness – is often the object of the early post-colonial studies. However, contemporary trans-cultural counter sites articulate that "cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories…Like everything which is historical, they undergo constant transformation"; far from being "eternally fixed in some essentialized past, they are subject to the continuous play of [different time-spaces], culture, and power".[87]

**Conclusion**

With its varying implications and applications, diaspora is a contested term. Hinting at the scattering of people over space and at transnational networks between people and sites, space "clearly lies at the heart of diaspora both as a concept and as lived experience, encompassing the contested interplay of place, home, culture and identity through migration and resettlement".[88] Therefore, the term "diaspora" is essentially spatial. While fixing and unfixing diasporic subjectivity, negotiations of space and time, and also workings of self and power technologies should be taken into consideration, since diasporic space includes a number of times and spaces in each of which "a different image of a person, contextualized in a different sense of history, society, and culture, is presented".[89]

In his categorization of heterotopias according to their functions, Foucault mentions two major types, "heterotopias of crisis" and "deviation heterotopias", underlining that while the former are mostly productions of the primitive societies, the latter are the updated version of the crisis heterotopias. The crisis heterotopias are established by social practices to provide lodgings for individuals in states of crisis. Foucault highlights that heterotopias and their functions may shift in time. If such states are re-evaluated through a contemporary point of view, the updated versions of "crisis heterotopias" are not thought to be related with crises on accounts of "menstrual pollution" or "ageing"[90]. Bevir argues that "[d]ifferent people adopt different beliefs and perform different actions against the background of the same social structure, so there must be at least an undecided space in front of these structures where individuals decide what beliefs to hold and what actions to perform".[91] Today crisis heterotopias "are borne more of the crises of identity politics in the age of globalization and transnationalization of flows of people and their cultural goods".[92] If a heteretopia is a counter site that destabilizes the real and unreal spaces contrasted to it as Foucault claims, so does diaspora theory move to unsettle, re-evaluate, destabilize existing practices in both spatial and temporal terms. In

---

[86] Robin Cohen, *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*, (London: UCL Press, 1997), p.165.
[87] Hall, "The Spectacle of the 'Other'", p.236.
[88] Alison Blunt, "Geographies of Diaspora and Mixed Descent: Anglo-Indians in India and Britain," *International Journal of Population Geography*, vol.9, iss.1, 2003, p.282.
[89] Wang, "The Chronotopes of Encounter and Emergence", p.1.
[90] Foucault, "Of Other Spaces", p. 24.
[91] Mark Bevir – Rod A.W. Rhodes, *Interpreting British Governance*, (London: Routledge, 2003), p.69.
[92]Ravindran, "Transnational Tamil Cinema as a Foucauldian Heterotopia: Diasporic Narratives, Identities, and Malaysian Indians", p.426.

diaspora perspicacity, crossing boundaries opens new critical spaces where alternate social orderings are possible against the dominant power technologies, knowledge and practices. By way of explanation, non-hegemonic heterotopias give rise to new systems of knowledge, self technologies and practices by problematizing the familiar space, order and time; thus, they are essential other spaces for subalterns to set their points of view on public policies and reorder conventional spatial hierarchies "by crisis or deviance" or "by their perfection or subversion of certain spatial designs".[93]

Diasporas are spaces of otherness by nature since they are counter sites in which the utopian temporal and spatial arrangements and practices of the mainstream culture are "represented, contested and inverted". These diasporic liminalities "organize a bit of the social world in a way different to that which surrounds them"[94] and "have a function" in relation to "all other spaces". Diasporic subjectivity dwells on such other spaces as "this space-between" where never ending cross-cultural experiences and hybrid becomings are performed. In the case of diaspora communities, being in-between two cultures does not create stable positions for the individuals; on the contrary, this other space, heterotopia, enables newness, connects them to new relational spaces and power technologies having the potential to transgress and subvert established cultural identifications.

**References**

ANDERSON, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1991.

BHABHA, Homi. "The Other Question The Stereotype And Colonial Discourse". *Screen*. Vol.24, iss.6, 1983: 18-36.

_____. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

BHATI, Sunil. "Acculturation, Dialogical Voices and the Construction of the Diasporic Self". *Theory and Psychology*. Sage Publication, vol.12, iss. 2,

BOUISSAC, Paul. "Space and Time as Cultural Artefacts: Blackpool as Heterotopy and Heterochrony". *Place as Material Culture: Objects, Geographies and the Construction of Time*. Eds. Dragoş Gheorghiu and George Nash. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013.

BRAH, Avtar. *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities: Gender, Race, Ethnicity*. London: Routledge, 1996.

BUTLER, Judith. *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection*. Palo Alto: Stanford UP, 1997.

CHAMBERS, Iain. *Migrancy, Culture, Identity*. London: Routledge, 1994.

CLAIR, Robert N. "The Sedimentation Theory of Cultural Time and Space: The Present is Embedded in the Past. *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*. Vol.31, 2007.

CLARKE, Simon. "Culture and Identity". *Handbook of Cultural Analysis*. London: Sage, 2008.

CLIFFORD, James. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.

[93] DeCerteau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, p.131.

[94] Hetherington, *The Badlands of Modernity: Heterotopia and Social Ordering* , p.xvii.

_____.. "Diasporas". *Cultural Anthropology*. Vol.9, Iss.3, 1994: 302-338.
COHEN, Robin. *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*. London: UCL Press, 1997.
DAVIS, Teresa. "Third Spaces or Heterotopias? Recreating and Negotiating Migrant Identity Using Online Spaces". *Sociology*. Vol. 44, iss. 4, 2010: 661-677.
DECERTEAU, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
DOLAN, Paddy. "Space, Time and the Constitution of Subjectivity: Comparing Elias and Foucault". *Foucault Studies*. Vol.8, 2010.
DUFOIX, Stephane. *Diasporas*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
EDMUNS, June and TURNER Bryan S. "The Re-Invention of a National Identity ? Women and 'Cosmopolitan' Englishness". *Ethnicities*. Vol.1, iss.1, 2001: 83-108.
FANON, Franz. *The Wretch of the Earth*. Translated by Richard Philcox. New York: Grove Press, 2004.
FOUCAULT, Michel. *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage, 1977.

_____. *History of Sexuality Volume I: An Introduction*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1990.
_____. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.
_____. "The Subject and Power". *Critical Inquiry*. Vol.8, No.4, 1982.
_____. "Of Other Spaces". *Diacritics*. Vol.16, iss. 1, 1986: 22-27.
_____. *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*. Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988.
_____. "The Ethics of the Concern for the Self as a Practice of Freedom". *Essential Works of Foucault, vol.1, Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*. New York: Semiotext, 1996.

_____. *Aesthetics, Method and Epistemology*. New York: The New Press, 1998.

_____. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of Human Sciences*. London: Routledge, 2000.

_____."Space, Knowledge, and Power". *The Essential Works 3*. Ed. J. Faubion. New York: Penguin, 2000.
GILROY, Paul. "Diaspora". *Paragraph*. Vol.17, iss.1, 1994.
GUIBERNAU, Montserrat. *Nationalisms: The Nation-State and Nationalism in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996.
GUPTA, Akhil and FERGUSON James. "Beyond Culture: Space, Identity and the Politics of Difference". *Cultural Anthropology*. Vol.7, No.1, 1992: 6-23.
HALL, Stuart. "The Spectacle of the "Other". *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage, 1997: 223–290.
_____. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora". *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. Ed. J. Rutherford. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990: 222–239.
HETHERINGTON, Kevin. *The Badlands of Modernity: Heterotopia and Social Ordering*. London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Press, 1997.
HOOKS, Bell. *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. Boston: South End Press, 1999.

HUA, Anh. "Homing Desire, Cultural Citizenship, and Diasporic Imaginings". *Journal of International Women's Studies*. Vol.12, iss.4, 2011: 45-56.

HUSSAIN, Yasmin. *Writing Diaspora: South Asian Women, Culture and Ethnicity*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2005.

JAY, Nancy. "Gender and Dichotomy". *Feminist Studies*. Vol. 7.1, 1981: 38-56.

JOHNSON, Peter. "Unravelling Foucault's 'Different Spaces'". *History of the Human Sciences*. Vol.19, iss.4, 2006: 75-90.

KARSKENS, Machiel. "Homeland and Heterotopia. The Place of the Stranger in Multiculturalism" *The New Europe at the Crossroads*. Ed. Beitter, U.E. New York: Peter Lang, 1999: 107-117.

KRÁL, Franoise. *Critical Identities in Contemporary Anglophone Diasporic Literature*. Palgrave: Macmillan, 2009.

LEFEBVRE, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1991.

McDERMOTT, Sinead. "The Gender of Nostalgia: Memory, Nostalgia, and Gender in A Thousand Acres". *Signs: A Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *Gender and Cultural Memory Special Issue*. Eds. Marianne Hirsch and Valerie Smith. Vol.28, iss.1, 2002: 389-408.

PEEREN, Esther. "Through the Lens of the Chronotope". *Diaspora and Memory: Figures of Displacement in Contemporary Literature, Arts and Politics*. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi, 2006.

RACEVSKIS, Karlis. *Michel Foucault and the Subversion of the Intellect*. London: Cornell UP, 1983.

RADHAKRISHNAN, Raj. "Nationalism, Gender, and Narrative". *Nationalisms and Sexualities*. Eds. Andrew Parker, Mary Russo, Doris Sommer, Patricia Yeager. New York: Routledge, 1992: 77–95.

RAVINDRAN, Gopalan. "Transnational Tamil Cinema as a Foucauldian Heterotopia: Diasporic Narratives, Identities, and Malaysian Indians". *Proceedings of the whither the Orient: Asians in Asian and Non-Asian Cinema Conference*. Ed. Joel David. Seoul: Asia Culture Forum, 2006: 419-454.

REID-PHARR, Robert F. "Disseminating Heterotopia". *African American Review*. Vol. 28, No. 3, 1994: 347-357.

RIOS, Michael and ADIV, Naomi. "Geographies of Diaspora: A Review". Davis: Center for Regional Change, 2010.

ROSE, Nikolas. "Authority and the Genealogy of Subjectivity". *Detraditionalization: Critical Reflections on Authority and Identity, Oxford Spatialities of Globalisation Ash Amin Environment and Planning*. Vol.34, 2002. Clifford,

SACK, Robert. "Territorial Bases of Power", *Political Studies from Spatial Perspectives*. New York: John Willey Press,1983.

SAID, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Random House, 1978.

SAN, JUAN. "Transforming Identity in Postcolonial Narrative: An Approach to the Novels of Jessica Hagedorn". *Post-Identity*. Vol.1, iss.2, 1998: 5–28.

SARA, Ahmed. "Home and away: Narratives of Migration and Estrangement". *International Journal of Cultural Studies*. Vol.2, iss.3, 1999: 329–347.

SATHIAN, Sanjena. "Gender and Nation in the South Asian Diaspora: Transnational Cultural Spaces in Bollywood Cinema". *The Columbia Undergraduate Journal of South Asian Studies*. Vol.II, Iss. I, 2010: 22-41.

SIDERI, Eleni. "The Diaspora of the Term Diaspora: A Working-Paper of a Definition". *Cultures in Transit*. Vol.4, 2008: 32-47.

SOYSAL, Yasemin. "Citizenship and Identity: Living in Diasporas in Postwar Europe?". *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. Vol.23, iss.1, 2000: 1-15.

SPEAREY, Suzan. "Spatial Odysseys in Diaspora Writing". *Shifting Continents/ Colliding Culture: Diaspora Writing of the Indian Subcontinent*. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi, 2000.

SPIVAK, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?". *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*. Eds. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman New York: Harvester/Wheatsheaf, 1994.

TOPINKA, Robert J. "Foucault, Borges, Het
erotopia: Producing Knowledge in Other Spaces". *Foucault Studies*. No.9, 2010: 54-70.

UPSTONE, Sara. *Spatial Politics in the Postcolonial Novel*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009.

VIJAYASREE, C. "Alter-Nativity, Migration, Marginality and Narrative: The Case of indian Women Writers Settled in the West". *Shifting Continents/Colliding Cultures: Diaspora Writing of the Indian Subcontinent*. Eds. Ralph J.Crane and Radhika Mohanram. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000.

WANG, Hongyu . "The Chronotopes of Encounter and Emergence," *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, vol.25, 2009.