Authoritarian spaces, (un)just spaces?

Sabine Planel, researcher for the IRD, UMR PRODIG

"This power that exceeds the rules of law that organise and delineate it, therefore extends beyond those rules, is invested in institutions, becomes embodied in techniques and obtains instruments for material intervention, instruments that may even be violent." (M. Foucault, 1997: 25)[*]

This issue offers a discussion on the authoritarian exercise of power,[1] not on authoritarianism defined as a political regime that seeks to restrict political pluralism (Brooker, 2009). It therefore considers the authoritarian exercise of power in all political regimes, whether they be described as authoritarian or democratic. This authoritarian phenomenon is characterised by a plasticity of practices that range from "cultural hegemony" to the use of force, from the "insidious blandishments of the State" to coercion. The approach the collection takes is highly pragmatic and material, tackling power in its spatial embeddedness and seeking to contribute to the analysis of authoritarian practice by focusing on its spatialisation. This provides a way to re-examine the link between justice and authoritarianism and is an invitation to discuss the obvious presumption of injustice often associated with these political situations

Ordering of space

While a totalitarian ideology disseminated to varying degrees by propaganda, political takeover by a military Junta or a one-party system, is a condition of the

---

[*] Translator's version.
[1] It draws in part on the ideas produced by the 'ESAU' – "ESpaces AUtoritaires africains" – working group, consisting of Marie Morelle, Marianne Morange, Pascale Philifert, Emmanuel Chauvin, Pierre Guidi, Mehdi Labzaé and Sabine Planel.

authoritarian exercise of power, the conception, creation and mobilisation of material systems of control also play a role. Concrete and tangible, the latter (prisons, camps, walls) are indissociable from the space they occupy: their very architecture is at the root of the authoritarian rationale that underpins their creation, their existence and their legitimacy (Morelle, 2013, Agier, 2008, Brown, 2009). Other systems, by contrast, are embedded in a pre-existing space (city centre to be redeveloped/controlled, rural land boundaries, project areas). Their socio-spatial characteristics influence the way that politics is done and expressed (Goirand, 2000), whether in the imposition of a constraint or in resistance to that constraint.

Tackling the question of politics through a spatial prism is an approach that has already demonstrated its analytical fruitfulness. The spatial embeddedness of power relations surfaces in many notions on which the political sciences draw. For example, the structures of political opportunity as defined by Tilly and Tarrow (2006) show us the influence of environment in political action, while in moral economics the objects of analysis are the spaces of production and their transformation (Siméant, 2013). Other analyses, following in the footsteps of Henri Lefebvre (1974), examine new spatialities from a highly political perspective (Bridge, 2013, Harvey, 2008, Jessop, 2002). In them, construction, the rearrangement of space, are akin to an ordering process in which there is more at stake than the spatial framework alone. It serves the interests of coalitions of power or simply of the dominant classes in the capitalist system (Harvey, 2010, Swyngedouw, 2009), seeking to spread the standardisation of new – consciously neoliberal – rationalities (Morange, 2015, Reigner, 2013). To what extent can it also serve the political interests of an authority and an authoritarian system primarily interested in surviving? That is the central question raised by this number, which seeks – through the prism of authoritarian practice – to explore the question of political intentionality in spatial transformation.

In the political combinations that are characteristic of contemporary situations (Banégas, 2003, Brown 2007), this collection focuses on authoritarian practices of power. It recognises and seeks to analyse the spatial structures produced by political practice characterised by domination and coercion (Bayart, 2008b) and their coercive

effects on individuals. It wishes to understand how the ordering of space contributes to an authoritarian system, to a process of control, how it is produced, appropriated – or conversely, rejected – by its inhabitants.

The spatialisation of authoritarian practice is a way to tackle the effects of domination from a dual perspective: in a Marxist tradition, spatial embeddedness is first of all a way of approaching the control of a resource, of an instrument of production, and is evidence of a differential – not to say conflictual – access to that resource; in a more mobile, governance-based approach, the ordering of space reflects power relations that are more diffuse, and social relations are conditioned by coalitions of varying interests. This dual interpretation of authoritarian situations is fertile ground for questions about justice. First because it relates to a tension now widely recognised – but particularly relevant in authoritarian conditions – between redistributive justice and procedural justice. But above all because it prompts us to consider the ideological dimension of material systems of control, to conceive spatial ordering as a political imperative. In any case, this number is an invitation to explore the capacity of a space – according to J. Rancière (1998) highly political – to be a vehicle of injustice (Barnett, 2012).

From authoritarian regime to authoritarian phenomenon, then authoritarian space

This exploration echoes work that has long been underway in the sciences of politics, and more specifically in political science. Far from rejecting this heritage, we are keen in our approach to draw on the different perspectives opened up by this work, which has revitalised our understanding of the authoritarian phenomenon.

The first – both the most fundamental and the oldest – lesson of this literature concerns the distinction between political regime and political phenomenon. Initially attached to an analysis in terms of regimes and ideology, the academic debate around the authoritarian phenomenon formerly classified regimes into all-encompassing categories, which often blocked consideration of the reality of the practices underlying the systems observed (Dobry, 2005). Nowadays, analysts have

moved away from the typology forged by Linz (2000) – in which authoritarianism is a "type" of regime – to adopt a less essentialist approach to the authoritarian phenomenon, with a greater focus on practices (Rowell, 2006). They have moved away from a "negative" vision in which authoritarianism is only understood in opposition to what distinguishes it from democracy, in studies of processes of "democratisation" (Camau & Geisser, 2003, Kuhonta et al., 2008, Collier, 1979).

Taking this lesson on board, from the authoritarian dynamic described by Linz we nevertheless retain the desire to limit political pluralism (single party, little institutional recognition of opposition, press censorship or control), a desire nevertheless constantly constrained by new contextual effects and a proliferation of modes of governance that is both horizontal (new political actors, participation, civil society) and vertical (multiple levels).

The second feature we retain, intimately linked to the first, concerns the notion of the hybridity of political situations, particularly in new forms of authoritarianism that pay lip service to democratic appearances. By identifying transitions, moments (see the "Thermidorian moment" defined by J.-F. Bayart (2008a)) and other situations of constraint that evolve as relations change (Pommerolle and Vairel, 2009), through political science we are able to explore – even in their contradictions – the multiple and ever shifting tensions that exist between dynamics of political liberalisation and dynamics of control, but also their rapprochements in the invention of an authoritarian governance (Froissart, 2014). The goal is to embrace a perspective on the authoritarian phenomenon that highlights different elements: its historicity and its capacity to adapt to contextual effects, the ways in which it renews and reinvents itself (Benin & Vairel, 2011), its convergences with more democratic conditions (Dabène, Geisser & Massardier, 2008), in particular through neoliberal reforms (Springer, 2009), its internalisation by individuals (Hibou, 2011), the representations it generates and its novel forms of legitimisation (Gatelier and Valeri, 2012).

To do this, we approach the authoritarian phenomenon through its practices and its materiality, in order to give a more nuanced, more hybrid view of the authoritarian – and even more the semi-authoritarian – situation, similar to the "optical illusion"

trope employed by Hilgers & Mazzocchetti (2010) to describe the dual capacity of these regimes to hide behind democratic forms and, in so doing, to "open up" the political arena, in particular through the creation of public spaces.

In short, authoritarian spaces form independently of the nature of the regime that accommodates them. While easier to observe in authoritarian regimes, the lessons on political hybridisation they offer in democratic situations are nevertheless more informative (Dabène, 2008). Here, they constitute a local and *ad hoc* form of power and political regulation, which emerges in the day-to-day interactions between state and society, in the repositioning of the authorities and in the emergence of new power processes.

Finally, the third criterion that we draw from this literature is as much methodological as analytical. It raises the argument of a grassroots authoritarianism (Bayart, 1984), rejecting the idea that "the different types authoritarianism largely reflect the strategies and plans of those who exercise power" (Bourmaud, 2006 : 641). It is now accepted that the authoritarian exercise of power cannot be restricted to "the univocal and top-down application of state power to subordinate social groups" (Bayart, 1984: 154), but that it reflects a complex and localised interplay of power, resulting equally from the strategies of those who exercise and of those who endure it – and, to varying degrees, resist it. Between "authoritarian routines and militant innovations" (Pommerolle, 2007), it is characterised above all by specific trajectories and methods. Following Jean-Noel Ferrié (2012), we see them as systems of power that combine specific practices, norms and categories of stakeholders and spaces. This understanding of the authoritarian phenomenon therefore prompts us to consider subaltern actors (Chatterjee, 2009), operating both outside and inside the state apparatus (Dubois, 2010), and to pay specific attention to local situations, to "people's" spaces.

A situated reading of power

The notion of the authoritarian space is a way to explore more deeply into this approach – situated as it is in the authoritarian phenomenon – by associating it more

explicitly with a scalar interpretation. It argues, in a Foucauldian understanding of power, that there is a coexisting plurality of political regulation, and that the transition from one mode of government to another is not only genealogical but also spatial. To situate ourselves more specifically in Foucauldian thought, we consider that the power relations we work on have not fully completed their transition to a "population state", and that authoritarian space in fact contributes to the survival of a "territorial state" (Foucault M., 2004). Space can help us to consider as a whole the different rationalities whose entanglements are clearly described by Michel Foucault:

"Now I think we see something new emerging in the second half of the eighteenth century: a new technology of power, but this time it is not disciplinary. This technology of power does not exclude the former, does not exclude disciplinary technology, but it does dovetail into it, integrate it, modify it to some extent, and above all uses it by a sort of infiltration, embedding itself in existing disciplinary techniques. This new technique does not simply do away with the disciplinary technique, because it exists at a different level, on a different scale, and because it has a different bearing area, and makes use of very different instruments." (Foucault, 1997: 215-216). It is in no way our intent to reduce authoritarianism to a form of sovereignty and/or to reduce democracy to governmentality. Quite the contrary, following J. F. Bayart (2008a), we will be very sensitive to what governmentality contributes to our approach to authoritarianism. We would nevertheless emphasise that our borrowing from the Foucauldian toolbox is only partial and we do not adopt his approach to domination. While we agree with him that the analysis of power must be situated "at the same level as the procedure of subjection", we think that the disciplinary methods that implement this subjection can be spatially and/or socially highly concentrated, very hierarchical and above all very *intentional* – which does not prevent their appropriation or rejection by a more diffuse political ensemble. In short, this number seeks not so much to explore the invisible forms of government – the "combinations of intermediate infra-political alignments" that produce an order (Reigner, 2013: 35), or revanchist convergences of interest (Smith, 1996) – as

disciplinary systems whose purpose, however much disguised, is essentially beyond doubt.

A spatial approach to the authoritarian phenomenon should make it possible to explore the practices of control and resistance not just conjointly, but together. The appropriation of space for a twofold purpose, be it control or resistance, is a theme much examined in the social sciences, in that space – or usually in these cases, territory – seems to be a good indicator of the political tensions that constitute it (Dikec, 2005). The subjects through which the literature explores these phenomena clearly reveal the hybridisation of politics, as well – does it need saying? – as the neutrality of space, a medium sometimes of control, sometimes of resistance. By way of example, the literature on the African street – and by extension on markets, squares and other public spaces, even the city as a whole – is a well-entrenched academic field which fully exposes the political polymorphism of space. The multiplicity of the uses of the street is explained by a vision of space that is "conflictual and politicised" (Fourchard, 2007:70), which in one place will afford the social and geographical opportunity for anti-establishment discourse in a street parliament (Banégas, Brisset-Foucault and Cutolo, 2012), while elsewhere will be presented as an architectural, hygienist or commercial reordering of space that thus reveals the handiwork of governmentality (Morange, 2015). Elsewhere, it may be a place for the expression of civil, military or quite simply state violence, likewise often associated with authoritarian conditions (Picard, 2008), though this aspect will not be much developed in this issue.

Whether they resist or submit, we consider such spaces to be authoritarian insofar as they are primarily, but not solely, the outcome of a desire for control. To what extent precisely? That is where lies all the difficulty of their characterisation, and the trap would be to treat them as a fixed and predetermined analytical category. In order to avoid such pitfalls, this collection provides exercises in political anatomy which carefully dissect the spatial and political structurings at work. Two more specific spatial dynamics underpin these analyses.

Scales and scalar structure (the capacity of a social dynamic to produce a spatial hierarchy (Brenner, 2001)) interest us insofar as they frame and reflect power processes (Planel, Jaglin, 2014), notably by giving material form to phenomenon of domination (Elden, 2013). Erik Swyngedouw (2000), for example, clearly identifies the link between scale factors (in particular the "jumping of scale") and authoritarian governance. The polysemy of the notion of scale, the tension it expresses between spatial form and political dynamic, are particularly useful in understanding the plasticity of authoritarian spaces. The correspondences here between frames of experience, in the sense defined by Goffmann (1991), the forms of framing – in particular partisan forms (Froissart, 2008) – or of levels/scales, are particularly numerous here. Their capacity to become entangled or to be confused says much both about the hybridisation of these political spaces and the capacity of an authoritarian exercise of power to play with spatial structurings, in this case scalar structurings.

While it is agreed, in fact largely on the basis of democratic regimes, that the exercise of state power, in particular since the neoliberal reform of that power, today constitutes a major process of scalar structuring (Brenner, 2004, Jessop, 2002), there is also cause to question the capacity of an authoritarian exercise of state power to generate a hierarchy of spaces and of similar powers. The exact forms of a specifically authoritarian scalar architecture are therefore worth studying, especially as they are currently subject to significant remodelling. While the delegation of power to local levels – mainly through decentralisation – is assumed automatically to foster democratic practices (Purcell, 2006), and while institutions rooted in civil society are presumed to help citizens learn democracy, authoritarian situations reveal the same desire for a strengthening, extension and diversification among local decision-making structures. Yet these phenomena result in greater control over local society, not liberalisation. China (Froissart, 2008), Ethiopia (Emmenegger et al., 2011, Vaughan, 2011) or Vietnam (Zinoman, 2001) are clear examples of this authoritarian – and socialist – genius for the exercise of control at local level.

This emphasis on the local level is also a result of a centrifugal trend in analysis towards the "people". For example, it is observed that the seeds of revolt are sown in local ground, that mobilisation is founded in neighbourhood conditions (Benit-Gbafou, 2012), that they are fed by particular conditions of life and that citizenship is constructed as much locally as nationally (Goirand, 2000).

Similarly, the effects of boundaries and limits are a way to explore the practical manifestations of the political plasticity of the authoritarian phenomenon. In this respect, enclaves and marginal locations are a particular focus of the articles in this number. They raise the question of the relation to law and particularly the question of exemption, one of its most ambiguous variants. There is certainly a need to document the exemption effects produced by spatial division, by the recognition of *ad hoc* modes of governance, but also to understand the conditions governing the production of this territorial exception, both in its historicity and in its intentionality. So we will see how certain spaces produce or are organised as systems of control, improvised forms of power engineering whose connection with the norm is embodied in a certain relation to space (Ferguson, 2005). Also in a certain relation to time, insofar as these regimes/spaces of exception go on to endure and become the rule, forgetting that they were supposed to be temporary response to emergency (Agamben, 2003).

Spatialisation and materialisation of state domination

Often, authoritarian space refers to categories of space that are subject to state domination, i.e. domination imposed via the state apparatus by a range of social groups, which also vary in their degree of formal development. In this sense, it is not the same as a territory insofar as it is not the outcome of a politically negotiated appropriation (Dubresson, Jaglin, 2005). It functions like a small public space in which geographical space constitutes for everyone – with the exception of the elite really in power – a constraint that is imposed, as much as a resource over which control is sought. In this respect, it operates as an instrument of power.

Though enforced by the state apparatus, authoritarian space is not solely produced by the state, in that the latter should not be considered to be a distinct actor, external to society, but instead as an integral part of the thinking about the "state in society" developed by J. S. Migdal (2001) or in more ethnographic approaches to the state (Bierschenk and Oliver de Sardan, 2014, Dubois, 2010). In constant interaction with their environment, the powers accruing to the state apparatus are constantly negotiated, historically constructed and geographically variable (Hagmann and Péclard, 2010), regardless of the regime concerned. In authoritarian conditions, however, the state is not just one actor amongst many. Its participation in the political contraction takes multiple forms, which the articles in this number seek to identify.

The way the state apparatus is used in the exercise of domination requires consideration of the role of bureaucracy (Dubois et al., 2005). Either from a Weberian perspective, which entails observation of the effects of domination linked to the symbolic distance from the administrative rule. Or in references to work on 'street level bureacuracy' (Lipsky, 1980), where the goal is to understand how the practices of interface bureaucracies construct the contact between state and society, how they frame local society and how they constitute and are constituted by a twofold constraint: the constraints that weigh on small state officials (Rowell, 2005, Labzae, 2015) and those that they impose on citizens, in particular the most vulnerable amongst them (Planel, 2014).

Beyond an institutional analysis of bureaucracy, this entails paying particular attention to this space of political interface, marked as it is by a play of negotiation and readjustment (Olivier de Sardan, Blundo 2007), where the discretionary power of small state officials adjusts to imperatives imposed from above, reaches accommodations with local notables and is applied to the most docile citizens. Insofar as authoritarianism is understood and practised more as a political activity exercised by and on the lower levels of society, the contact zone between the state and its citizens merits exploration, including from a spatial point of view, in order to understand how local geography gives form to this interface.

While in West Africa, Thomas Bierschenk (2010: 8) describes the bureaucracy as "disintegrated", as produced by the "never-finishing 'building site'" that he calls the state, one may wonder to what extent the expansion of a contact zone that is relatively vague, but subject to a bureaucratic type of rationality both within and outside the state (Weber, 1995), contributes to the political contraction of authoritarian spaces? By deploying varyingly institutionalised vehicles of power, it permits the proliferation of opportunities for domination and/or political capture, and in so doing entangles social relations in power combinations that are characterised by a fine mix of voluntary servitude, routine domination and day-to-day resistance (Scott, 1997).

Finally, just as authoritarianism is understood as a limitation on pluralism, we will ask whether authoritarian space, despite its social and political depth, does not constitute a simplified space. Here, we understand simplification in the sense employed by James Scott (1998), when he speaks of the simplification applied by the state to the diversity of the real in order to restrict reality to a situation amenable to it. While this definition is not confined to authoritarian spaces, but essentially extends to all political spaces, it is interesting to explore in what specific ways authoritarian powers undertake a political simplification of the real. How do these spaces, simplified by the state through maps, land registries, statistical systems, planning standards or legal registers, fully – and intentionally – constitute authoritarian spaces?

Justice and authoritarian spaces

The existence of authoritarian spaces characterised by a specific practice of power raises questions more broadly relating to spatial justice (Soja, 2010, Gervais-Lambony et al., 2014). Although founded on the exercise of domination, these political systems are conceived, described and legitimised in terms of justice: procedural justice, when they borrow from the "democratising" toolbox of good governance; much more often, redistributive justice, when the aim is to correct past errors, redevelop space or implement a new project. Beyond this, the very existence of authoritarian spaces

challenges the democratic – or at the very least, egalitarian – presuppositions of spatial justice (Swyngedouw, 2011).

The study of authoritarian practices and their elective affinities with modernising plans (Scott, 1998, Ferguson 2005) raises major issues of development. At a time when many countries are experiencing economic growth, often with no reduction in inequalities and outside the democratic framework, authoritarian space – especially when envisaged as an infra-national space – is a way of exploring the political dimension of these inequalities. A political dimension that is expressed in multiple registers. Whether it is embodied in unbalanced power relations, anchored in ideological systems that leave little room for contestation, or it constructs or implements norms and criteria (legal or administrative) that structure public space, the power exercised through authoritarianism contributes fully to the construction of these inequalities.

First because it limits capacities for devising, expressing and above all carrying out an alternative project. Very effective in the control it imposes on populations, authoritarian power directly or indirectly produces actions and discourses that leave little room for challenge. While these spaces are not devoid of resistance, the forms it takes are very routine and deliberately conformist or concealed (Scott, 1987). It remains to varying degrees associated with voluntary servitude and fails to structure public spaces in a collective and different way.

This is all the truer in that these powers are often founded on strong claims to revolutionary or religious legitimacy – if not both – that encourage challenge in terms of justice, yet prevent justice being considered outside the shackles of official ideology. It is not unusual to find egalitarian ideals at the ideological foundation of these regimes, or even principles of equality in the case of Communist influenced regimes.

While justice in such regimes is frequently associated with equality, it can be conceived in different terms. These are regimes where the state has often orchestrated – sometimes with the greatest violence – spatial redevelopment and population policies designed to bring about greater redistributive justice, with only

partial impact, limited for example to certain national territorial scales, but not others, in particular local scales, or else to a single period and context, now in the past. Until very recently, citizen participation and decentralised government were not envisaged. Today, they are penetrating authoritarian spaces in a highly depoliticised form and do not automatically facilitate collective expression or empowerment. Can they, against all expectations, change local power balances and entrain greater participatory justice, the construction of a juster space?

How do political systems founded on the exercise of domination envisage space: as a blank sheet on which to write a revolutionary project? As a resource to control/exploit? As a reality to correct or conversely to acknowledge? The conditions of existence of (an un)just space(s) in an authoritarian situation depend on the answer to these questions.

Diversity and vitality of authoritarian spaces

While the notion of authoritarian space constitutes a new and as yet little documented field of research, the economy of meaning embedded in the notion has attracted numerous authors, working in varied disciplines and on a wide range of situations. All familiar with political analysis, they come from the fields of geography, sociology, anthropology and psychology, and write of Europe, Africa, Latin America and Asia. Of particular interest in this number is the representation of political contexts in transition, like Brazil, or those that are more clearly democratic, like Greece.

Marked by the legacy of political science, a significant proportion of the articles in this number are dedicated to the Brazilian situation, where the regime is more commonly described as post-authoritarian and where the exceptionality and marginality of the *favelas* provide ground for the development of an infra-national conception of authoritarian space. Rather than unbalancing the representativeness of political situations, this focus in fact offers very rich terrain for the analysis of the system of constraint, by detailing its diverse underpinnings (symbolic, economic and political). In considering the impoverished sub-citizens of the *favelas*, the articles

analyse the nature of political bonds in authoritarian conditions, and show how the *favelas* are not political spaces but rather places of great social responsiveness.

In her article, *"Favelas: Towards a Fairer Space? Democratic Transition and Collective Mobilisation in Authoritarian Space "*, Justine Ninin offers a reflection on the processes whereby *favelas* are constructed as authoritarian spaces of exclusion. She therefore focuses on the way in which they are structurally constituted by state domination and on the reappropriation that they are experiencing under the impact of more private constraints. In particular, she shows how representations and spatial perceptions feed a specific local citizenship, institutionally organised by intermediate agents, who are particularly able to transform the contact zone between state and society into a space of mobilisation and to respond – even if only partially – to the claims for justice formulated in these spaces.

On this particular interface, Luciana Araujo De Paula more specifically explores the question of the hybridisation of authoritarian enclaves, in an article titled "*The 'grey zones' of Democracy in Brazil: the 'militia' phenomenon and contemporary security issues in Rio de Janeiro".* Through an analysis of the militias, she shows the methods by which such authoritarian spaces can function as authoritarian relief valves in democratic conditions. Moreover, her article draws attention to the militarisation of authoritarian spaces.

The article by Rodrigo Drozak, *"Ambivalence in Controlling Births in the Favelas of Rio de Janeiro"* is particularly welcome in this approach to the authoritarian phenomenon. He reminds us how the relation to politics plays out at the level of individuals and how strongly it shapes their individualisation. In a situated analysis of bio-power, he analyses the way in which women adopt a discourse of "purportedly democratic" emancipation in order to subjectivise their attitude to childbirth in a highly restrictive family planning context. In these areas, a new target for the family planning authorities, the author shows us that the wide variety of ways in which the desire for motherhood is subjectified nevertheless reinforces social inequalities.

Keen to tackle the ideological dimension of these situations, this number also turns its attention to Communist inspired regimes and – with Vietnam and Ethiopia –

presents two very similar situations, despite the fact that the geographical objects under consideration have almost nothing in common. These two articles explore the tensions produced by opening up to the market economy, the repositionings of power that they cause, and the new expectations they arouse.

The article by Marie Gibert and Juliette Segard, "*Urban Planning in Vietnam: A Vector for a Negotiated Authoritarianism?*" explores the question of day-to-day authoritarianism and analyses the procedures of its negotiation. They show how urban transformation constitutes a new and particularly coveted structure of political opportunity in Vietnamese society. By fully exploiting the resources of a relation between state and society that is undergoing a process of remodelling, local actors participate in the production of urban space by means of negotiation. In this negotiated and semi-shared authoritarian space, dominators and dominated use common criteria to legitimise their action on public space.

The construction of political legitimacy is at the heart of the article by Mehdi Labzaé entitled "*The authoritarian liberation of the western lands. State practices and the legitimation of the cadastre in contemporary Ethiopia*". Through a study of the ordering of landholding in a peripheral area of Ethiopia, the author analyses the actors and discourses involved in constructing the partial legitimacies of public action. While laws, access to land and ethnicity are reinterpreted in the light of multiple socially and historically situated factors, power for its part is expressed and exercised in the rearrangement of space.

Finally, the issue closes with an analysis of a situation in a democratic regime, in an article entitled: "*The lost sailors of Piraeus: crisis, racism and ordinary politics in a working-class Athens suburb*". Lucile Gruntz transports us into a day-to-day space where the interactions between urban life, migratory processes and xenophobia construct a discreet authoritarian space where "private changes are experienced collectively".

About the author : Sabine Planel is researcher for the IRD, UMR PRODIG

To quote this article: Sabine Planel, « Authoritarian spaces, (un)just spaces?» *justice spatiale | spatial justice*, n° 8 juillet 2015, http://www.jssj.org

Bibliographical references:

Agamben G., 2003, *Etat d'exception, Paris, Le Seuil.*

Agier M., 2008, *Gérer les indésirables. Des camps de réfugiés au gouvernement humanitaire,* Paris, Flammarion, 350 p.

Banégas R., 2003, *La démocratie à pas de caméléon,* Karthala, Paris.

Banégas R., Brisset-Foucault F., Cutolo A., 2012, « Espaces publiques de la parole et pratiques de la citoyenneté en Afrique », *Politique Africaine*, 127, 5-21

Bayart J.- F., 1984, « Le politique par le bas en situation autoritaire », *Esprit*, juin 1984, pp.142-154.

Bayart, J.-F., 2008a, « *Le concept de situation thermidorienne: régimes néo-révolutionnaires et libéralisation économique », Questions de recherche*, n°24, CERI Sciences Po, Paris.

Bayart J.-F., 2008b, «Hégémonie et coercition en Afrique sub-saharienne. La politique de la chicotte. », *Politique Africaine*, 110, 123-152

Barnett C., 2012, « Situating the geographies of injustice in democratic theory », *Geoforum*, 43, 677-686

Benin J. & Vairel F., 2011, *Social movements, mobilization and contestation in the Middle-East and North Africa,* Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Bénit-Gbaffou, 2012, "Party politics, civil society and local democracy – Reflections from Johannesburg", Geoforum, 2012, 43(2), pp. 178-189.

Bierschenk T., 2010, "States at Work in West Africa: Sedimentation, Fragmentation and Normative Double-Binds", Institut für Ethnologie und Afrikastudien, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität, working paper n°113, 22 p.

Bierschenk T, Oliver de Sardan J. P. , 2014, States at Works. Dynamics of African Bureaucracies, London, Brill, 442 p.

Bourmaud, D., 2006, « Aux sources de l'autoritarisme en Afrique : des idéologies et des hommes », *Revue Internationale de Politique Comparée*, n°13, pp. 625-641.

Brenner N., 2001, "The limits to scale? Methodological reflections on scalar structuration", *Progress in Human Geography,* vol.25, n°4, pp. 591-614.

Brenner N, 2004, *New State Spaces. Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*, Oxford, oxford University Press, 351 p.

Bridge G., 2013, "Territory, now in 3D!"*, Political Geography*, 34, 55-57

Brooker P., 2009, *Non-Democratic Regimes. Theory, Government and Politics,* Macmillan, Houndmills, 312 p.

Brown W., 2009, *Murs. Les murs de séparation et le déclin de la souveraineté étatique*, Les Prairies ordinaires, Paris.

Brown W., 2007, *Les habits neufs de la politique mondiale*, Les Prairies ordinaires, Paris.

Camau M. & Geisser V., 2003, *Le syndrome autoritaire,* Presses de Sciences Po, Paris.

Chatterjee P. 2009. *Politique des gouvernés. Réflexion sur la politique populaire dans la majeure partie du monde*. Editions Amsterdam. Paris.

Collier D., 1979, *The new authoritarianism in Latin America*, Princeton University Press

Dabène O., Geisser V. & Massardier G. (dir.), 2008, *Autoritarismes démocratiques et démocraties autoritaires au XXIe siècle,* La Découverte, Paris.

Dabène O., « Enclaves autoritaires en démocratie : perspectives latino-américaines », in Dabène O., Geisser V. & Massardier G. (dir.), 2008, *Autoritarismes démocratiques et démocraties autoritaires au XXIe siècle,* La Découverte, Paris, p. 89-112

Dikec M., 2005, « Space, politics and the political », *Environment and planning D : Society and Space*, 23, 171-188

Dobry M., 2005, « « Penser=classer ? » Entretien avec André Loez, Gérard Noiriel & Philippe Olivera », *Genèses,* n°59, pp. 151-165.

Dubois V., 2010, *La vie au guichet,* Economica, Paris.

Dubois V., Lozac'h V., Rowell J., 2005, « Jeux bureaucratiques en régime communiste », *Société contemporaines*, 57, 5-19

Dubresson A. & Jaglin S., 2005, « Gouvernance, régulation et territorialisation des espaces urbanisés, Approches et méthodes » *in* Antheaume B. et Giraut F. (eds), *Le territoire est mort, vive les territoires !,* IRD Editions, Paris, pp. 337-352.

Elden S., 2013, « Secure the volume: Vertical geopolitics and the depth of power », *Political Geography*, n°34, pp. 35-51.

Emmenegger, R., Sibilo Keno, Hagmann, T., , "Decentralization to the household: expansion and limits of State power in rural Oromiya" *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 5, n°4 (2012):733-754

Ferguson J., 2005, "Seeing Like an Oil Company: Space, Security, and Global Capital in Neoliberal Africa", *American Anthropologist,* vol 107, issue 3, pp. 377-382.

Ferrié J.-N., 2012, « Dispositifs autoritaires et changements politiques. Le cas de l'Egypte et du Maroc », *Revue internationale de politique comparée,* vol. 19, n°4, pp.93-110.

Foucault M., 1997 [1976], *Il faut défendre la société,* Gallimard, Paris.

Foucault M., 2004 [1978], *Sécurité, territoire, population,* Gallimard, Paris.

Fourchard L., 2007, « Violences et ordre politique au Nigeria », *Politique africaine* 2007/2 (N°106), p. 4-27

Gatelier K. & Valeri M., 2012, « Les stratégies de légitimation dans les régimes autoritaires. Perspectives comparées », *Revue internationale de politique comparée,* vol 19, n°4, pp.7-13.

Gervais-Lambony P., Benit-Gbaffou C., Musset A., Piermay J.L., Planel S. (Eds), *La Justice Spatiale et la ville, regards du sud*, Belin, Paris.

Goffmann E., 1991, *Les cadres de l'expérience. Minuit, Paris.*

Goirand, C. (2000). *La politique des favelas.* Paris: Karthala.

Hagmann, T. & Péclard, D., 2010, "Negociating Statehood: Dynamics of Power and Domination in Africa" *Development and Change* 41, n°4, 539-562.

Harvey D., 2008, *Géographie de la domination,* Les prairies ordinaires, Paris.

Harvey D., 2010, *Géographie et capital,* Syllepse, Paris.

Hibou B., 2011, *Anatomie politique de la domination,* La Découverte, Paris.

Hilgers M., Mazzocchetti J., 2010, *Révoltes et oppositions en contexte semi-autoritaire : le cas du Burkina Faso*, Karthala, Paris.

Froissart C., 2008, « Le système du *hukou*: pilier de la croissance chinoise et du maintien du PCC au pouvoir », *Études du CERI*, n°149,

Froissart C., 2014, « The Ambiguities between Contention and Political Participation: A Study of Civil Society Development in Authoritarian Regimes », *Journal of Civil Society*, 10, 3, 219-222

Jessop B., 2002, "Liberalism, Neoliberalism, and Urban Governance: A State Theoretical Perspective", in Brenner N., Theodore N. (éds), *Spaces of Neoliberalism : Urban Restructuring in North America and Western Europe,* London, Blackwell, pp. 105-125.

Kuhonta E. M., Slater D., Vu T., 2008, *Southeast Asia in Political Science. Theory, Region and Qualitative Analysis*, Sandford University Press, 480 p.

Labzaé M., 2015, « Les travailleurs du gouvernement. Encadrement partisan et formes du travail administratif dans l'administration éthiopienne », *Génèse,* n° 98, pp. 89-109

Lefebvre H., 2000 [1974], *La production de l'espace,* Economica, Paris.

Linz J.J., 2000, *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes,* Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder.

Lipsky M., 1980, *Street-level bureaucracy. Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services,* Russell Sage Foundation, New York.

Migdal, J. S., 2001, *State in Society: Studying How States and Societies Transform and Constitute One Another*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Morange M., 2015, "Street trade, neoliberalisation and the control of space: Nairobi's Central Business District in the era of entrepreneurial urbanism", *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, 9, 2, 247-269

Morelle M., 2013, « La prison centrale de Yaoundé : l'espace au cœur d'un dispositif de pouvoir », *Annales de géographie*, n°691, pp. 332-356.

Olivier de Sardan J.-P. & Blundo G., 2007, *Etat et corruption en Afrique,* Karthala, Paris.

Picard E., Le sécuritaire - culture, institutions et agents - au cœur de l'autoritarisme », in *Autoritarismes démocratiques, démocraties autoritaires ? Convergences Nord/Sud*, O. Dabène, G. Massardier, V. Geisser (dir.), Paris, La Découverte, 2008.

Planel S., 2014, « A view of the *Bureaucratic* Developmental State. Local governance and agricultural extension in rural Ethiopia", *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, 8, 3, 420-437

Planel S. & Jaglin S., 2014, « Echelles : partage des pouvoirs et partage de l'espace », *in* Gervais-Lambony P., Benit-Gbaffou C., Musset A., Piermay J.L., Planel S. (Eds), *La Justice Spatiale et la ville, regards du sud*, Belin, Paris.

Pommerolle M.-E., Vairel F., 2009, « S'engager en situation de contrainte », *Genèses*, n°77, pp.2-6.

Pommerolle M.-E., 2007, « Routines autoritaires et innovations militantes. Le cas d'un mouvement étudiant au Cameroun », *Politique Africaine*, n°108, pp. 155-172.

Purcell M., 2006, "Urban democracy and the Local Trap", in *Urban Studies*, 43(11), pp. 1921-1941.

Rancière J., 1998, Aux bords du politique, Paris, Folio Essais

Reigner H., 2013, "Vers une gouvernance néo-hygiéniste des conduits? Les formes renouvelées de la domination dans la ville pluraliste. », *Working paper du Programme Cities are Back in Town,* n° 2013-9, Paris, Science Po

Rowell J., 2006, *Le totalitarisme au concret : Le logement en RDA 1945-1989*, Paris, Economica, coll. Etudes politiques, 336 p.

Rowell J., 2005, « Les paradoxes de « l'ouverture bureaucratique » en RDA », *Sociétés contemporaines*, 57, 21-40

Swyngedouw E., 2000, "Authoritarian governance, power and the politics of rescaling", *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 18, pp. 63-76.

Swyngedouw E., 2009, "The Communist Hypothesis and Revolutionary Capitalisms: Exploring the Idea of Communist Geographies for the Twenty-first Century", *Antipode*, 41, 298-319

Swyngedouw E., 2011, "Interrogating post-democratization: Reclaiming egalitarian political spaces." *Political Geography* 30, no. 7(2011) : 370-380

Scott J.C., 1998, *Seeing like a State,* Yale University Press, New Haven.

Scott J. C., 1987, *Weapons of the Weak. Everyday forms of peasant resistance,* Yale University Press, New Haven, 392 p.

Siméant J., 2013, "Protester/Mobiliser/Ne pas consentir. Sur quelques avatars de la sociologie des mobilisations appliquée au continent africain », *Revue internationale de politique comparée*, vol. 20, n°2, pp. 125- 143.

Smith, N., 1996, *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City.* Routledge

Soja E., 2010, *Seeking Spatial Justice*, University of Minnesota Press, 256 p.

Springer S., 2009, « Renewed authoritarianism in Southeast Asia: Undermining democracy through neoliberal reform, *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 50, 3, 271-276

Tilly C. & Tarrow S., 2006, *Contentious Politics,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Vaughan, S. "Revolutionary democratic state-building: party, state and people in the EPRDF's Ethiopia" *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 5, n°4 (2011): 619-640

Weber M., 1995 [1921], *Economie et Société*, Plon, Paris.

Zinoman P., 2001, The Colonial Bastille. A History of Imprisonment in Vietnam, 1862-1940, University of California Press, 370 p.