From 1975, Vientiane shifted once again to being primarily a Lao urban centre, although broader regional and global processes continue to shape the city. From 1975 to the late 1980s and early 1990s, these were Vietnamese and Soviet influences, although the authors note that Vientiane shows relative little evidence of Soviet-style architecture and urban planning. From the 1990s, forces shaping Vientiane have shifted to include substantial influence from Thailand, south-east Asia more generally within the framework of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and Asian Development Bank inspired ‘Greater Mekong Sub-region’ and the broader trends of contemporary globalisation.

As this review should make clear, one of the authors’ main points is that (with the partial exception of the Lan Xang period) Vientiane and its history have been constructed largely through processes of marginalisation, as much or more than processes of centrality commonly associated with and assumed for urban sites. The detail and clarity this book brings to the account make it well worth consideration by anyone who is interested in theories of urbanism and urbanisation. As a superb account of a small, out-of-the-way city in a small, out-of-the-way nation, one hopes that this book will not be destined to marginality and obscurity by the very processes it critiques.

**Eric C. Thompson**  
*Department of Sociology*  
*National University of Singapore*
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In recent decades, new narratives and strategies of space control have entered the thinking and practices of policing: crime hot spots, dangerous places, banning orders, open street CCTV, place-specific police powers to stop-and-search and computerised crime mapping are some examples. This trend is accompanied by the downscaling of policing competencies and the responsibilisation of local actors through the creation of crime reduction partnerships, public safety round tables, urban wardens, and the revitalisation of municipal police forces.

It is this spatial turn in policing that the German geographer Bernd Belina critically examines from a Marxist perspective in his book *Raum, Überwachung, Kontrolle: Vom staatlichen Zugriff auf städtische Bevölkerung* (Space, surveillance, control: governing urban populations). What are the meanings of space and scale for contemporary crime control and criminal justice policies? Do they really matter in these contexts, and if so, how? These are the key questions approached by the author.

His answer is, briefly spoken, that space and scale do matter, but not as abstract factors that determine the social and urban fabric or explain their shape and change. Instead, both space and scale are strategically utilised in spatial and scalar practices in order to regulate and maintain the social order and mode of capitalist production and manage its inherent crises. The concept of governing through crime through space and scale is the key to Belina’s book. Against the ‘democracy at work’ thesis that criminal justice policies are responding to the electorates’ demands, Belina argues in the tradition of critical criminology that they actually create and frame fear and discourses on crime. The specific function of space in these discourses and policies then is to justify a pre-emptive risk-based logic of crime control that is expanding state control beyond individual acts or criminalised groups towards selected territories being labelled as ‘criminal’ or ‘dangerous’.

Thus, Belina argues “against space” (p. 25) and its respective turns and fetishisms. Instead, drawing on Henry Lefebvre and radical geographers such as David Harvey and Neil Smith, he suggests that space (as well as scale) is meaningless without the context of social processes.
and practices. The author works with a dualism and thus escapes from Lefèbvre’s “ominous third” (p. 40), the _espace vécu_. Space is the physical, material space, on the one hand, and stands for meaning, signifier and ideology on the other. Rather than standing for themselves, space and scale are invoked in social practices as the means—or, if deployed against other interests, even as strategies—of achieving economic, political or other purposes, such as “landscape in order to walk ..., territory in order to exercise power over population” (p. 28). How this happens in the context of crime control and criminal justice policies is exemplified in the empirical chapters of the book which study different aspects of such spatial and scalar practices with a focus on Germany and the US.

First, Belina shows how the buzz-words and concepts of ‘broken windows’, ‘zero tolerance’ and ‘New York’ are deployed as ideologies of space to the end of, borrowing from Jonathan Simon (1997), “governing through crime”. The ‘broken windows’ thesis proposes that the social phenomenon of increased presence of ‘disorderly’ people in particular areas might attract and entail severe crime and a breakdown of social order. In so doing, the thesis serves as justification for the spatially selective enforcement of a neo-conservative vision of order. The ambivalence of zero tolerance as a flexible concept to denote disproportionate racist police work as well as a measured and just law enforcement allows it simultaneously to promote and conceal the selective policing of space. When deployed against drug markets in Afro-American ghettos, zero tolerance policing might satisfy the revanchism of White suburban middle classes as well as it might nurture the hopes of the resident population. Last but not least, ‘New York’ as spatial metaphor is exploited to prove the alleged success of such policing strategies and to promote their superiority over competing strategies.

Secondly, Belina discusses how debates about public space mask the shift from inclusionary towards exclusionary visions of social control. While earlier notions of public space represented ideals of equality and citizenship, recent slogans to ‘reclaim the streets’ indicate the move to displace certain sections of the population in order to appease others. Thirdly, he shows how efforts to ‘reclaim the street’ materialise in the form of open street CCTV, banning orders and the selective policing of territories targeting the unwanted and marginalised, the beggars, junkies, prostitutes and homeless, those whose ‘phenotypes’ disturb aesthetic visions of new urbanism.

Fourthly, it is shown how responsibilities for crime control have oscillated between the local and the central state in the US since the 1920s and how these politics of “scale jumping” (p. 269) are determined by strategic interests and the quest for regulation. Only from the 1920s onwards did local police forces become more formalised (ending community-based policing of frontiers and boundaries), while in the 1960s the federal state intervened for the first time at the local scale in response to the urban riots during this time. Since the 1980s, the ‘war on drugs’ has brought federal law on the agenda while the 1990s witnessed the promotion of ‘community policing’. (De)industrialisation and spatial strategies on crime, the author shows, are deeply intertwined.

He concludes that the changing practices of governing through crime through space and scale are to be understood as efforts to manage the economic and political contradictions of capitalism. The spatial turn in policing and the new downscaling of crime control thus have to be seen as efforts to stabilise the neo-liberal project by regulating and containing the ‘surplus’ population at possible low costs.

Belina’s comprehensive analysis of the role that space and scale play for criminal justice policies is a sophisticated synthesis of critical criminology and radical geography. It both echoes and refines works on the governing of neo-liberalism through crime as, for instance, indicated in the ‘roll out’ concept of Jamie Peck and Adam Tickell (2002) or elaborated in the writings of Steve Herbert (1997; Herbert and Brown, 2006).
Sometimes the author paints with a very broad brush, for instance, when he more or less ignores the significant quantitative and qualitative differences between open street CCTV in Britain and Germany. Moreover, one wonders why there is basically no word about space strategies outside urban areas, despite their importance for the policing of borders and the control of migrants who are, as Belina will know, key (not only) to the neo-liberal project.

However, his book is an important contribution to the understanding of strategies of crime control in (neo-liberal) capitalism and, what is more, it is part of the author’s project to transfer and translate the ideas of radical geography and promote them among a German-speaking audience (Belina and Michel, 2007). Thus, it is also a contribution to a better understanding between Anglophones and researchers from continental Europe—obviously a matter of concern for the author (Belina, 2005).

Volker Eick
John F. Kennedy Institute
Department of Politics
Freie Universität Berlin

and Eric Töpfer
Zentrum Technik and Gesellschaft
Technische Universität Berlin
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The argument in Blair’s Community can be succinctly put in three propositions: that it is generally thought that New Labour has been an administration whose philosophical approach to governance and society includes a large dose of communitarianism; that this would be a difficult case to make even if it were true given the breadth of communitarian thinking and the divisions within that genre; and that it is in fact not the case anyway, since any supposed communitarianism in Blair’s approach was a misreading of the many and contradicting signals emitted in his term of office by a Prime Minister whose particular brand of high pragmatism included discursive mechanisms which he perceived to hit the right public buttons.

As the author points out, Blair was singled out by Amitai Etzioni as one of the UK’s examples of a “growing number of political leaders” who “often speak communitarian” (Etzioni, 1995, p. ix), but her suggestion is that even this appropriation by the communitarian order was a misinterpretation of the true meaning of the various soundbites that constituted Blair’s communitarian repertoire. Blair was for Hale, in essence, an authoritarian who recognised the possible unpopularity of parts of his ‘common sense’ approach to crime and incivility and took linguistic measures to dilute the more hard-line consequences of an intolerant law-and-order agenda with the more inclusive implications that radiate from the “warm glow” of talk of community (Hale, 2006, p. 76). I have put this in slightly more bald terms than the author does, but I do not