

Heterotopia and Postmodern Community in the Context of Migration and Relationship Towards Migrants

Vlaho Kovačević, Krunoslav Malenica

How to cite

Kovačević, V., Malenica, K. (2021). Heterotopia and Postmodern Community in the Context of Migration and Relationship Towards Migrants. [Italian Sociological Review, 11 (1), 63-86]
Retrieved from [<http://dx.doi.org/10.13136/isr.v11i1.415>]

[DOI: 10.13136/isr.v11i1.415]

1. Author information

Vlaho Kovačević

Department of Sociology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,
University of Split, Split, Croatia

Krunoslav Malenica

Department of Sociology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,
University of Split, Split, Croatia

2. Author e-mail address

Vlaho Kovačević

E-mail: vkovacevic@ffst.hr

Krunoslav Malenica

E-mail: kmalenica@ffst.hr

3. Article accepted for publication

Date: November 2020

Additional information about
Italian Sociological Review
can be found at:

[About ISR-Editorial Board-Manuscript submission](#)

Heterotopia and Postmodern Community in the Context of Migration and Relationship Towards Migrants

Vlaho Kovačević*, Krunoslav Malenica*

Corresponding author:

Vlaho Kovačević

E-mail: vkovacevic@ffst.hr

Corresponding author:

Krunoslav Malenica

E-mail: kmalenica@ffst.hr

Abstract

This work approaches the issue of migration of the Arab population to Europe within the idea of postmodern community and the concept of heterotopia. The social and historical context (of globalization and migration) imposes necessity to discuss the community and postmodern circumstances. In this paper we refer to Foucault's heterotopic elements within the context of migrations; places of refuge, shelters and migrants' asylums present certain heterotopias of our society; absolute other places that give a mirror-like mixing experience. Our analysis shows how the underlying motives for resolving some of the key social problems of contemporary Europe and new community formation are not (just) at the level of social forms, but in the vital transformation of people, their lives and relations towards the Other.

Keywords: heterotopia, postmodern community, migrants' asylums.

* Department of Sociology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Split, Split, Croatia.

1. Introduction

The present epoch will perhaps be above all the epoch of space. We are in the epoch of simultaneity: we are in the epoch of juxtaposition, the epoch of the near and far, of the side-by-side, of the dispersed. We are at a moment, I believe, when our experience of the world is less that of a long life developing through time than that of a network that connects points and intersects with its own skein. One could perhaps say that certain ideological conflicts animating present-day polemics oppose the pious descendents of time and the determined inhabitants of space. (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986: 22).

Through addressing the issue of the migrations of the Arab population to Europe, we address the idea that the community implies belonging (Day 2006; Delanty 2018) in terms of national, ethnic and religious affiliation, way of life, lifestyle and a number of other features. Modern society sees the reoccurring need for belonging, arisen from the fact that insecurity has become a major experience (Bauman, 2001) for many people in the context of the phenomenon of migrations. All of this certainly affects a certain level of closing towards the other and the different. If we accept the thesis that community is essentially concerned with the fundamental human need for belonging (dramatically contested by the emergence of contemporary migrations), the question arises as to whether the migrations of the Arab population present a (symbolic and/or real) threat to certain (European) communities.

It is from this issue that the problem of attitudes towards migrations and towards migrants occurs, which can be symptomatically observed by analyzing the places of refuge, shelters and asylums. These are certain heterotopias of our society; absolute other places that undoubtedly give a mirror-like mixing and bounding experience (Foucault, Miskowiec, 1986). The issue of migration stretches through public and scientific discourse on multiple levels, i.e. from multiple perspectives and viewpoints (Giddens, 1994).

Using a different, unconventional conceptualization (introducing the phenomena of heterotopia and symbolic community into the analysis of migration processes), we try to point out the necessity of thinking outside the box if wanting to find any applicable methods and models for solving current social and political problems which occur as a result of migration processes.

The general attitude towards the migrations of the Arab population to Europe, as well as the relationship and attitude towards migrants and asylum seekers, will depend on the ability and effectiveness of the scientific community (both in finding solutions and in presenting them to the public and decision makers). These are certainly significant issues for Europe (Croatia included) as

migrations affect the transformation of community (Castles, 2002; Al-Ali, Koser 2003), identity (La Barbera, 2014) and culture (Erel, 2010).

2. Community in the context of postmodernity and the self-rediscovery

Defining a *community* means drawing boundaries that divide it from that and/or those that is/are not part of it. The community therefore necessarily seeks not only an understanding of the formation of its identity, but also sufficient reasons to understand its specificity, represented by different cultural and national communities shaped by different histories, religions, languages, customs, etc. Migration of the Arab population to Europe certainly influences the transformation of communities, identities and cultures.

Delanty (2018) claims how nowadays identity has become an issue because the reference points for the self have become unstuck; the capacity for autonomy is no longer held in check by rigid structures, such as class, gender, nation or ethnicity. Thus, the self can be invented in many ways, as in and through new technologies of communication (Delanty, 2018). “One of the major themes in postmodernist thought over the past twenty years concerns the identity of the self. The question ‘Who am I?’ has returned today in a whole variety of contexts, including feminism, multiculturalism, ethnicity and race” (Delanty, 2018: 158).

Therefore, we have approached the understanding of the community in the context of migration and the relationship towards migrants through the question “Who are we, as a community?” “All present struggles revolve around the question: Who are we?” (Foucault, 2002: 331). “My objective”, Foucault explained, “has been to create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects” (Foucault, 2002: 326).

This is about generating relationships, which is primarily determined by external influences, which are the historical product of particular discourses and technologies. At the same time, Foucault questions identity as a permanent category that partly derives precisely from historicity of identity (Gunn, 2006). In other words, identities are seen as having been constructed historically; they are therefore, if not transient, at least open to the possibility of change and subversion (Gunn, 2006).

The mentioned changing nature of identity fits in with the views on change and what Foucault called governmentality, or the practices and techniques by which control is exercised over people (Ritzer, 2007). The cost of this rationalization process, which spans through many periods, becomes apparent when we look at what Foucault called the “dark side” of the instrumental rationalization of Europe’s modernization, which is the excruciating history of

the increasing discipline and subjugation of living embodied subjectivity, covered by the veil of legal superstructure (Kemper, 1993). Kemper adds that all the social and cultural aspects of civil society – the produced institutions, forms of consciousness and cultures – become the embodiment of the only primal driving force: either the desire for power or the subject's effort to rule the world (Kemper, 1993).

The culmination of the instrumental rationalization is its integration into the organization of government, which is able to fully control and manage social life as a result of the regulatory action of administratively perfect organizations. These institutions and organizations encroach on the life circumstances of each individual to make her/him a submissive member of society through discipline and control, manipulation and training, within the body disciplining (Kemper, 1993). In other words, subjects in an understanding of their own self and creating their own personalities, educate themselves over the course of history for that which power strategies will use as an object of ruling and manipulation (Kemper, 1993). Returning to the question of relation to oneself and the question of knowing oneself as a subject, in his recent works, Foucault interprets human subjectivity no longer as a manipulative field of the power technique, but as an independent and creative factor in every single system of power. Irrespective of this, in the major works on power theory, individuals are no other than passive beings subject to form and manipulation (Kemper, 1993).

On the other hand of Foucault's concept of modernity and the destruction of the subject as the creator of meaning, "community is what takes place through others and for others" (Nancy, 1991: 15). "In community, the self finds its identity in a relationship with others. This view of community resists every attempt to pin it down in an institutional or spatial structure since it is something that is only experienced. The point is that community is experienced in a communicative relationship and not in a common bond as such, since it does not take a concrete form" (Delanty, 2018: 162).

It really takes time to get to know people. Every relationship changes us. Each of us must be ready and willing to change before engaging in a relationship. Collective and group instrumental rationality which produces prejudices often falls short already in the first encounters with the Other. However, the problem of the instrumental rationality will not be solved by aggressively imposing different policies and ideologies from "above"; this is yet another in a series of missed (and possibly misdirected) attempts to change.

Prejudice and initial ultimate rejection are rather the result of fear and misunderstanding than of human wickedness and inhumanity. It is for this reason that rigidly placed collective attitudes of instrumental rationality at the macro level blunt their edges and loosen when people get to know each other through individual and personal relationships at the micro level. In doing so,

knowledge and experience are imposed as two key factors in mitigating sharpened and apparently irreconcilable differences.

The personality structures, on the one hand, show how identities operate in the social space of new cultural struggles for identity, culture and ideology,¹ which led to the beginning of the discourse on identity when the discourse on community stopped. This potentially leads to reactionary parallel processes in the form of re-nationalization, anti-immigrant political discourse, creation of anti-immigrant parties, and strengthening of xenophobia and conflicts in Europe that arise when completely different and often exclusive national and religious communities clash (Beyer, 1994).

On the other hand, determinants of culture and identity mark the effort required to move closer to the identity and self-understanding of the culture and nation in which individuals live. This, in turn, led to a resumption of discourse on community, because as we moved to a higher, more developed stage of society, we became stuffed with identity (Bauman, 2001). Under the guise of globalization of socio-structural and cultural forces, we have left the problem of community open. In postmodern society, the community still exists, but in its fragile and changing form of new shapes of community (Delanty, 2018) of consumer culture, lifestyles and hybrid-transnational cultures of changing identities.

The concept of creation of identity – the social processes involved in creating an individual sense of identity – is at the heart of the problem of the postmodern community. As the subject of the identity-building process, it is bound by action, as well as thought, by social practice and social imagination (Jenkins, 1996), thus it seeks to be overcome in the removed form – and therefore needs to be studied as such. Otherwise, the *irreconcilable* opposites occur at the identity level. Michel Foucault often viewed modernity as a means of “understanding the present, which did not require recourse to transcendent principles – certain concepts such as, for example, the concept of totality” (Swingewood, 1998: 142-143).

In sum, we can say that identity becomes an issue when the self ceases to be taken for granted (Delanty, 2018). Foucault in later works returned to the

¹ Recreating the community or seeing it is as something that has yet to be recreated is an important theme of some of the most influential universalist political ideologies of modernity, especially those that marked the period between 1830 and 1989 (Delanty, 2018). Delanty calls this historical sequence “The age of ideologies”, and among the most significant political ideologies of that turbulent period, he includes the doctrines of liberalism, republicanism, conservatism, communism, socialism, anarchism, zionism, fascism, and various nationalisms. All these ideologies – except liberalism – in their foundations included certain concepts of community, which, in turn, functioned largely as a normative ideal.

self, seeing new possibilities for a recovery of the human subject. Delanty further explains how the demise of the subject has not meant the death of the self. For instance, in his final writings Foucault became more interested in the possibility of a new ethics based on resistance (Foucault, Ewald 2003; Delanty, 2018). Finally, the contemporary understanding of the self is that of a social self formed in relations of difference rather than of unity and coherence (Delanty, 2018).

3. The self, information society and migrations

Postmodern concepts of community, in Delanty's view, stress the fluidity of relations between self and other, leading to a view of community as open rather than closed. The upshot of all of this is a transformative notion of community which fills the space of mass culture (Delanty, 2018). The postmodern is the age of a new social upgrade marking the entry into the digital and technological period of history (Ritzer, Smart, 2003), accompanied by the creation of a new form of virtual reality. "However, two specific remarks should be noted. First, the postmodern is often used to imply that a specific ethos, or way of experiencing the world, or *Zeitgeist* is in play in the postmodern (see Bauman, 2003; Lemert, 1997; Lyotard, 1992). Secondly, the postmodern constitutes a new and distinctive social order (see Bauman, 1988; Featherstone, 2007; Ritzer, 1997: ch. 11)" (Ritzer, Smart, 2003: 310).

The Internet, social networks, globalization, materialism, the development of consumerism and society of spectacle have created a complex system of social values, affinities and priorities. In the inexhaustible swirl of daily information and news, an average citizen feels at the same time both a player and a spectator. As the one who actively works and spends but at the same time idles consuming the empty entertaining content of mainstream media. In doing so, she/he does not manage to unite and enrich any identity, including herself/himself. It will be clear that the distinctions outlined above make available a range of postmodern positions. "So, the reluctance of a Baudrillard, Derrida or Foucault to accept the label 'postmodern' when their orientations seem so close to what was defined as 'postmodernist' above can be linked to a fear of complicity in an idea of 'postmodernity' that seems to derive from modernist models of historical evolution and social system" (Ritzer, Smart, 2003: 310).

Putting the above-mentioned in the context of migrations, it can be seen how in the mainstream media a somewhat derogatory tone is dominant, which attaches label of "unsuitable and unacceptable" to migrants and asylum seekers in a civilized, European and Christian context. These are clearly not new

phenomena, and they have been analyzed for more than a century within the framework of social theory in the context of migration topics, relations between the domicile and immigrant population, foreigners, metropolis, and later the clash of civilizations, the incommensurability between Islamic and Christian culture, etc.

European fears are certainly not unfounded; there is a whole range of extremist and radical movements within the Arab world that look upon the West with disdain and are ready to act and “give” their life for the “greater” good. One of the reasons for this is also the emergence of different social identities of the social and cultural community, within which it is impossible to discover common elements in the historical articulations of the community, as well as structural determinations of the main social forms of such articulations in order to overcome the state of dependence on ideologies and mentalities; a state of casual spiritual vanity emanating from the unmeasured relativization of uncertainty, coincidence, the crown of which is an awareness of one’s finality.

This experience, according to Delanty, captures the essence of the postmodern sensibility, namely the feeling of insecurity, contingency and uncertainty both in the world and in the identity of the self (Delanty, 2018). Thus, failing to control the capacity for autonomy, the self can be invented in many ways, as in and through new technologies of communication (Delanty, 2018).

Referring to the remarkable “Halt and Catch Fire” TV series, which is about the very beginnings of PC technology and the creation of social networks in the late 1980s, there arises the question: Is security a myth?² We wonder if we can learn to take care of each other in times of mass connectivity? Will this horrible, destructive new connection isolate us from one another and ultimately leave us totally alone, with the least space for humanity, solidarity and empathy for vulnerable social groups?

Foucault believes these manipulations through the mass media, that is, in the institutions of industrialized culture, are dependent on body disciplining procedures, carried by seemingly loosely interconnected institutions – such as schools, factories, prisons, asylums (Kemper, 1993). This is about a concept of abstract space that began to function in the early nineteenth century as a paradigm of Foucault’s disciplinary power (Foucault, 1980). It is certain that the political and ideological aspirations will once again succeed in “overshadowing” the necessity of openness and overcoming prejudice (Foucault, 2010). “Thus, the realistically utopian way of thinking – the eminently demanding determinant of the human spirit – is transformed into verbal venting and abdicating rhetoric” (Jukić, 1975: 39).

² <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-yVosy3k75g&feature=youtu.be> (5/9/2019).

Despite the great possibility of the entry of extreme Arab population to Europe, as well as the spread of Islamic culture and “threats” to Christian culture and European standards of living, there are proportional opportunities for the entry of the unprotected, displaced, vulnerable, poor and needy citizens. And they should also get their place in the public, media and destination goals when this complex contemporary problem is addressed.

4. Migrations, asylums and heterotopias

Fargues (2004) emphasizes that the Arab migration to Europe is a matter of discrepancy between facts and policies. He argues that migration is a key dimension of the actual relationship between the two shores of the Mediterranean; (1) one that is likely to bring more benefits to both parties in the near future due to the exceptional economic and demographic conditions that are expected to prevail; and, on the contrary, (2) migration has become an issue that most governments dislike, not only in matters of internal policy as a scapegoat that politicians can blame for all sorts of illnesses at home, but also in matters of external policy as a stumbling block on the Mediterranean negotiating table.

Current geopolitical situation in the Middle East and the omnipresence of “Islamic terrorism” in daily media life of the West as well as of the Republic of Croatia certainly can (and probably they have already done it) create the environment and the overall socio-political context for developing negative attitudes toward Muslims and Islam in the West (Kovačević, Malenica, Jelaska, 2020).

This is also supported by a number of recent papers in (Western) Europe addressing the theme of Islam and Muslims, as well as issues of migration, refugee crisis and the relationship of the domicile population towards migrants and asylum seekers. They have been quite investigated in the area of the Republic of Croatia (Franc, Šakić, Kaliterna-Lipovčan, 2008; Šram, 2010; Čapo, 2015; Župarić-Iljić, Gregurović, 2013; Gregurović, Kutli, Župarić-Iljić, 2016; Malenica, Kovačević, Kardum, 2019; Kovačević, Malenica, Jelaska, 2020), as well as globally (Stephan, Ybarra, Bachman, 1999; Fetzer, Soper, 2003; Klocker, Dunn, 2003; Ervasti, 2004; Kerwin, 2005; Field, 2007; Louis et al., 2007; González et al., 2008; McDonald, 2008; Strabac, Listhaug, 2008; Bleich, 2009; Lalić-Novak, Padjen, 2009; Wike, Grim, 2010; Adida et al., 2010; Pereira, Vala, Costa-Lopes, 2010; Ciftci, 2012; Savelkoul et al., 2012; Spruyt, Elchardus, 2012; Carr, Haynes, 2013; Elchardus, Spruyt, 2014; Mandel, 2014; Nilsson, 2015; Kerwin, 2016; Pedersen, Hartley, 2017). In general, Kovačević, Malenica and Jelaska (2020) conclude that the most important predictors of ethnocentrism

are the perception of national security threats coming from members of some national minorities and the perception of threats to national cultural integrity that comes from immigrants. Many of them refer to the increased values of negative attitudes toward Muslims in Europe, which can be brought in the context of immigration and terrorism, poor economic conditions, the cultural heritage of communism and the lack of democratic tradition in post-communist countries (Jeong, 2017).

Despite the historical presence of a certain kind of animosity and prejudice against Islam and Muslims, Markešić (2013) argues that the foundations of modern “islamophobia” have appeared since the 1960s. With the development of national economies and the economies of leading European countries, the demand for labor is growing, of course, if possible, as cheaply as possible. Thus, the author continues, there is a large influx of labor from less developed countries of Southern and Southeastern Europe and mostly Muslim countries, whether they are the Maghreb and West Africa, the Indochina Peninsula or Turkey.

The permanent settlement of a certain number of Muslims throughout Western and Northern Europe increases the problem of reconciling the European tradition based on secularity and the Muslim tradition, which has a completely different attitude towards marriage, family, religion and state, etc (Markešić, 2013). Political scientist Bassam Tibi emphasizes they have two options: (1) to become political Europeans and keep their Islamic identity, or (2) to retreat to one of the Islamic ghettos and not communicate with the public around them. Consequently, there are two groups of European Muslims: integrated Muslims and ghettoized Muslims (Tibi according to Markešić, 2013).

On that trail, it is possible to follow the phenomenon of migrant's asylums in the context of Foucault's concept of heterotopia.

Johnson (2016a) emphasizes that the biography of the concept of heterotopia has a significant place within the overall context of what is often called a ‘spatial turn’ in social theory (Cragg, Thrift, 2000) and a related ‘postmodern turn’ within human geography (Minca, 2001). Spatial theories have been explored in relation to the structure of language, the process of writing, themes of identity and experience, and notions about new forms of global communication while seminal works within these theoretical developments include Jameson's focus on space in *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (1991) and the English translation of Lefebvre's *The Production of Space* (1991) (Johnson 2016a).

Foucault's first reference to the concept of heterotopia appeared in 1966 in his preface to *Les Mots et les choses*, later translated into English as *The Order of Things* (1970). Foucault interests are not just the amazing juxtapositions, but the fact that such juxtapositions are impossible except in the space of language, a

contradictory 'unthinkable space' (Johnson, 2016b). He compares such ambiguous textual space with the tradition of 'utopias', a place (*topos*) that is both nowhere (*outopia*) and a good place (*eutopia*). Borges' invention, in stark contrast, is a 'heterotopia', a different or another (*heteros*) place. Whether Foucault was aware of it or not, it is also worth noting that heterotopia is originally a medical term referring to a particular tissue that develops at another place than is usual (Johnson 2016b).

Returning to the terms used in both the preface to *The Order of Things* and the radio broadcast, Foucault (1970) describes two major types of emplacement that involve these extraordinary properties: utopias and heterotopias. The latter are probably in every culture, in every civilization; like utopias these sites relate to other sites by both representing and at the same time inverting them; unlike utopias, however, they are localized and real. In some ways they are like utopias that are practiced or enacted. Foucault also spends some time discussing what he describes as the 'intermediate example of the 'mirror' – the thoroughly disruptive experience of the mirror produces a 'placeless place'. The link with heterotopia concerns the ability to be both different and the same, both unreal and real (Johnson, 2016b).

Turning to heterotopia directly, there are bunch of verbs that Foucault uses to describe these different spaces – 'mirror', 'reflect', 'represent', 'designate', 'speak about' all other sites, but at the same time 'suspend', 'neutralize', 'invert', 'contest' and 'contradict' those sites. He goes on to support his argument by providing, rather didactically, a list of principles and, rather teasingly perhaps, a diverse range of examples (Johnson, 2016b):

1. arise in all cultures but in diverse forms – pre-modern 'crisis' places (e.g. for adolescents, menstruating women, old people), voyage des noces (honeymoon trip), nineteenth century boarding and military schools; places of 'deviation' (e.g. rest homes, psychiatric hospitals, prisons, old people's homes)
2. mutate and have specific operations at different points in history – cemeteries
3. juxtapose in a single space several incompatible spatial elements – cinemas, theatres, gardens, Persian carpets
4. encapsulate temporal discontinuity or accumulation – fairs, 'primitive' vacation villages, museums, libraries
5. presuppose an ambivalent system of rituals related to opening/closing and entry/exit – barracks, prisons, Muslim baths, Scandinavian saunas, motel rooms used for illicit sex
6. function in relation to the remaining space, for example, as illusion or compensation – brothels, Puritan communities, Jesuit colonies.

Foucault's accounts of heterotopia have probably provoked more discussion and controversy than any other of his minor texts, articles or interviews and remain briefly sketched, provisional and at times confusing (Johnson, 2016a). Genocchio (1995) notes a clear inconsistency between the presentations of the notion in the preface to *The Order of Things*. Dehaene and De Cauter (2008) consider it incomplete, as it does not fully address the third stage of 'emplacement' in Foucault's brief comments on the history of space. Soja (1996) suggests that Foucault's ideas are not only incomplete; they are also 'inconsistent' and at times 'incoherent'. A specific instance can be found in the way he presents his first 'principle' in his lecture. Johnson (2016a) argues that Foucault first of all suggests it refers to the way heterotopias are found in all cultures with no universal form and then goes on to suggest two 'major types' relating to crises and deviation. Author, therefore, raises the question as to where we draw the line. "If we include the prison as a 'different space', and the other 'deviation heterotopia' that Foucault associates with it – boarding schools, psychiatric hospitals, barracks, old people's homes – where do we stop? If we are inclusive here, does this not create an imbalance in that these institutions, as Foucault reveals in his other work, have more in common with each other than with festivals, cemeteries, brothels and so on?" (Johnson, 2016a: 2). In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault (2012) outlines four different 'principles' which characterize the spatial distribution of prisons, schools, factories and naval hospitals in the late eighteenth century without mentioning heterotopia. The fact that Foucault never returned to the concept of heterotopia directly, despite concentrating on the detailed and complex spatial arrangements within a range of institutions, at least raises some doubts as to its potential usefulness (Johnson, 2016a).

One of major problems with Foucault's account of these spaces therefore concerns the question of the extent of their 'difference' and how such difference can be measured (Johnson, 2016a: 2). Saldanha (2008) argues that such terminology undermines the whole schema. She claims that Foucault's notion is fundamentally defective because it is based on structuralist fallacies and reduces spatial difference to a 'quasi-transcendent totality'.

A recent collection of essays by mainly architects, planners and urbanists, *Heterotopia and the City* (Dehaene, De Cauter, 2008a), demonstrates clearly various contradictions. The editors put forward an emphasis on 'play' and holiday in all its guises, arguing that heterotopia is above all a *liminal space, a break from normality* (Dehaene, De Cauter, 2008b). They argue that – in the principles and distinctions that Foucault indicates – we are left with different axes and related qualifications such as imaginary (real/unreal), temporal (permanent/transient) and anthropological (normal/abnormal).

This double logic is, according to Johnson (2016a), a possible key to interpreting heterotopia, emphasizing the relational aspect of the concept. In a sense, heterotopias do not exist, except in relation to other spaces; “heterotopia is perhaps more about a point of view, or a method of using space as a tool of analysis. In a sense, heterotopia is a modest, in some respects, underwhelming, notion that teases us to think about new ways of relating and conceiving spaces and places” (Johnson, 2016a: 3).

4.1 Heterotopia – some attempts of defining the term

As is often remarked, there are also complex and subtle differences in English and French between space (*espace*) and place (*lieu*) (Johnson, 2016b). Augé (1995) provides a succinct distinction. He argues that ‘space’ is more abstract than ‘place’. The former term can refer to an area, a distance and, significantly in relation to Foucault’s concept of heterotopia, a temporal period (the space of two days). The latter more tangible term is relational, concerned with identity and linked to an event or a history, whether mythical or real (Augé, 1995). For Agnew (2005) space is traditionally seen as a general and objective notion, related to some form of location, whereas place refers to the particular, related to the ‘occupation’ of a location. However, Foucault strongly favors the word ‘emplacement’, a term which has a sense of both space and place, and which is repeated over twenty times in the introductory paragraphs (Johnson, 2016b).

In his detailed essay, Johnson (2016a) offers a thorough overview of interpretations of heterotopias. He points out how the notion of Foucault’s ‘different spaces’ can be found scattered across literary studies (see Bryant-Bertail, 2000; Meerzon, 2007), science fiction studies (see Somay, 1984; Gordon, 2003) and curriculum and childhood studies (see Sumaura, Davis, 1999; McNamee, 2000) (Johnson, 2016a). Vattimo (1992) uses the general term heterotopia to describe the productive features of a postmodern era driven by the mass media and communicative technologies. He encapsulates the emergence of post-modernity as a transformative aesthetic experience based upon plurality of different ‘worlds’.

In *The Badlands of Modernity*, Kevin Hetherington (1997) provides a convincing relational perspective which avoids seeing heterotopia as fundamentally oppositional or marginal. He anchors his interpretation within the evolution of specific social spaces during the formative years of modernity. Hetherington defines heterotopia as “different places which provide either an unsettling or an alternative representation of spatial and social relations” (Hetherington, 1997: 8). When the spatial aspect of Foucault’s other major works is discussed by Hetherington, the prison, asylum and hospital are lumped

together and defined within a 'metaphor of the panopticon'. Hence, Hetherington describes heterotopia as laboratories for experimenting with new ways of ordering society – heterotopia, and by implication, modernity itself, is characterized by combining, in new ways, aspects of social control and expressions of freedom (Johnson, 2016a).

Shane (2005) endorses and builds on functionalist dimension. Heterotopias 'help maintain the city's stability as a self-organising system' (Shane, 2005: 231). They work to handle exceptions containing specialized exclusions as in prisons, or they can help balance binary forces, for example, consumption and production, or they can act as facilitators, for example, addressing the need for speed through virtual spaces. A key function is to contain people and activities that have been classified as 'taboo' (Shane, 2005) or the 'rejected elements necessary to construct an urban system' (Shane, 2005: 244). They are spaces that can act as safety valves, gathering exceptions, making them harmless, avoiding disintegration and instability, handling flows and managing change (Johnson, 2016a).

Edward Soja (1989, 1995, 1996) (in contrast to Hetherington) links the notion of heterotopia with post-modernity rather than modernity and uses Foucault's work generally, and the notion of heterotopia specifically, to open up and explore new approaches to the study of human geography (Johnson, 2016a). He wishes to overturn what he describes as a 'persistent residual historicism' (Soja 1989: 16) that distorts and blinkers much modern critical social theory. He makes a case for spatializing social theory and argues that Foucault was ahead of the game in this project and often justifies these innovative approaches by explicitly aligning Foucault and post-modernity (Johnson, 2016a).

Soja's main application springs from Foucault's term 'heterotopology' to describe a method of 'reading' particular sites. This is built up into a whole new way of seeing and thinking about space, or the conception of 'thirdspace' (Soja, 1996: 145). Thirdspace embraces a range of what he calls 'radical postmodern perspectives' and also includes an interpretation of Lefebvre's work, particularly *The Production of Space* (1991), combined with Foucault's concept of heterotopia (Johnson, 2016a). Soja finds 'thirdspace' perspectives in Foucault's notion of heterotopia and goes as far as to equate the concept with Lefebvre's lived or representational space, building up a new 'transdisciplinary' approach (Johnson, 2016a).

4.2 Migrant's asylums as a heterotopia

Referring to Foucault and his concepts of heterotopias and space, we have analyzed the issues of asylum seekers and asylum as a kind of *placeless place* i.e. a

special type of social space (Foucault, 2012). Places of refuge, shelters and asylums are certain heterotopias of our society; absolute other places that “undoubtedly give a mirror-like mixing and bounding experience” (Foucault, Miskowiec, 1986). Our daily lives take place under established patterns of action within conventional places and spaces while migrants’ lives take place within *places* and *spaces* of counter-sites. As Foucault points out, “there are real places, and those that are counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted” (Foucault, Miskowiec, 1986). These places, being absolutely different from all the sites that they reflect and speak about, are, for Foucault, heterotopias (Foucault, 2009).

Foucault and Miskowiec (1986) articulate several possible types of heterotopia or spaces that exhibit dual meanings:

- A ‘crisis heterotopia’ is a separate space like a boarding school or a motel room where activities like coming of age or a honeymoon take place out of sight.
- ‘Heterotopias of deviation’ are institutions where we place individuals whose behavior is outside the norm (hospitals, asylums, prisons, rest homes, cemetery).
- Heterotopia can be a single real place that juxtaposes several spaces. A garden can be a heterotopia, if it is a real space meant to be a microcosm of different environments, with plants from around the world.
- ‘Heterotopias of time’ such as museums enclose in one place objects from all times and styles. They exist in time but also exist outside of time because they are built and preserved to be physically insusceptible to time’s ravages.
- ‘Heterotopias of ritual or purification’ are spaces that are isolated and penetrable, yet not freely accessible like a public place. Either entry to the heterotopia is compulsory like in entering a prison, or entry requires special rituals or gestures, like in a sauna or a hammam.
- Heterotopia has a function in relation to all the remaining spaces. The two functions are: heterotopia of illusion creates a space of illusion that exposes every real space, and the heterotopia of compensation is to create a real space - a space that is other.

Foucault goes on to explain that such sites can be found in all cultures and suggests that there could be a ‘science’ of these extraordinary spaces, a ‘heterotopology’ and suggests that modern heterotopian sites relate more to enclosing some form of deviation rather than marking a stage in life (Johnson, 2016b).

In our case, it is about asylum as a heterotopia of deviation that lean on heterotopia of crisis. Foucault and Miskowiec (1986) argue that, in the so-called

primitive societies, there is a certain form of heterotopia – crisis heterotopias – privileged or sacred or forbidden places, reserved for individuals who are, in relation to society and to the human environment in which they live, in a state of crisis: adolescents, menstruating women, pregnant women, the elderly, etc. In our society, authors continue, these crisis heterotopias are persistently disappearing, though a few remnants can still be found. For example, the boarding school, in its nineteenth-century form, or military service for young men, have certainly played such a role, as the first manifestations of sexual virility were in fact supposed to take place “elsewhere” than at home. These heterotopias of crisis are disappearing today, and Foucault believes they are being replaced by *heterotopias of deviation*: those in which individuals whose behavior is deviant in relation to the required mean or norm are placed. Cases of this are rest homes and psychiatric hospitals, and of course prisons (Foucault, Miskowicz, 1986).

Foucault thinks that between the utopias and these absolutely other dispositions – heterotopias – there is a mirror-like mixing and bounding experience. Looking in the mirror, we see ourselves in real condition and shape; the mirror as an object is realistic and is in real space and time, it can be felt, moved and even broken. However, what the mirror reflects, the image it depicts, cannot be retrieved, nor accessed by that dimension; we cannot enter it and be on the other side of the mirror. It is a kind of parallel with social spaces of another dimension, such as asylum in our case. Although physical presence within the asylum is possible, it is reserved only for a specific circle of professionals, staff and volunteers involved in the reception, supervision, and care of asylum seekers. From a general social perspective, these spaces are “inaccessible”; moreover, asylums are made as far away from urban and populated areas as possible in order to be as far as possible from the locals, who for the most part do not even think about the existence of such places, or about the lives of asylum seekers, their future or the conditions they live in. Their presence is, from time to time, “mirrored” through the media, which, depending on the need for readership and clicking, (re)present their stories.

Foucault therefore describes ‘crisis’ heterotopias that are associated with the so called ‘primitive’ cultures: locations set aside for people at particular stages of their lives, marking a rite of passage involving, as outlined in van Gennep’s seminal ethnographical study, ‘separation, transition or incorporation’ (Johnson, 2016b: 8). Foucault then refers to modern versions of these earlier forms of heterotopia that are now focused on ‘deviation’. These examples are, of course, the institutions that are involved before and after the lecture in some of Foucault’s major studies concerning the asylum (2006), the hospital (1973) and the prison (1977) (Johnson, 2016b). Such new heterotopias (of deviation), which frequently form part of everyday life and are no longer

necessarily and literally distinguishable spatially from it, acquire a normative charge, in the sense of 'empowerment' of minorities and resistance to dominant practices (van Oenen, 2009).

Today, to Foucault's analysis we should add aspects of a digitalization and medialization of society that have resulted in generating the structural changes in the context of the development of virtual (re)production of reality. "Due to technological revolution, especially in the media, cultural struggles will increasingly take place in the virtual space" (Castells, 2000: 26). The culture of real virtuality is linked to multiculturalism, which combines cultural identity, global networking and multidimensional politics (Castells, 2000). Multiculturalism is created on the basis of new information technology that creates social processes in the creation of symbols and their manipulation (culture of society), as well as the ability to produce and distribute goods and services (productive forces) (Castells, 2000). Strong technological development is causing a resentment of the world's endangered population, who from a "global village" becomes a serious threat to developed nations as well as its antipode of "wild elephant" of world financial capitalism. The former takes away freedom in the name of material survival and the latter takes away material means in the name of freedom. Such a "deal" also establishes the boundary of political modernization (Katunarić, 1999).

5. Discussion and conclusion

The issues of community definition and meaning are of great importance in understanding the social patterns regarding migrants and migrations of the Arab population to Europe. On the one hand, in the social context they are strongly linked to national and religious content, while on the other hand, due to the technological revolution, especially in the media, they are related to the "hegemony" of globalism as a process and/or a system of international regimes (Castells, 2000).

The social construction of cultural and identity determinants provides an opportunity for identification, both inside and outside the traditional supporting the identities that we associate with the Modern period – such as family, religion and a solid community (Miles, 2001). This shows how difficult it is to avoid the influence of political, cultural and other factors in shaping (Miles, 2001) the attitudes towards the Others.

With the advent of modernity, and especially with the later process of globalization, there have been major reversals in the field of identity. Until people came to think about who/what they were, they had no problem answering these questions. What was imposed on them by socialization was

accepted once and for all, and they were subject to it, regardless of whether it was politics, religion or a third social field. “The question of who you are becomes meaningful only when you believe you can be someone else; only if you have a choice, and only if your choice depends on you; only if you need to do something to make that choice realistic and sustainable” (Bauman, 2009: 22). Bauman conveniently observes that the idea of identity arose in the crisis of belonging; in an effort to really rise to the standard set by the idea.

Unlike their ancestors, the citizens of the current modern world, as Bauman calls it, can no longer trust those frames of reference that are assumed to be durable and timeless. Not only do they mistrust them, they do not even need them. “In a brave new world of fleeting opportunities and poor security, old-fashioned, rigid and non-negotiable identities are simply not good enough” (Bauman, 2009: 28). As noted above, globalization and the collapse of the identity hierarchy are two closely related phenomena. In fact, globalization is an indication that the state and nation no longer have the strength and/or desire to preserve their marriage. States have outsourced most of their tasks to global markets, so they have less need for supplies of patriotism, which has also been left to market forces through sport, entertainment and souvenirs. Thus, identities have been “unleashed” and now it is up to each individual to catch them, relying on their own ability.

Based on Foucault’s heterotopic elements, this paper implies a certain parallelism and multiple realities. The realities of everyday life of the local population, which are countered by the reality of migrants rushing towards our security and abundance. A superficial approach to migration and the attitude towards migrants as well as consuming a superficial and suggestive way of mass media reporting bring us to a simple and resolute conclusion that migrants, as a Croatian singer Darko Rundek says in his song ‘Ima ih’, are primitive, ignorant and unscrupulous (Rundek Cargo Trio, 2015).

All this shows Foucault’s heterotopic elements. The scenes with which the media periodically “bombard” the local population, all the fear and horror photos in “their” countries of origin, sinking into the Mediterranean, footage of queues and dehumanizing conditions, information about violent and illegal attempts to enter Europe, riots, rapes and crimes, seem a bit fictitious and beyond reality, as in a trailer of one of the upcoming Hollywood blockbusters.

At the same time, the places of refuge, shelters and asylums are a kind of heterotopias of our society; absolute other places that “undoubtedly give a mirror-like mixing and bounding experience” (Foucault, Miskowiec, 1986: 24). In all this, there is also an inevitable certain ideological element that prevents the problem from being approached critically and rationally, with the aim of resolving the situation in a strategic and long-term perspective.

In any case we should keep in mind that “a community is transcendent in nature and cannot simply be equated with particular groups or a place, nor can it be reduced to an idea, because ideas do not simply exist outside of social relations, social structures or historical milieu” (Delanty, 2018: 4-5). Therefore, an attempt is needed to find a balance between the structural and symbolic nature of expressing a longing for the community, seeking meaning and recognizing the community and its reality as a special form of experience in sharing solidarity and belonging.

The meanings of the community are not fixed, as they depend on the context of the interaction within the community. Meanings are also created, developed, modified, and altered in the current process of interaction within the community. The community ultimately exists in symbolic order, not in objective reality; it is a form of “community awareness”, and as such the community is “encompassed in the perception of its boundaries”. Consequently, it is always a “symbolic, constructed reality” (Cohen, 1985: 13).

“In this sense, community is both an ideal and a symbolic reality, and the meaning of symbolic reality is that it has no objective content or a particular meaning. The form of symbolic reality may persist, but its meaning may change” (Kovačević, 2019: 260). “This gives symbolic forms a versatility that allows them to adapt to changing circumstances. (...) The interpretation of community as symbolic deviates from conventional representations in many respects, ranging from the idea of traditional communities to the notion of civil society. It also potentially frees the community from the place” (Delanty, 2018: 51).

Hence, the new thinking about the community in modernity calls for a reconstruction of the classical sociological perspective of fetishizing the category of “society” which reveals three key sources of the dynamism of modernity (the separation of time and space involving the process of ever closer social relations and interactions between people living and working in different parts of the world, “rising” and moving of social relationships from local interaction contexts to new contexts, reflexive regulation of all social relationships in order to improve the society) (Haralambos, Holborn, 2002). “In simultaneously designating a structure of thought and an historical formation, modernity combines in one word meanings that are conventionally separated out in the terms: postmodernism and postmodernity” (Gunn, 2006: 109).

Postmodernism re-examines the foundations of this modern world, not necessarily renouncing rationality, but rather questioning the nature of rationality and its hidden assumptions (Patridge, 2005). Postmodernity is generally considered to be the determinant of this new stage or new conditions in society, and it is a “hermeneutical counterpoint to modernity” (Starić, 2009: 665).

The above-mentioned shows how the underlying motives for community formation are not at the level of social forms, but in the vital transformation of people in order to sustain people in the nightmare of life with uncertain outcomes and socially threatening challenges. This represents a demanding and challenging process of opening, getting to know each other and generating mutual respect and trust.

References

- Adida, C. L., Laitin, D.D., Valfort, M.A. (2010), Identifying Barriers to Muslim Integration in France, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107, 22384–90.
- Agnew, J. (2005), Space: Place, In: P. Cloke, R. Johnston (eds.), *Spaces of Geographical Thought*, pp. 142–174, London, Sage.
- Al-Ali, N., Koser, K. (2003), *New approaches to migration?: Transnational communities and the transformation of home*, London, New York, Routledge.
- Augé, M. (1995), *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*, London, Verso.
- Bauman, Z. (2009), *Identitet: Razgovori s Benedettom Vecchijem*. Zagreb, Naklada Pelago.
- Bauman, Z. (1988), Sociology and Postmodernity, *Sociological Review*, 36(4), 790–813.
- Bauman, Z. (2001), *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2003), *Intimations of postmodernity*, London, Routledge [ed. orig. 1992, London, Routledge].
- Beyer, P. (1994), *Religion and Globalisation*, London, Sage.
- Bleich, E. (2009), Where do Muslims stand on ethno-racial hierarchies in Britain and France? Evidence from public opinion surveys, 1988–2008, *Patterns of Prejudice*, 43, 379–400.
- Bryant-Bertail, S. (2000), Theatre as Heterotopia: Lessing's Nathan the Wise, *Assaph*, 16, 91–108.
- Čapo, J. (2015), The Security-scape and the (In)Visibility of Refugees: Managing Refugee Flow through Croatia, *Migracijske i etničke teme*, 31(3), 387–406.
- Carr, J., Haynes, A. (2013), A Clash of Racialisations: The Policing of 'Race' and of Anti-Muslim Racism in Ireland, *Critical Sociology*, 47, 21–40.
- Castells, M. (2000), *Ušpon umreženog društva*, Zagreb, Golden marketing.
- Castles, S. (2002), Migration and community formation under conditions of globalization, *International migration review*, 36(4), 1143–1168.

- Ciftci, S. (2012), Islamophobia and Threat Perceptions: Explaining Anti-Muslim Sentiment in the West, *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, 32, 293–309.
- Cohen, A. P. (1985), *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, London, New York, Routledge.
- Crang, M., Thrift, N. (2000), *Thinking Space*, London, Routledge.
- Day, G. (2006), *Community and everyday life*, London, New York, Routledge.
- Dehaene, M., De Cauter, L. (2008a), *Heterotopia and the City*, London and New York, Routledge.
- Dehaene, M., De Cauter, L. (2008b), The space of play: towards a general theory of heterotopia, In: M. Dehaene. L. De Cauter (eds.), *Heterotopia and the City*, pp. 75–87, London and New York, Routledge.
- Delanty, G. (2018), *Community*, London, New York, Routledge.
- Elchardus, M., Spruyt, B. (2014), Universalism and anti-Muslim sentiment, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 38, 75–85.
- Erel, U. (2010), Migrating cultural capital: Bourdieu in migration studies, *Sociology*, 44(4), 642–660.
- Ervasti, H. (2004), Attitudes towards foreign-born settlers: Finland in a comparative perspective, *Yearbook of Population Research in Finland*, 40, 25–44.
- Fargues, P. (2004), Arab Migration to Europe: Trends and Policies, *International Migration Review*, 38(4), 1348–1371.
- Featherstone, M. (2007), *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*, London, Sage. [ed. orig. 1991, London, Sage].
- Fetzer, J. S., Soper, C. (2003), The Roots of Public Attitudes Toward State Accommodation of European Muslims' Religious Practices before and after September 11, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 42, 247–58.
- Field, C. D. (2007), Islamophobia in Contemporary Britain: The Evidence of the Opinion Polls, 1988–2006, *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, 18, 447–77.
- Foucault, M., Ewald, F. (2003), *"Society Must Be Defended": Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976, vol. 1*, Macmillan [ed. orig. 1976, Cours au Collège de France].
- Foucault, M., Miskowicz, J. (1986), Of other spaces, *Diacritics*, 16(1), 22–27.
- Foucault, M. (1970) [1966], *The Order of Things*, Andover, Hants, Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. (1973) [1963], *The Birth of the Clinic*, Andover, Hants, Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. (1977) [1975], *Discipline and Punish*, London, Allen Lane.
- Foucault, M. (1980), *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. C. Gordon, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Press.
- Foucault, M. (2002), *Power (Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984, vol. 3)*, ed. J. Faubion, London, Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (2006) [1961], *History of Madness*, London, Routledge.

- Foucault, M. (2009), *Les Hétérotopies-Le Corps Utopique*, Paris, Nouvelles Editions Lignes.
- Foucault, M. (2010), *The Archeology of Knowledge and The Discourse on Language*, London and New York, Vintage Books [ed. orig. 1969, Gallimard].
- Foucault, M. (2012), *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*, New York, Vintage.
- Franc, R., Šakić, V., Kaliterna-Lipovčan, Lj. (2010), Percipirane posljedice doseljavanja i stav prema doseljavanju, *Društvena istraživanja*, 19(3), 421–440.
- Genocchio, B. (1995), Discourse, Discontinuity, Difference: the Question of Other Spaces, In: S. Watson, K. Gibson (eds.), *Postmodern Cities and Spaces*, pp. 35-46, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Giddens, A. (1994), *Now Here: space, time, and modernity*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, New York, Univ of California Press.
- González, V., Verkuyten, M., Weesie, J., Poppe, E. (2008), Prejudice toward Muslims in the Netherlands: Testing integrated threat theory, *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 47, 667–85.
- Gordon, J. (2003), Hybridity, Heterotopia, and Mateship in China Miéville's "Perdido Street Station", *Science Fiction Studies*, 30(3), 456–476.
- Gregurović, M., Kuti, S., Župarić-Iljić, D. (2016), Attitudes towards Immigrant Workers and Asylum Seekers in Eastern Croatia: Dimensions, Determinants and Differences, *Migracijske i etničke teme*, 32(1), 91–122.
- Gunn, S. (2006), *History and Cultural Theory*, Edinburgh Gate, Pearson Longman.
- Haralambos, M., Holborn, M. (2002), *Sociologija. Teme i perspective*, Zagreb, Golden marketing.
- Hetherington, K. (1997), *The Badlands of Modernity: Heterotopia and Social Ordering*, London, Routledge.
- Jameson, F. (1991), *Postmodernism: or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, London, Verso.
- Jeong, H. (2017), South Korean Attitudes Toward Muslims: Revealing the Impact of Religious Tolerance, *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, 28, 381–98.
- Johnson, P. (2016a), Interpretations of Heterotopia, *Heterotopian Studies* (<http://www.heterotopiastudies.com> 17/5/2020).
- Johnson, P. (2016b), Brief History of the Concept of Heterotopia (revised), *Heterotopian Studies* (<http://www.heterotopiastudies.com> 17/5/2020).
- Jukić, J. (1975), Sociološki pristup sekularizaciji, *Bogoslovska smotra*, 45(1), 39–48.
- Katunarić, V. (1999), Informacijsko doba i homofilija: rasprava o doprinosu sociologije mreža, *Revija za sociologiju*, 30(1-2), 65–80.
- Kemper, P. (1993), *Postmoderna ili borba za budućnost*, Zagreb, August Cesarec.

- Kerwin, D. (2005), The use and misuse of 'national security' rationale in crafting U.S. refugee and immigration policies, *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 17(4), 749–763.
- Kerwin, D. (2016), How Robust Refugee Protection Policies Can Strengthen Human and National Security, *Journal on Migration and Human Security*, 4(3), 83–140.
- Klocker, N., Dunn, K. M. (2003), Who's driving the asylum debate? Newspaper and government representations of asylum seekers, *Media International Australia*, 109, 71–92.
- Kovačević, V., Malenica, K., Jelaska, I. (2020), Attitudes of Students of the University of Split towards Asylum Seekers as a Realistic and a Symbolic Threat in the Context of Risk Society, *Nova prisutnost*, 18(2), 245–258.
- Kovačević, V. (2019), Ideja zajednice u sociološkoj misli i kršćanska zajednica, *Nova prisutnost*, 17(2), 251–264.
- La Barbera, M. C. (2014), *Identity and migration in Europe: Multidisciplinary perspectives*, London, New York, Springer.
- Lalić-Novak, G., Padjen, I. (2009), The Europeanization of asylum policy: From sovereignty via harmony to unity, *Politička misao*, 46(5), 75–101.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991), *The Production of Space*, translated D. Nicholson-Smith, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Lemert, C. (2016), *Postmodernism is not what you think*, New York, Routledge [ed. orig. 1997 Malden, Blackwell].
- Louis, W. R., Duck, J. M., Terry, D. J., Schuller, R. A., Lalonde, R. N. (2007), Why do citizens want to keep refugees out? Threats, fairness and hostile norms in the treatment of asylum seekers, *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37(1), 53–73.
- Lyotard, J. F. (1992), *The Postmodern Explained to Children*, (translated by Julian Pefanis and Morgan Thomas), London, Turnaround.
- Malenica, K., Kovačević, V., Kardum, G. (2019), Impact of Religious Self-Identification and Church Attendance on Social Distance toward Muslim, *Religions*, 10(4), <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel10040276>.
- Mandel, M. S. (2014), *Muslims and Jews in France: History of a Conflict*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Markešić, I. (2013), Islamofobija - ideologija ili posljedica prijeteće opasnosti od islama i muslimana, In: H. Mehtić, I. Pehlić (eds.). *Uzroci i prevencija islamofobije*, pp. 57-80, Zenica: Islamski pedagoški fakultet Univerziteta, Sarajevo: Centar za dijalog – Vesatija
- McDonald, M. (2008), Securitization and the construction of security, *European Journal of International Relations*, 14(4), 563–587.
- McNamee, S. (2000), Foucault's Heterotopia and Children's Everyday Lives, *Childhood*, 7(4), 479–492.

- Meerzon, Y. (2007), The Ideal City: Heterotopia or Panopticon? On Joseph Brodsky's Play Marbles and Its Fictional Spaces, *Modern Drama*, 50(2), 184–209.
- Miles, S. (2001), *Social Theory in the Real World*, London, Sage.
- Minca, C. (2001), *Postmodern Geography*, London, Blackwell.
- Nancy, J. L. (1991), *The Inoperative Community*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- Nilsson, P.E. (2015), 'Secular Retaliation': A Case Study of Integralist Populism, Anti-Muslim Discourse, and (Il)liberal Discourse on Secularism in Contemporary France, *Politics, Religion and Ideology*, 16, 87–106.
- Partridge, C. H. (2005), *Enciklopedija novih religija: nove religije, sekte i alternativni duhovni pokreti*, Zagreb, Naklada Ljevak.
- Pedersen, A., Hartley, L. (2017), False Beliefs About Asylum Seekers to Australia: The Role of Confidence in Such Beliefs, Prejudice, and the Third Person Effect, *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology*, 11(5), 1–12.
- Pereira, C., Vala, J., Costa-Lopes, R. (2010), From prejudice to discrimination: The legitimizing role of perceived threat in discrimination against immigrants, *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 40(7), 1231–1250.
- Ritzer, G., Smart, B. (2003), *Handbook of social theory*, London, Sage.
- Ritzer, G. (1997), *Postmodern social theory*, New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Ritzer, G. (2007), *Contemporary sociological theory and its classical Roots*, Boston, McGraw Hill.
- Rundek Cargo Trio. (2015), *Mostovi*, Menart, CD.
- Saldanha, A. (2008), Heterotopia and structuralism, *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 40(9), 2080–2096.
- Savelkoul, M., Scheepers, P., van der Veld, W., Hagendoorn, L. (2012), Comparing levels of anti-Muslim attitudes across Western countries, *Quality and Quantity*, 46, 1617–24.
- Shane, D. G. (2005), *Recombinant Urbanism: Conceptual Modelling in Architecture, Urban Design and City Theory*, Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Soja, E. (1989), *Postmodern Geographies: the reassertion of space in critical social theory*, London, Verso.
- Soja, E. (1995), 'Heterotologies: A Remembrance of Other Spaces, in the Citadel-LA', In: S. Watson, K. Gibson (eds.), *Postmodern Cities and Spaces.*, pp. 13–34, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Soja, E. (1996), *Thirdspace*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Somay, B. (1984), Towards an Open-Ended Utopia (Vers une utopie ouverte), *Science Fiction Studies*, 11(1), 25–38.
- Spruyt, B., Elchardus, M. (2012), Are anti-Muslim feelings more widespread than anti-foreigner feelings? Evidence from two split-sample experiments, *Ethnicities*, 12, 800–20.

- Šram, Z. (2010), Etnocentrizam, percepcija prijetnje i hrvatski nacionalni identitet. [Ethnocentrism, threat perception, and Croatian national identity], *Migracijske i etničke teme*, 26(2), 113–142.
- Starić, A. (2009), *Enciklopedijski teološki rječnik*, Zagreb, Kršćanska sadašnjost.
- Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., Bachman, G. (1999), Prejudice Toward Immigrants, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29(11), 2221–2237.
- Strabac, Z., Listhaug, O. (2008), Anti-Muslim prejudice in Europe: A multilevel analysis of survey data from 30 countries, *Social Science Research*, 37, 268–86.
- Sumaura, D., Davis, B. (1999), Interrupting Heteronormativity: Towards a Queer Curriculum Theory, *Curriculum Inquiry*, 29(2), 191–208.
- Swingewood, A. (1998), *Cultural Theory and the Problem of Modernity*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- van Oenen, G. (2009), *Heterotopia and the City Public Space in a Postcivil Society*, Open! Platform for Art, Culture & the Public Domain (www.onlineopen.org/heterotopia-and-the-city 17/5/2020).
- Vattimo, G. (1992), *The Transparent Society*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Wike, R., Grim, B. J. (2010), Western Views Toward Muslims: Evidence from a 2006 Cross-National Survey, *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 22, 4–25
- Župarić-Iljić, D., Gregurović, M. (2013), Stavovi studenata prema tražiteljima azila u Republici Hrvatskoj, *Društvena istraživanja*, 22(1), 41–62.

Internet source

- Ray, R. *You Are Not Safe, Halt and Catch Fire*. (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-yVosy3k75g&feature=youtu.be> 5/9/2019).