Space, Spatiality, Human Geography and Social Science : Politics of the Production of Space

Swapna Banerjee-Guha, Mumbai, Maharashtra

Abstract

In current time, an increasing number of researches in social sciences are found to use 'space' and 'spatiality' as key theoretical constructs to articulate the link between social and political processes, between State, people and the issues of their everyday life. Consequently, the understanding of 'space' as a material social and political construct, is progressively becoming significant, focusing on issues of spatiality, intermixed with uneven development, contemporary globalisation and the prevailing geopolitical order. The need for a socio-spatial approach in understanding the present-day social and political processes thus has become a need of the hour not only for the analysis of the changing socio-political frame-work, but also for reflecting on how people organise their lives, livelihoods and struggles against various power structures.

Space can be absolute, relative or relational or all together, depending on the ongoing process. There is no ontological answer to questions of its typology; it essentially lies in human practice. Tension and conflict, however, is seen to arise over the use of space for individual or social purposes or its domination by State and other forms of class power. Definite patterns of praxis that generate out of such uses are an integral part of the socio-spatial dialectic of every region. Underlying spatialities, one thus can find a complex material framework of social relations, power structure and discursive methodologies of the common people.

In the last 100 years of capitalist development, due to drastic redrawing of economic and political boundaries based on newer political economic relations, discussion on space has further taken a centre-stage position. Consequently, globalisation is getting theorised as a reconfiguration of superimposed socio-economic spaces that operates on multiple geographical scales, interconnecting societies and economies of a large number of nation-states within the network of an anomalously developed interdependence. The spatiality of the above process is further shaped by the geographies of cultural forms and practices in countries and regions and hence may vary from one spatial framework to the other.

This article intends to analyse the dynamics and typology of 'space' with a focus on the underlying constructions of social relations and geopolitical structure. In the process, it exposes the complex interrelationships of absolute, relative and relational spaces that get typically nuanced by the functioning of given power structures at various scales.

Prologue: Space and Spatiality

In current time, an increasing number of researches in social science are found to use 'space' and 'spatiality' as key theoretical constructs to articulate the link between social theory and everyday life. On the one hand it opens up potentials of linking social processes with their respective

spatialities from various angles while, on the other, it calls for a more comprehensive understanding of 'space' and 'spatiality' as key constructs in social, literary and cultural theories. In his last major work, 'State, Power, Socialism', Poulantzas (1978) offered a comprehensive understanding of a socio-spatial dialectic and argued, building in part upon Lefebvre's (1974) works, that for establishing a primary material framework of social life, both spatial and temporal matrices were logical priorities.

Supremacy of time and time-related analysis had dominated the disciplines of social science for long. In the process, the concept of spatiality as a begetter and a product of social relations lost its edge. It was only in the second half of the twentieth century that the significance of space and spatiality of social processes staged a comeback in the debates as a part of perspective building in social science. At the same time, the idea of space as fixed, undialectical and immobile and time as dynamic and fecund, faced serious challenges (Foucault, 1980). Together they worked towards a firm grounding of the concept and construction of spatiality of society and social relations in academic praxis.

To elaborate on the supremacy of time, it is widely known that since nineteenth century, space as an object of critical social discourse was devalued, and the spatial hermeneutics of social processes deemed subordinate to time related social analysis. A distinctively different culture of space, time and modernity emerged, and at each level of philosophical and theoretical discourse, from ontology to epistemology to empirical explanation, the historical imagination was systematically missing out

the critical salience of space. Interestingly, this happened despite innumerable examples of capitalist expansion 'in space' in the form of colonies that opened up possibilities of exploring space as 'difference', alonag with its changing material forms. But 'space' in all these expositions was seen merely as a container, at the best, a combination / product of coincidences. Following the same logic, throughout the nineteenth century and till the early part of the twentieth century, the obvious and common link between society (and its related discipline, sociology) and space (and its related discipline, human geography), despite Vidal de la Blache's seminal work 'Anthropogeographie' in 1894 validating the link between geographical and anthropological patterns, was not only ignored, the difference between the two in terms of intellectual and institutional frameworks got widened. For example, a scanty regard was given to the bearing of Von Thunen's model of agricultural land use - frequently used for explaining the dynamics of land rent in agricultural and urban geography - on social relations between landlords and labourers in the form of agricultural wages that was embedded in the political philosophy of Hegel (Harvey, 1981). What was instead projected in the explanation was the deterministic relationship between land value, rent and distance from city centre. Similarly, the relation between the isodapanes of Weber's industrial location model and the dynamics of capitalist industrialisation was treated as a matter of default, while undue focus was given to locational aspects of the factors of production. Last but not the least, the close relationship between the concentric rings of the Chicago School urban land-use model and Durkheim's basic ideas on

'moral order', founded on public discourse and communication (Gregory and Urry, 1985) was never highlighted. Instead, a mechanical classification of urban space was focused. By all these, the path of critical interpretative spatial studies that viewed spatiality as a shaping force (or medium) and a social product (or outcome), remained blocked for a long time.

During the era of competitive industrial capitalism, there was seen an approximate balance between historicity and spatiality with an emerging radical critique challenging the spatial and territorial structures of industrial capitalism (Soja, 1997). After the fall of Paris Commune, the critique lost its fervour leading to a definite preference of time and history with a simultaneous de-sensitisation of space and its integrative character. In the last decade of the nineteenth century, a growing trend of historicism along with subordination of space in critical social thought became common. Expansion of capitalism was also perceived primarily as a historical (economic, social and political) process and incidentally a spatial one.

Till early twentieth century, the 'social' was generally separated from the 'spatial' – a profoundly Kantian dualism- and de-spatialisation of social process was evident in sociological researches that carved out a distinct identity for sociology in explaining social processes with the help of social structures. Following the same logic, human geography, during this time, wound around notions of determinism and possibilism, remained fixed in a chorographical character having an approach of areal differentiation that again lent it a distinct identity in explaining spatial processes mechanically by spatial structures. Many of these 'spatial processes' were described in the terminologies of formal language systems, especially geometry or that further distanced human geography from the heterogeneous language systems used for social theory. The above scenario dominated till 1940s and worked on a complete separation of spatiality from social theories as well as spatial from social, in general. On the other hand, in the mainstream parlance of human geography, space was considered as epiphenomenal, a mere codification of social structures. The culmination led to two distinct directions: first, conception of social life in the realms of interpretative sociology and humanistic geography, and second, in the realms of structural functionalism (Gregory and Urry, 1985). The question of integrating spatial structures with social processes remained quite non-essential to both these deliberations. Further, refinement of explanations attempted spatially through formal techniques and quantification, intensified the process of this distancing that reached a climax in 1950s. The wave of quantitative revolution completed the circle by introducing scientific methods in spatial theories to establish a notion of spatial studies as functioning science that according to Peet (1977), however, became instrumental in the desperate search for a philosophical (nee radical) perspective in human geography in the 1960s.

Subsequently, in the 1970s, through a series of works from human geography and other social science disciplines, society and space started getting juxtaposed to each other along with logical explanations, and the imperative to embed space in critical social theory came in the forefront. It culminated into a critical understanding of space with a bearing of the dynamics of its production and reproduction. The

related interpretations and analyses, ushered in a philosophical revolution projecting the ontology of spatiality (Harvey, 1973, Massey, 1973; Peet, 1977; Bunge, 1977; Lefebvre, 1974; Pickvance, 1976; Castells, 1977, Poulantzas, 1978; Gregory, 1978) and a precise understanding of space-society integration. While Lefebvre (1974) conceived space as a material product, often backed by ideology, reflecting an integrative relationship between social and spatial, Poulantzas conceptualised a 'spatial matrix' of state and society embodying the relations of production and challenged the prevailing idea of spatial structural analysis as a derivative, secondhand exercise, inferior to the analysis of social structure. Massey showed how aspatial, neoclassical accounts of industrial location got fundamentally disrupted when spatial dimensions were addressed. Harvey, on the other hand, attempted, in a systematic manner, a conceptualisation of space under capitalism which remained his abiding concern and became decisive for his later works on space-time compression, commodification of space and time and the neoliberal globalisation process. For Harvey, space is produced within capitalism and expresses the system's inner contradictions. A crucial issue that was raised in the 1980s by others was the conceptualisation of the structuring of human life and practices in diverse social forms. While Giddens (1984) considered 'structure' and 'agency' as its foremost elements, Gregory (1982) focused on the subjective notions of actors and Massey (1984) stressed the significance of the component of 'space' in it. Subsequently, several researchers in social science articulated in diverse manner how the practice of any society, be it

economic, socio-cultural or political, at any given point of time, has a spatial expression which indicates that social relations are both constituted through and constrained by space, giving rise in the process, to a socio-spatial dialectic (Soja, 1989; Dear and Flusty, 2001). Subsequently, from 1980s onwards, human geographical thinking got reoriented towards the above dialectic with increasing number of researches focusing on the relationship between nature, space, society (Harvey, 1982; Smith, 1984; Gregory, 1984; Massey, 1985), economy and uneven development, moving towards a theorisation of space. Post 1990s have seen important researches on space as a part of social theory and political economy (Harvey, 1990; 1996; Banerjee-Guha, 1992; Smith, 1993; Castells, 1996; Massey, 1999; Gregory, 2002) in the light of post-Fordist, postmodern and neoliberal constructions bringing, in the process, dimensions of gender (Massey, 1994), nature (Harvey, 1996) and environment.

Significant researches in a number of social science disciplines including human geography in recent decades are found to have got intermixed with studies on spatiality, uneven development, geopolitics, gender, culture and social theory, to mention a few (Munsi, 1980; Chakraborty, 1983; Deshpande, 1983; Sassen, 1996; Escobar, 1995; Anderson, 1996; Desai, 1997; Banerjee-Guha, 1997; Raju, 1997; Dodds, 2000; Soja, 2000; Lahiri-Dutt, 2001; Nilsen, 2010). They attempt at providing explanation of spatial patterns and structures of everyday life that are integrally connected to social and political processes. Several contemporary researchers in social science, engaged in interdisciplinary researches, have acknowledged the above concept

as a key construct. Space is increasingly being viewed not as a realm of stasis, as a pre-given, unchanging territorial platform upon which social action occurs[1], nor just a social construct, but a crucial factor of social relations (Massey and Allen, 1984) and the 'spatial' has not remained only an outcome or a product, but evolved as a part of the explanation.

Revisiting Discourses on Spatiality of Social Processes

To trace the discourses on socio-spatial dialectic, one must acknowledge the pioneering efforts, outside human geography, of Gramsci (1971), in concretising the mode of production in time and space and in history and geography. Although Gramsci did not directly bring the problematic of space in his analysis, his arguments were embedded in the logic of spatial relations with specific premises of place, location and territorial community (Soja, 1989). Following his work, as a natural process, social ontology of time-space structuration introduced an existentially structured spatial topology attached to the concept of 'being'. Subsequently, a social 'being' started getting contextualised in a multi-layered geography (spatiality) of socially created and differentiated regions. Ontological spatiality, evolved therefrom, although was found to be impacted by time and time-related structures, it nonetheless initiated a systematic search for a radical theory construction. Discourses on time, space and society as well as time-space convergence slowly led to a number of conceptualisations among which the seminal contribution of Lefebvre (1974) is again worth mentioning. In seeking dialectically

to combine the relational contradictions of 'thought' and 'being', 'consciousness' and 'material life', 'superstructure' and 'economic base', Lefebvre (1974) was the first to apply a reformulated dialectical logic to shed the weakness of the then prevailing dominating viewpoints of existential phenomenology (Soja, 1989). His key notion that social and spatial relations of production are both space-forming and space-contingent, became the basic premise of socio-spatial discourses in later years. His focused attention on the characteristic features of modern capitalism of the early twentieth century simultaneously stretched the usage of relevant terms associated with the notion of space well beyond the immediate confines. Thus, 'urbanisation' became a summative metaphor for the 'spatialisation of modernity' that, according to Lefebvre, provided a support system for capitalism to survive. The said system, he argued, depended on an increasingly embracing and socially mystified spatiality, producing and reproducing geographically uneven development through simultaneous homogenisation and fragmentation. Lefebvre, however, was critiqued for the position he had bestowed on the spatial relation structures - that was felt to have led towards a spatial fetishism- which according to Lefebvre were autonomous. In the early 1970s, Harvey (1973), along with Lefebvre, embarked on a Marxist analysis in exposing the link between social justice and the city that unfolded the dynamics of urban space in a dialectical materialist framework, later to be applied to regional scales working towards a theorisation of uneven development under capitalism. During the same time Mandel (1976) reiterated that uneven development was the basis of

capitalism and it essentially represented a spatial problematic. On a different note, Edward Said (1978), taking Middle-east as an example, exposed the potent 'spatial imaginations' that were embedded in the colonial projects. Recent engagements in postcolonial theory and scholarship have revealed the ensuing complexities of socio-spatial structures (Brun and Jazeel, 2009) and associated power balances in colonialism's afterlife in postcolonial countries. Although Foucault (1986) contributed considerably to debates seeking for an appropriate and epistemological location for spatiality, all the above ideas are different from his theoretical formulations on heterotopia and its association with space, knowledge and power (Soja,1989).

The 1980s thus experienced the impact of theoretical realism in the form of a renewed reassertion of space in the construction of social theory (Giddens, 1981; Urry, 1985) whereby space was viewed not just as the reflection of the society but as society in operation. At the same time, as mentioned, Harvey's (1973) groundbreaking work on social justice and urban space had already created a strong impact on human geography in terms of spatial analysis with a Marxian perspective that set a trend in research on the reality of the socio-spatial dialectic at macro and micro scale, linking political economy with space and spatiality, initially focusing on the urban, later to be applied on a regional scale (Taylor and Thrift, 1982; Castells, 1983, 1989; Smith, 1984; Walker,1985; Forbes, 1984; Jenkins, 1987). Soja (1989) states that it was from the middle part of 1970s that uneven geographical development and its ramifications at economic, social and cultural scales, started getting integrated in the development discourse in concurrence with social theory that drastically changed the directions of research in human geography and got linked with works on related areas in other social science disciplines (Castells, 1989; Sassen, 1988, 1991), viewing space and spatiality as key shaping force of social relations. Harvey's (1982) emphasis on conceptualising the spatialisation of historical materialism became exceedingly significant at this juncture for a radical reformulation of social theory. The core perspective was political economy (Frank, 1969; Emmanuel, 1972; Amin, 1976; Wallerstein, 1979) that provided an epistemological rationalisation to go beyond the patterns and exposit the socio-political structure and causal social relations that were region / space specific. On the one hand, social relations were identified to be existing within a produced framework of spatialities while on the other, institutions were viewed as produced spaces of a durable sort, representing territorialisation of control and surveillance as well as organised spaces of symbolism (Johnston and Taylor, 1989).

Outside the Marxist realm too, the significance of spatiality of social life increased. Simonsen (1996) identified three broad conceptions of space, all interconnected, in contemporary social theory, namely (i) space as material environment, (ii) space as difference and (iii) space as a social reality. Materiality as a concept of nature, according to her, does not have a possible independent status in social discourse, but by addressing social practices in relation to the material environment, it becomes significant. Similarly, space as difference suggests the existence of varying conditions for social processes. Compared

to these ideas, however, the theme of social spatiality brought out by the Marxist authors proves more dynamic as it not only exposes the socio-political dynamics of the elements of space but also the process of its production and reproduction through history.

A sum total arising out of the above (Soja, 1989) can be seen in the form of three different paths towards spatialisation, namely (i) 'post-historicism', (ii) post-Fordism', and (iii) 'postmodernism'. The first is rooted in the fundamental reformulation of nature and conceptualisation of social being and reasserts the importance of space and spatiality, challenging the overall dominance of history. The second is directly related to the political economy of the material work and the most recent phase of economic and socio-spatial restructuring during the post Second World War era. The third has a framework of a cultural and ideological reconfiguration with a stress on the postmodern (Banerjee-Guha, 2004). It overlaps with post-historicism and post-Fordism as a theoretical discourse. In the face of the assertive popularity of the third trend, Harvey (2006) suggests that a more thorough and expansive understanding of the problematic of space-time association within the Marxist tradition is an imperative of the current time.

The need for a spatial approach to understand contemporary social processes hence is not only important for the analysis of changing spatial forms, but for the reconstitution of contemporary society and social relations as well. The actuality of the phenomena has become clearer by various works on the dynamics of space in its various forms (Smith, 1986; Brenner, 1999 Corbridge, 2000 Banerjee-Guha, 2009). The following section captures some relevant details.

Realities of Absolute, Relative and Relational Space:

A spatial ontology to understand the contemporary social process is important not just for analysing the changing socio-spatial forms and the relationship between spatiality, and social relations, but primarily for understanding the significance of space itself in the realities of everyday life practice. After having written on space and spatiality for years, Harvey in 2006 stated that although included in the updated version of Raymond William's (1985) 'Keywords', space should simultaneously have an identity of 'one of the most complicated words' in use in its variety. The exploration on space can start with a discussion on the dynamics of absolute, relative and relational space (Banerjee-Guha, 1997; Brenner, 1999; Harvey, 2006) positioned in diverse regional conjectures.

Absolute space is fixed within the frame of which events are recorded or planned. This is the space of Newton or Descartes, usually represented by immovable grid, amenable to standardised measurement and open to calculation. Geometrically it is the space of Euclid and hence, the space of all types of cadastral mapping and engineering practices. When put in application, it represents a primary space for individuation that applies to all discrete and bounded phenomena including people, resources and commodities. Socially, this is the space of private property and other bounded territorial designations. Introduction of modern cartography in India by the British is a pertinent example in this context that specifically aimed at producing knowledge about and gain control over her absolute space. This absolute space, on the basis of its elements (like resources and people, forming

a part of a contextualised spatiality), can simultaneously become an area of material practice as well an object of imagination of communities who possess an organic link with regional elements through historically evolved spatial practices. But the above nuances of the absolute space may be totally disregarded through a process of multiple constructions by the State or powers to be, through projects of teritorrialisation having specified economic and cultural objectives. Depending on the latters' visualisation/ imagination that often leads to practices of an absolutely conflicting nature vis-a-vis the imaginations of the locals, such usurpation of the people's rights or in other words, the organic embedding, has become common phenomenon of the present time. In India, at micro-level, for example, fertile agricultural areas in several regions are being opened up to the statist strategy of capitalist industrialisation in the form of Special Economic Zones that are at complete opposition to the imagination or objectives of the locals with regard to the economic or cultural aspirations of such areas. At macro-level, a pertinent example can be the North-east India, a region historically characterised by three simultaneous practices, namely (i) colonial, (ii) national and (iii) vernacular/ local, having their own epistemological and ontological specificities. The colonial and national, buttressed by instrumental rationality and action are found to have over-extended themselves to subjugate the vernacular discourses emerging out of the organic practices from below. The process is wrought with 'epistemic violence' leading to deformation and discontinuity (Ahmed, 2009) of the absolute space and the regional communities. In case of relative space, time happens to be an inseparable phenomenon

mandating a shift from 'space' and 'time' to space-time or spatio-temporality (Harvey, 2006). The spatial frame in this case depends critically upon 'what' is being relationised and by 'whom'. Hence come the notions of time, cost, social and psychological distances (Ambrose, 1969; Bunge, 1974; Chapman, 1979), talking about the use of absolute space by diverse class and social groups, through different modalities, structural frameworks, needs and wants, affordability and control over communication and technology (Banerjee-Guha, 2002). The contemporary globalisation process, depending on the above, has created myriad divisions in space in the form of many absolute spaces depending on their levels of development and tuned to the requirement of international capital. The resultant international economic space which is unquestionably a relative space, is characterised by a simultaneous tendency of concentration and dispersal inducing a space-specific valorisation and devalorisation. For example, the absolute space of a poverty stricken mining region of Orissa gets directly connected to the global economy and becomes a part of the global economic regions of the contemporary capitalist accumulation system (Banerjee-Guha, 2008). Space in this case remains calculable, measurable, exploitable on the basis of the prevailing level of poverty but also stands to be negotiated, depending upon the power of the negotiating groups. The relational concept of space suggests that both space and time are embedded in processes and vice versa; nothing exists in dissociation. Thus, space cannot be disentangled from time and process. Any event or events at a point of time and space, cannot be analysed by referring to the situation of only that point of time or

in those specific spaces. Take for example, the resistance movements against SEZs in India. These have to be seen in the context of everything else going around, far and near, both through a large range of time and space – past, present and future and at different spatial scales – to define the nature of the movements. Identity, according to this viewpoint, means something very different from the sense that absolute space suggests.

So, is space (more accurately, space-time) absolute, relative or relational? The reality suggests that it can be one or all together, depending on the social process, nature of the 'space' and the happenings out there. Harvey (2006) feels there is no ontological answer to the question on the nature of space; the answer essentially lies in human practice. For example, in India in the current time, a fusion has occurred between the quest of capital for individual advantages and the state imperative towards augmentation of power of its territory vis-à-vis other territories in the emerging neoliberal framework of 'competition' that finally has gone to use the inherent instability of regional structure leading to space-specific valorisation and devalorisation of selected spaces and the associated human praxis. The contradiction of capitalist and statist logics of power in these cases gets internalised within the process of capitalist accumulation in the given tensions between regionality, territorial class alliance and free geographical movement of capital. The primary / absolute space of private property in such situations, located in different regional settings and bounded by various territorial designations should be seen as absolute (representing regionality and territorial class formations), relative and

relational (representing a more continuous surface suited to the operation of capital) all three together, in dialectical tension between each other and in interplay (Banerjee-Guha, 2009). All these suggest that it is almost impossible to confine to just one modality of spatial and spatio-temporal thinking (Harvey, 2006). The actions taken in the absolute space make sense only in relative terms. At the same time, as Mitchell (2003) rightly observes, it is imperative for people to concretise all processes in space and time in order to derive wider and relational nuances.

Social processes thus can be seen constructed and reproduced according to the spatiality of factors, involving complexities of politics and history that permeate all aspects of the everyday life, moulding the contours and topologies of dynamic spaces that again (re)produce subjective imaginations about spatiality through interactions as well as encounters (Jazeel and Brun, 2009). The diversified aspects of 'the spatial', in tandem, become extremely important in the construction, functioning and reproduction of the society, polity and economy, engulfing the daily life practices of individuals located at diverse situations. Spatialisation of politics (Agnew and Corbridge, 1995) and political economy hence becomes intensely material, unfolding the relationships between spatialities, peoples, institutions and the lived praxis that do not involve only one territory, but a highly differentiated and varied geography and many spatialities through which the nation-state is contested and controlled. US war on Vietnam in 1960s is a glaring example of the subjective imagination of a world power about a distant nation-state 'wrought with dangers of communism'

that it decided to control in the name of 'helping the primitive peoples to understand the true basis of a civilised existence' (Lawrence, 1966). The relative spaces of brutality and torture opened up by the US since the second half of the 20th century in Afganisthan, Iraq, Guantanamo Base and many other regions are innumerable, beset with the imaginations of a new empire and its desire to subjugate space for political and economic reasons (Chomsky, 2007). Similarly, Pentagon's recent announcement of converting Afganisthan into a prosperous global mining region with Afganisthan's lithium reserve worth 1 trillion dollars, is a polished expression of the geo-political ambition of a hegemonic power. Global capital's increasing use of cheap labour in discrete locations of several countries, outsourcing services and production in locations far and near, is again a reflection of a distinct spatiality of the capitalist accumulation strategy of current times. In India, state supported big capital's current interest in fast track global mining operations in mineral-rich backward regions in different parts of the country - displacing and dispossessing the locals, exposits, in a similar fashion, the neo-liberal state's spatial imaginations about local communities and their reconstitution as fundamental elements of power and control. Their spaces of absolute poverty remain, calculable, measurable, exploitable on the basis of their identity of underdevelopment, but also stands to be negotiated, depending upon the power of the negotiating groups.

Spatial practices also take their meanings under specific relations of class, gender, community, ethnicity, caste or race and get 'used up' or 'worked over' in the course of social action. Tension and conflict may arise within society, often over the use of space for individual or social purposes and domination of space by State and other forms of class and power. This conflict can give rise to social movements whose aim is to liberate space by resisting the process of domination. From Dantewada to Chattisgarh, Orissa, Jharkhand, Lalgarh, right up to Jammu and Kashmir and the North-east and in many other places in India and other countries, definite patterns of praxis are being generated out of such conflicts and resistances that are an integral part of the socio-spatial dialectic of those regions. These are grounded in particular places, since place is the arena where social structure and social relations interact (Ahmed, 1991), giving rise to relations of power, domination and resistance.

As social relations always exist within a certain produced framework of spatiality, discourses as well as production of space relations in many occasions essentially get embedded in discourses of social relations, so much so, that the line of differentiation which is any ways thin becomes evidently irrelevant, making the discourses socio-spatial. From the above viewpoint, institutions are also considered as 'produced spaces' of a durable sort, representing territorialisation of control, terrains of jurisdiction, organisation and administration.

The Socio-spatial and Spatio-temporal Dialectic: Globalisation and the Production of Space:

Engagement with material space, however, does not deprioritise the need for understanding the spaces of representation because the latter happen to be a part and

parcel of the way people live and carry on their daily life practices. In the process of representation, a dual methodology may evolve. As the elements, moments and events of the absolute space are constituted out of the materiality of certain qualities, for an appropriate if not an accurate reflection, words, graphs, pictures, maps, etc. surface as major representative elements. In case of maps, however, a valid question will be, 'who maps?' This is because as mapping spaces is a discursive activity, it may be associated with power and, therefore, loaded with diverse motives. On the other hand, Lefebvre (1976) and Benjamin (1999) argue that human beings do not just live as material atoms floating around in a materialist world; they too have imaginations, fears, emotions, psychologies, dreams, fantasies (Harvey, 2006) as well as ideologies, value-judgement and class interest or preferences. All these impact the mode and nature of representation. Thus material practices transform the spaces of experiences from which the entire gamut of knowledge of spatiality is derived. As mentioned, underlying the spatialities produced by transformative material practices, one finds the material framework of social relations, power structure and discursive methodologies. The key methodological link that exists in all these are found to be closely interconnected with recent globalisation studies that have largely engaged in questioning the notion of the territorial nation-state as a pre-constituted geographical unit of analysis for social research.

The last 100 years of capitalist development have involved the production and reproduction of space at an unprecedented scale. The renewed importance of geographical space is reflected in the drastic redrawing of economic and political boundaries, based on newer global political economic relations. Grandiose phrases like the 'shrinking of the world' or 'global village' (Banerjee-Guha, 2006) need to be understood in terms of the specific necessity of a mode of production based on the relation between capital and labour expressing a time-space compression (Harvey, 1982), a globalisation project of all times, particularly more ostentatious in the present time. The universalising tendency it projects, primarily concerns the goal of equalisation of profit with unhindered movement of goods, services, technology and selective labour-power for the need of a constantly expanding market- depicted by Marx (1973: 1857) as a historical product of capital's globalising dynamic- and essentially represents (Banerjee-Guha, 2002) a leveling of the globe at the behest of capital, exacting equality in the conditions of the exploitation of labour (Marx, 1967, edn.) in every sphere of production. It projects a one-dimensional geography of sameness in which essentially all facets of human experiences are degraded and equalised downward (Smith, 1986), hiding the fact that the premise of this equalisation rests on a strategy of dividing relative space into many absolute spaces of differential development (Banerjee-Guha, 2009), all tuned to the requirement of global capital. Brenner (1999) argues that the current round of globalisation has significantly reconfigured the inherited model of territorially self-enclosed societies and brought in new modes of analysis that do not naturalise the territoriality of state and its associated Cartesian image of space as a static, bounded block but focuses on a variety of heterodox and interdisciplinary

methodologies, challenging the rigidity of the nation-state and its social imagination. At the same time, whatever has been the degree of transcendence of state-centric configuration by the new capitalist territorial organisations in recent times, on both sub- and supra-national geographical scales, it has not in any ways entailed irrelevance of the state as a major locus of social power; rather it has generated a rethinking of the transformed role of the state from a provider to a condescending player of diversified global operations [2].

Formation of a transnationally operated space by global capital within the boundaries of the nation-state in the contemporary era is important here as it brings the issue of the changing relation between absolute and relative space to the forefront. Consequently, globalisation can be theorised as a reconfiguration of superimposed social spaces that unfolds simultaneously upon multiple geographical scales. Striking an integral accord with regional attributes of various space economies, capital in the current times is interconnecting societies and economies of a large number of nation-states within the network of an anomalously developed interdependence involving not only space-specific production processes, but, more importantly, the dynamics of political economy and social relations. Instead of eliminating absolute space – which anyways is not its agenda – global capital (Banerjee-Guha, 1997) creates and recreates innumerable absolute spaces as a part of a largely produced framework of relative space (Smith, 1984) by building, fragmenting and carving out newer spatial configurations with specific human practice and circumstances (Harvey, 1982). In this arrangement, absolute and relative space

get entwined giving way to reconstruction of newer spaces and reconfiguration of the old ones. This leads to 'annihilation of space by time' – a drive famously described by Marx (1973 edn.) as capital's globalising dynamic – abolishing all spatial barriers to capital's accumulation process, in search of cheaper raw materials, fresh sources of labour power, new markets and new investment opportunities, to essentially create disintegration of space and marginalisation of peoples based on disparate levels of development in respective regions[3]. The spatiality of the above process is further shaped by the geographies of cultural forms and practices of countries and regions and hence may vary from one spatial framework to the other (Banerjee-Guha, 2002b). In this sense, globalisation emerges as both spatial and temporal: spatial - featuring continual expansion or restructuring of capitalist territorial organisation, and temporal - featuring continual acceleration of capital's socially average turn-over time.

Understanding the significance of space in the post-Fordist era, however, requires a deeper deconstruction and reconstruction of social theories in the light of the ensuing discourses on spatiality. This is particularly because the strategy of post-Fordist flexible accumulation has ushered in a more intense phase of time-space compression[4] having a disorienting impact on the entire gamut of political, economic and social practices. This can be viewed as one 'moment' within the process of the contradictory socio-spatial dialectic that is continually molding, differentiating, deconstructing and reworking capitalism's geographical landscape. Hence, it is only through the production of relatively fixed and immobile configurations of territorial organisations

that capital's circulation process can be continually accelerated temporally and expanded spatially. But the current process of restructuring space, a double-edged process that allows free movement of capital, goods and commodities and limited movement of labour (power), entails a dialectical interplay (Brenner, 1999) between the endemic drive towards space-time compression (the moment of de-territorialisation) and the continual production of relatively fixed, stabilised configurations of territorial organisation on multiple geographical scales (the moment of re-territotialisation). Hence profit rates are equalised internationally by competition while wages are not. As workers of different countries are not equally mobile, they are not in competition with each other for which variations occur in national level wages between one country and the other (Emmanuel, 1972). But *in situ* these workers (remaining in the moment of reterritorialisation) are incorporated in the network of capital's international economic operation underpinning the construction of contemporary capitalist spatiality. In the present time, the Chinese State's using its own uneven development (Harvey, 2005) by means of its incredibly low-wage labour advantages as a competitive edge over other countries and becoming a vociferous partner in facilitating the expansion of global capital is a pertinent example. Status of low waged Chinese labour, especially from interior rural areas is an element of absolute space reflecting a particular level of uneven development while their status as participants in international production is an expression of their inclusion in the relative and relational spaces of global economy.

The associated politics of place (of the above nature) and their respective identities go to assume a level of criticality leading to fierce struggles between time and space, juxtaposing the votaries of the two constructs face to face, exhibiting an integral link between space and society. The contemporary process of neoliberal globalisation uses the spatialities of unevenness as a premise to recreate a social order that suits the need of the market. It concentrates on an arena of struggle over social production and reproduction either by maintaining /reinforcing the existing spatiality or restructuring it according to the given requirement of the market. Its transition from single production process to a flexible, disaggregated and fragmented one is essentially an outcome of new organisational forms that are achieved through new technologies in production and communication. The related strategy of a 'partial' production process, labeled by Ettlinger (1990) as non-Fordist and viewed as global capital's non-traditional manipulation of production functions for the purpose of maximising profit, bypasses the rigidities of Fordism (Banerjee-Guha, 1997), accelerates turn-over time, simultaneously involving large-scale and small batch productions (run at times in pre-capitalist modes)- distributed in discrete absolute spaces having cheap resource and labour- for achieving efficiency by externalising economies of scale (in complete contrast to large-scale factory-based mass production achieving efficiency by internalising the economy of scale). The success lies in subcontracting and outsourcing, using unskilled labour along with modern production systems, without getting replaced by a unilinear, evolutionary progression of production and technology of a post-Fordist system (Banerjee-Guha, 2008). The present-day territorial dispersal

of industrial activities on a global scale, contributing to the emergence of a changed order of centralised functions, exemplifies this new capitalist spatiality that has not only made the production of space[5] crucial, but categorically highlighted the issue of capitalisation of space at various scales.

Summing Up

The crisis of the above socio-spatial dialectics in the present time can be seen both at an expansive international and at specific urban/local levels having repercussions at various scales. The entrenched geopolitical and geoeconomic structures of the twentieth century capitalism have now been radically reconfigured at global, national regional and urban scales (Smith, 1997). I have discussed elsewhere (Banerjee-Guha, 2004; 2006; 2009) how internationalisation of production and the new international division of labour got consolidated by reorganising space at global scale. On the national scale, not only territorial borders have become increasingly porous to international capital (Brenner, 1999), the contemporary globalisation process has further decentered the role of 'national' by creating a wide range of sub- and supra-national forms of territorial organisations. On the regional scale, this is exemplified by the establishment of new economic spaces in different countries by dispossessing the longtime users at the behest of capital and developing these spaces as continuous spaces of capital accumulation. On the urban scale, processes of redevelopment and gentrification are remapping the trajectory of cities at the cost of people's right over the city space, converting the city-space into a space of contradictions and flux,

reflecting a 'spatial fix' (Harvey, 1982). All these have evidently worked towards the segmentation of society and space at global and local levels (Soja, 2000), having a systematic leaning towards polarisation and marginalisation of the disadvantaged. The resultant 'spaces of difference' reflect an acute spatial imbalance, combining modern urban functions and 'first worlding' (Katz, 2001) of specific areas in the urban spaces. At the heart of this pompous system lie the contradictions of globalisation, subsumed under the 'heterotopia' (Mitchell, 2001) of the postmodern. A number of researches have looked at the global city as a historical construct in which an endless interplay of differently articulated networks, practices and power relations takes place interlinking people, places and processes transnationally in a disjointed manner rather than hierarchically (Appadurai, 1990; Smith 1999). Spatiality of postmodern cities, however, cannot really put out of sight the consequences on the general mass of poor. The associative cultural implications in the daily life of such cities have been found (Smith, 1996; Herman and Chomsky, 1988) to be deeply associated with a dominant global culture legitimised by an ideology integrating power and hegemony. The interweaving of simulacra in the daily life brings together different worlds of the commodity in space and time and while doing so, again tries to hide the traces of origins of the essential social relations (Harvey, 1990) implicated in their production, exuberating a flavour of universalism in flux. A new wave of time-space compression leading to a multiscalar exploitation is wrought in the process (Harvey, 2000, 2006; Katz, 1998; Smith, 1998; Chomsky, 2007; Amin, 2010) that have implications on various forms of

institutional and state power as well as the collective praxis of spatial struggles arising therefrom (Chomsky, 1999).

The increased significance of 'space' and 'spatiality' and the associated theoretical reconstructions accompanied by a distinct 'spatial turn' in contemporary academic praxis, have undoubtedly helped the process of demystification of 'spatiality'. The understanding of the situational praxis and the use of spatial metaphors in the field of social, literary and cultural theory has also gone to reconstruct the 'time' dominated discursive strategies throwing up significant challenges to a longdrawn traditional thinking. It is interesting to see how the theorisation of 'space' and related analysis of 'spatiality' have become a crucial element of explanation of social relations that have opened up possibilities of a meaningful symbiosis between various disciplines of social sciences in their research and related academic praxis. These dimensions, however, have not been explored by a large section of human geographers for whom 'space' has continued to remain a 'taken for granted element' of the discipline leading to an unconscious fetishism of space and a legitimacy of appropriating the term without getting concerned about the associated theorisation. As Smith argues, 'The solidity of the geography of twentieth century capitalism in various scales has melted …. leaving us to reconstruct a viable map of everything, from ….. local change to global identity. Under these circumstances, the taken-for-grantedness of space is impossible to sustain. Space is increasingly revealed as a richly political and social product……in practice as well as in theory (Smith, 1997: 50-51).

A detailed theoretical-historical-empirical account of the ongoing multiscalar transformation of space lies and the associated analysis is beyond the scope of this article. My concern here has been to elaborate the dynamics of 'space' and 'spatiality' that is currently being found in use in numerous social science researches, outside the realm of human geography, particularly in globalisation studies. I will conclude with invoking Lefebvre (1974) whose exposition on 'space' marked a major beginning in recognising the nuances of 'space' and 'spatiality' as a part of the expansionist strategy of capital. Lefebvre argued that socially produced spaces are where the dominant relations of production are reproduced, concretised and progressively get occupied by an advancing capitalism. The above understanding logically links up all de- and re-territorialised production and human-resource complexes of the present time with struggles that are being launched in different regions against the strategy of a belligerent globalisation in the name of 'creative destruction'.

Notes

1. The fact that social relations are interconnected on a diversified spatial scale necessarily problematises the spatial parameters of these relations and challenges the timeless concept of space. For an incisive critique of the latter, see Henri Lefebvre, 1991 (1974); John Agnew, ' The Devaluation of Space in Social Science' in John Agnew and James Duncan (eds.), The Power of Place, Unwin Hyman, London, 1989, pp 9-29; Doreen Massey, 1984, 1994; David Harvey, 1990; Edward Soja, 1989.

2. For detailed analyses of reconfiguration of capitalist territorial complexes as one of the prime methodologies of the twentieth century globalisation, see David Harvey, 1982; Saskia Sassen, 1996; Erik Syyngedouw, 'Neither Global nor Local: Glocalisation and the Politics of Scale', in Kevin Cox, (ed.) Spaces of Globalisation, Guilford Press, NY, pp 137-166; Neil Smith, 1993 and 1997.

3. The process, characterising removal of all spatial barriers to international production and exchange, however, entails a simultaneous differentiation of space and uneven development to exploit region and country specific characteristics, such as levels of income, wage rate, labour laws, Environment Impact Assessment rules, etc. The upshot is that the development of space economy of capitalism is beset by counterposed and contradictory tendencies. See Neil Smith, 1984; Swapna Banerjee-Guha, 1997, 2009; David Harvey, 1982, 2006.

4. The point that needs to be stressed here is that the resultant changes in relative space are neither accidental nor arbitrary, but integral to the global political economic relations. The universalising tendency they project, primarily concern the goal of equalisation and a leveling of the globe at the behest of capital, exacting equality in the conditions of exploitation of labour in every sphere of production. See Neil Smith, 1984: David Harvey, 'The Geopolitics of Capitalism' in D. Gregory and J.Urry, (eds.), 1985; Ann Markusen, Regions the Economics of Politics and Territory, Rowman and Littlefield, USA, 1987.

5. For detailed discussion, see David Harvey, 2000; Neil Brenner, 1999; Swapna Banerjee-Guha, 2002; Bob Jessop, 'Capitalism and its Future: Remarks on Regulation, Government and Governance', Review of International Political Economy, 1997, pp 561-581

References

Agnew, J and Corbridge, S (1995): Mastering Space: Hegemony, Territory and International Political economy, Routledge, London

Ahmed, A (1991): Social Geography, Rawat Publications Jaipur

Ahmed, R(2009): 'Contesting Geo-Bodies and Rise of Sub-Rationalism in North-East India: A Case Study of Nagas and Kukis', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Centre for Studies in Regional

Development, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi

Ambrose, P (ed).)(1969): Analytical Human Geography, Longmans, London

Amin, S (1976): Unequal Development, Random House, New York

Amin, S (2010): From Capitalism to Civilisation: Reconstructing the Socialist Perspective, Tulika Books, New Delhi, India

Anderson, J (1996): The Shifting Stage of Politics: New Medieval and Post-modern Territorialities Environment and Planning: D: Society and Space, Vol.14, pp.133-155

Appadurai, A.(1996): Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalisation, University of Minnesota Press, U.S.A

Banerjee-Guha, S (1997): Spatial Dynamics of International Capital, Orient Longman, Hyderabad, India

Banerjee-Guha, S (2002): 'Critical Geographical Praxis: Globalisation and Socio-Spatial

Disorders', Economic and Political Weekly, Vol.37(44 & 45) pp.4503-09, Mumbai

Banerjee-Guha, S (2004): Space, Society and Geography: Investigating the Crisis of Postmodern Urban Space in S. Banerjee-Guha (ed.)Space, Society and Geography, Rawat Publishers, New Delhi, pp.61-82

Banerjee-Guha, S (2006): Postmodernism, PostFordism and Flexibilised Metropolis: Dialectical Images of Mumbai in S. Raju, et.al.(eds.), Colonial and Postcolonial Geographies of India, Sage, New Delhi, pp.205-22

Banerjee-Guha, S (2008): 'Space Relations of Capital and Significance of New Economic Enclaves: SEZs in India', Economic and Political Weekly, Vol.43(47), pp.51-60, Mumbai

Banerjee-Guha, S (2009): 'Contradictions of Enclave Development in Contemporary Times : Special Economic Zones in India', Human Geography, Vol. 2 (1) , Massachusetts, pp.1-10

Benjamin, W (1999): The Arcades Project, Belknap Press, Cambridge: Massachusetts, U.S.A

Brenner, N (1999): 'Beyond State-Centrism? Space,Territoriality and Geographical Scale in Globalisation Studies', Theory and Society, Vol.28, pp.39-7.

Brun, C and Jazeel, T (2009): Spatialising Politics: Culture and Geography in Postcolonial Sri Lanka, Sage, New Delhi

Bunge, W(1974): 'The Human Geography of Detroit' in R.A.Roberge (ed.) La Crise Urbaine: A Challenge to Geographers, University of Ottawa Press, Ottawa, pp.49-69

Castells, M (1977): The Urban Question, Edward Arnold, London

Castells, M (1983): The City and the Grassroots, University of California Press, Berkeley

Castells, M (1989): The Informational City, Blackwell, U.K

Castells, M (1996): The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, Vol. 1, Blackwell, Oxford

Chakraborty, S.C (1983): Developing Urban Economic Space, Indian Indtitute of Management, Kolkata

Chapman, K (1979): People, Pattern and Process, Arnold-Heinemann, London

Chomsky, N (1999): Profit over People: Neoliberalism and Global Order, Seven Stories Press, NY

Chomsky, N (2007): Pirates and Emperors: Old and New, Viva Books, New Delhi, India

Chomsky, N (2007): Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance, Allen Unwin, U.K

Corbridge, S (2000): Development: Critical Concepts in the Social Sciences, Routledge, London

Dear, M and Flusty, S (2001): 'The Banality of Interdiction: Surveillance, Control and the Displacement of Diversity', International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, Vol. 25, pp. 658-64, U.K

Dematteis, G (1994): 'Global and Local Geographies', F.Farinelli, et.al. (eds.), Limits of Representation, Accado, pp.199-214

Desai, A (1997): Indian Cities: Conglomeration of Culture, Illustrated Book Publishers, Jaipur

Deshpande, C.D (1983): 'Discovering Indian Geography' in R.P.Misra (ed.), Contributions to Indian Geography: Concepts and Approaches, Heritage Publishers, Delhi, pp 11-14

Dodds, K (2000): Geopolitics in an Changing World, Pearson Education Limited, U.K

Emmanuel, A (1972): 'Unequal Exchange: A Study of the Imperialism of Trade', Modern Reader, New York

Escobar, A (1995): Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third

World, Princeton University Press, Princeton

Ettlinger, N (1990):Worker Displacement and Corporate Restructuring: A Policy Conscious Appraisal, Economic Geography, Vol.66, pp.67-80

Forbes, D. (1984): The Geography of Underdevelopment, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Foucault, M (1980): 'Questions in Geography' in C.Gordon (ed.), Power, Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Press, pp.63-77

Foucault, M.(1986): 'Of Other Spaces', Diacritics Vol.16, pp.22-27(translated from the French by Jay Miskowiec)

Frank, A.G (1969): Latin America: Under-development or Revolution? Monthly Review Pres, London

Giddens, A (1984): The Continuation of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration, Polity Press, Cambridge

Gramsci, A (1971): Selection from the Prison Note books, International Publishers, New York.

Gregory. D (1978): 'Social Change and Spatial Structures', in T.Carlstein, et.al. (eds.), Timing Space and Spacing Time, Macmillan, Vol.1, pp.38-46

Gregory, D (1982): 'A Realist Construction of the Social', Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, Vol. 6, pp 1-18

Gregory, D (1984): 'Space, Time and Politics in Social Theory', Environment and Planning, D : Society and Space, Vol. 2, pp 123-132

Gregory, D (ed.) (2002): Lefebvre, Spatiality and Capitalism, Routledge, London

Gregory, D and J. Urry (eds.)(1985): Social Relations and Spatial Structures, Macmillan, London

Harvey, D (1973): Social Justice and the City, Edward Arnold, London

Harvey, D (1981): 'The Spatial Fix: Hegel, Von Thunen and Marx', Antipode, Vol. 13(3), pp. 1-12, U.S.A

Harvey, D (1982): Limits to Capital, Blackwell, Oxford

Harvey, D (1990): The Condition of Postmodernity, Blackwell, London

Harvey, D (1996): Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference, Blackwell, Oxford

Harvey, D (2000): Spaces of Hope, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh

Harvey, D (2005): A Brief History of Neoliberalism, Oxford University Press, New York

Harvey, D (2006): Spaces of Global Capitalism, Verso, London.

Herman and N. Chomsky (1988): Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of Mass Media: Pantheon Books, New York.

Jazeel, T and Brun, C (2009): 'Spatial Politics and Postcolonial Sri Lanka' in C. Brun and T.Jazeel (eds.) Spatialising Politics: Culture and Geography in Post-Colonial Sri Lanka, Sage, New Delhi

Jencks, C (1993): Heteropolis: Los Angeles, the Riots and the Strange Beauty of Hetero-Architecture, Academy Editions, U.K

Jenkins, R (1987): Transnational Corporations and Uneven Development: The Inter-nationalisation of Capital and the Third World, Methuen, London

Johnston, R.J and P.J.Taylor (eds.)(1989): A World in Crisis: Geographical Perspectives, Basil Blackwell, U.K

Katz, C (1998): 'Whose Nature? Whose Culture? Private Production of Space and the Preservation of Nature' in B.Braun and N. Castree (eds.) Remaking Reality and Nature of the Millennium, Routledge, New York, pp.46-63

Katz, C (2001): 'Hiding the Target: Social Reproduction in the Priralised Urban

Environment', in C. Minca (ed.)Postmodern Geography, Basil Blackwell, London, pp.93-112

Lahiri-Dutt, K (2001): 'From Gin Girls to Scavengers: Women in Ranigunj Collieries' Economic and Political Weekly, Vol36 (44), 4213-19, Mumbai

Lawrence, D (1966): U.S.News and World Report, February 21, pp.12 as citied in William Blum, Rogue State, pp.10, Zed Books, London

Lefebvre, H (1974): The Production of Space, (Translated from French by Donald Nicholson-Smith) Cambridge, Mass, 1991

Lefebvre, H (1976): 'Reflections on the Politics of Space', Antipode, Vol.8(2), pp.30-37, U.S.A

Mandel, E (1976): 'Capitalism and Regional Disparities' Southwest Economy and Society , Vol.1, pp.41-47, U.K

Marx, K (1967 edn.) Capital, Vol. 1, Ney York, (first published in 1867)

Marx, K (1973 edn.) Grundrisse, Harmondsworth, (Completed 1857-8: first published in 1939)

Massey, D (1973): 'Towards a Critique of Industrial Location Theory', Antipode, Vol. 5, pp 33-39

Massey, D (1984): Spatial Division of Labour, Macmillan, London

Massey, D (1985): 'New Directions in Space' in D. Gregory and J. Urry (eds.), Social Relations and Spatial Structures, Macmillan, London, pp.9-19

Massey, D (1992): 'Politics and Space / Time, New Left Review, Vol.96, pp.65-84

Massey, D (1994): Space, Place and Gender, Polity Press, Cambridge

Massey, D. and J. Allen (eds.) (1984): Geography Matters, Cambridge University Press in association with the Open University, U.K

Mitchell, D (2001): 'Postmodern Geographical Praxis: Postmodern Impulses and The War against Homeless People in the Post-Justice City' in C. Minca (ed.) Postmodern Geography, Basic Blackwell, London, pp.57-92

Mitchell, D (2003): The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space, The Guilford Press, NY

Munsi, S.K (1980): Geography of Transportation in Eastern India Under the British Raj, Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Kolkata

Nilsen, A (2010): Dispossession and Resistance in India: The River and the Rage, Routledge, New Delhi

Peet, R (ed.)(1977): Radical Geography: Alternative Viewpoints on Contemporary Social Issues, Maaroufa Press, Chicago

Peet, R (2007): Geography of Power: The Making of Global Economic Policy, Zed Books, London

Pickvance, C.J (ed.)(1976): Urban Sociology: Critical Essays, Tavistock Publishers, London

Poulantzas, N (1978): State, Power, Socialism, Verso, London

Raju, S (1997): The Issues at Stake: An Overview of Gender Concern in Post Independence India' Environment and Planning A, Vol.29, pp 2197-2206

Said, E (1978): Orientalism, Penguin, London

Sassen, S (1988): The Mobility of Labour and Capital, Cambridge University Press, New York.

Sassen, S. (1991): The Global City, Princeton University Press, U.S.A

Sassen, S. (1996): Losing Control: Sovereignty in the Age of Globalisation, Columbia University Press, U.K

Sidaway, J (2000): Post Colonial Geographies: An Exploratory Essay', Progress in Human Geography, Vol.24(4), pp.591-612

Simonsen, K (1996): 'What Kind of Space in What Kind of Social Theory', Progress in Human Geography, Vol.20(4), pp.494-512

Slater, D (1973): 'Underdevelopment and Spatial Inequality', Progress in Planning, Vol.4, pp.97-167

Smith, M.P (1999): 'Transnationalism and the City', R.A. Beauregard and S.Body-Gendrot (eds.).,The Urban Moment, Sage, U.S.A., pp.119-39

Smith, N (1984): Uneven Development, Basil Blackwell, NY

Smith, N (1986): 'On the Necessity of Uneven Development', International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, Vol.10, pp.87-104

Smith, N (1993): 'Homelessness/Global: Scaling Places' in J. Bird, et.al (eds.), Mapping the

Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change, Routledge, London, pp 87-119

Smith, N (1996): The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City, Routledge, NY

Smith, N (1997): 'Antinomies of Space and Nature in Henri Lefebvre's The Production of Space', Philosophy and Geography, Vol.2, pp.50-51

Smith, N (1998): 'Giuliani Time: The Revanchist 1990s', Social Text, Vol. 57, pp.1-20

Soja, E (1989): Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory, Verso, London

Soja, E (2000): Postmetropolis: Critical Studies of Cities and Regions, Blackwell, Oxford

Taylor, P and N.Thrift (1982): The Geography of Multinationals, Croom Helm, London

Urry, J (1985): 'Social Relations, Space and Time', in D. Gregory and J. Urry (eds.), Social Relations and Spatial Structures, Macmillan, London, pp.20-48

Walker, R (1985): 'Class, Division of Labour and Employment in Space', in D. Gregory and J. Urry, Social Relations and Spatial Structures, Macmillan,London,pp.164-189

Wallerstein, I (1979): The Capitalist World Economy, Cambridge University Press, U.K

Williams, R (1985): Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society, Oxford University Press, Oxford

Dr. Swapna Banerjee-Guha
Professor, I.I.P.S. Deonar, Mumbai