U. PORTO
FLUP FACULDADE DE LETRAS
UNIVERSIDADE DO PORTO

MESTRADO EM ESTUDOS ANGLO-AMERICANOS
VARIANTE EM LÍNGUAS E LITERATURAS

‘Thirdring-as-Othering’: Modern and Postmodern Spaces of Art from Traditional to Critical Utopias

Jéssica Rafaela Correia Moreira

M

2019

Jéssica Rafaela Correia Moreira

‘Thirdring-as-Othering’: Modern and Postmodern Spaces of Art from Traditional to Critical Utopias

Dissertação realizada no âmbito do Mestrado em Estudos Anglo-Americanos, orientada pela Professora Doutora Maria de Fátima de Sousa Basto Vieira

Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto

setembro de 2019

‘Thirdring-as-Othering’: Modern and Postmodern Spaces of Art from Traditional to Critical Utopias

Jéssica Rafaela Correia Moreira

Dissertação realizada no âmbito do Mestrado Estudos Anglo-Americanos, orientada pelo(a) Professor(a) Doutor(a) Maria de Fátima de Sousa Basto Vieira

Membros do Júri

Professor Doutor Rui Manuel Gomes Carvalho Homem
Faculdade de Letras – Universidade do Porto

Professora Doutora Maria de Fátima de Sousa Basto Vieira
Faculdade de Letras – Universidade do Porto

Professora Doutora Iolanda Cristina de Freitas Ramos
Faculdade de Letras – Universidade de Lisboa

Classificação obtida: 18 valores

Table of Contents

Declaração de honra II

Agradecimentos III

Resumo IV

Abstract V

List of Tables VI

List of Abbreviations VII

Introduction 1

Chapter 1. Methodology: Space of Art as Utopia 7

1.1 Space, Place and the Spatial Turn: A defence of the postmodern space 7

1.2 Spaces of Art: Postmodernism and the utopian impulse 29

1.3. A geocritical approach to the spaces of art in utopia: Methodology and the Practice of Space in Utopian Texts 58

Chapter 2. Art in Utopia: The case studies of Bellamy, Morris, Le Guin and Delany... 65

2.1. The modern space of art from traditional to critical utopia: the cases of Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward: 2000-1887* and William Morris' *News from Nowhere, or, An Epoch of Rest* 65

2.2. From Anarres to Triton and Back again: The Utopia as (Space) Ship in the Critical Utopias of Ursula K. Le Guin and Samuel R. Delany 90

Conclusion 106

Bibliographic References 117

Annexes 133

Annexe A 133

Annexe B 133

Declaração de honra

Declaro que o presente trabalho/tese/dissertação/relatório/... é de minha autoria e não foi utilizado previamente noutro curso ou unidade curricular, desta ou de outra instituição. As referências a outros autores (afirmações, ideias, pensamentos) respeitam escrupulosamente as regras da atribuição, e encontram-se devidamente indicadas no texto e nas referências bibliográficas, de acordo com as normas de referenciação. Tenho consciência de que a prática de plágio e auto-plágio constitui um ilícito académico.

Porto, dezembro de 2019

Jéssica Rafaela Correia Moreira

Agradecimentos

Começo este agradecimento à minha orientadora, Professora Fátima Vieira, sem a inspiração da qual nunca teria encontrado as utopias, os espaços ou o valor do método. Obrigada também pela confiança depositada e pela compreensão.

Obrigada aos meus professores, os de literatura e os de filosofia, que me ensinaram a construir pontes fundamentais para esta dissertação. Pontes entre fenomenologia e poesia irlandesa, ética e estudos de género, antropologia e literatura americana, filosofia política e utopia, linguagem e Shakespeare.

À Edite por me relembrar que a sanidade mental é mais importante para uma dissertação do que todos os livros do mundo.

Aos meus pais por terem tentado, sempre, dar-me mais do que o seu próprio horizonte.

Obrigada pelo carinho, mãe. E obrigada pelo trabalho, pai.

Obrigada à Tânia pela amizade, pelos conselhos e tempo.

Ao meu irmão, pela incansável curiosidade e altruísmo, pela ternura e pela loucura; cuja idade vem provar que há materiais muito mais preciosos no mundo do que os anos da experiência.

Ao Pedro, por acreditar sempre nas minhas utopias e por me ouvir incansavelmente. Sem a tua empatia, esta tese seria só preto e branco. Obrigada por teres enchido as minhas utopias de cores e músicas bonitas.

Ao José Saramago por me ter emprestado, involuntariamente, a sua ilha itinerante tornando o processo de escrita um pouco menos doloroso e um pouco mais humanizante.

Finalmente, obrigada a todos aqueles que não tive oportunidade de mencionar, mas os quais fizeram parte, de uma forma ou outra, da construção deste barco e desta utopia e deste processo.

Novamente, ao Pedro, um mar inteiro não chegava para te agradecer.

Deixo os agradecimentos em português e desformatados propositadamente, como desafio às instituições perfeitas.

Resumo

A relação entre a utopia e a arte revela-se um tópico profícuo a nível da investigação interdisciplinar, enriquecendo os discursos destas e de outras áreas circundantes. Contudo, ao passo que inúmeros autores se dedicaram à exploração das funções utópicas da arte, a investigação utópica e literária tem-se mantido silenciosa no âmbito da exploração da prática artística *na* utopia.

Instigado por esta ausência, o presente estudo procura demonstrar quais as funções e modos de produção artística no cânone literário utópico através da análise dos seus espaços e enquadrar a espacialidade, como modo narrativo privilegiado das utopias, no âmbito do debate pós-moderno. A aplicação do método artístico espacial pós-moderno, como forma *trialética*, às utopias canónicas de Edward Bellamy e William Morris e às utopias críticas de Ursula K. Le Guin e Samuel R. Delany, servirá, por um lado, para evidenciar a evolução das funções artísticas espaciais e, por outro, para enquadrar estas mudanças no contexto das novas condições de globalização e de uma nova sensibilidade estética.

O método aqui proposto revelará a sua operacionalidade não apenas a nível dos resultados obtidos, mas também na abertura a novas formas de investigação na área dos Estudos sobre a Utopia.

Palavras-chave: pós-modernismo – espaço – utopia – estética – literatura

Abstract

The relation between utopia and art has proven a fruitful topic at the level of interdisciplinary investigation, enriching the discourses of both these fields and other surrounding ones. However, despite a large number of authors having devoted themselves to the issue of the utopian functions of art, research has remained silent as to the exploration of artistic practice *in* utopia.

Instigated by this lack, the present study aims to discern the functions and modes of artistic expression within the literary utopia through the analysis of its spaces and frame spatiality, as the privileged mode of narration of the utopian genre, within the postmodern debate. The application of this postmodern artistic spatial method, as a form of trialectic, to the traditional utopias of Edward Bellamy and Willian Morris and the critical utopias of Ursula K. Le Guin and Samuel R. Delany will enable, on one hand, the distinction between artistic spatial functions within these forms of the literary utopia and, on the other, frame these changes in the context of the new global conditions and aesthetic attitudes.

The method here proposed will reveal its operability not only at the level of the obtained results but also on its opening to new forms of investigation within Utopian Studies.

Keywords: postmodernism – spatiality – aesthetics – utopia – literature

List of Tables

Table 1. Soja's ‘triple’ trialectics, applied across different spectrums of analysis. 22
Table 2. Presentation of Lefebvre's Unitary Theory of Space, taken from ‘Spatial Conceptualization in the Context of Postmodernity: Theorizing Spatial Representations’ (108) 133
Table 3. ‘Spatial elements of a fictional text’ (Piati et al. 180), taken from ‘Mapping Literature: Towards a Geography of Fiction’..133

List of Abbreviations

LB – Edward Bellamy, *Looking Backward: 2000-1887*

NFN – William Morris, *News from Nowhere, or, An Epoch of Rest*

TD – Ursula K. Le Guin, *The Dispossessed: An Ambiguous Utopia*

TOT – Samuel R. Delany, *Trouble on Triton: An Ambiguous Heterotopia*

Introduction

The dialogue between artistic practices and utopia has been long and fruitful. Art has been used as a powerful tool through which utopia is enacted by presenting either an explicit critique or proposal for a better society. It has served as inspiration, contestation and activist practice. The articulation between art and utopia, stemming from an imaginative and social practice, has also proven to be an important democratic, emancipatory, revolutionary and educational tool.

Performances by Pussy Riot, a punk-rock activist band, have been contesting Putin's government, demanding, through activist utopian art, democracy and freedom. Their performances usually transgress public spaces, since most Russian big centres of arts and museums have, under Putin's government, self-censored themselves from political art with fear of repercussion. As Dorian Lynskey articulates in the *The Guardian*, 'by laying claim to public spaces, [their concerts] are Situationist-inspired acts of dissent even before a note has been played' (Lynskey, December 2012). Their utopian links become apparent as activist method and their creative practices reclaim social space and reveal their critical stance as agents of utopian demand. Following the release of their song 'Track About Good Cop', the group released a statement describing the song as 'a utopian dream about alternative political reality in which instead of arresting activists and putting them in jail, cops are joining activists' (Me and the cop: Pussy Riot releases new protest song, July 2018).[1]

In Brazil, the art of 'pichação' (a form of graffiti that claims the streets and the most unlikely places for the articulation of social and historical issues) makes use of the street as a space of utopian contest as a form of resistance to institutionalisation and its perceived marginalization. By doing this, pichação gives primacy to conceptual over aesthetic form in the reformulation of the city space as a space of the people (most of which have been spatially marginalised in the favela).

In *Artistic Utopias of Revolt: Claremont Road, Reclaim the Streets, the City of Sol,* Julia Ramírez Blanco exposes the relations between utopia, art and space in what has been widely coined 'activist art'. She begins her study with the occupation of Claremont

[1] See also Sean Michaels' 'An art revolution in St Petersburg'.

Road in 1993, aimed at preventing the construction of a roadway. During this occupation statues were turned into barricades and utopian realisation and practices enacted via the aesthetic. In her study, Blanco exposes how ordinary people and micro-structures can communicate and construct utopia through creative spatial practice. These performances invert top-down utopian movements by engaging in the deconstruction of dominant discourses and reclaiming space as individuals' and communities' rights. These artistic forms of utopian expression have been especially important during the 1960s' and 1970s' countercultural movements that sought to establish difference as an important nexus of utopian construction.

On a different note, dystopias – largely in response to the form of the traditional[2] utopia, the consequent historical events of the WWII, and to the institutional tools that participate in the construction of holistic oppressive systems of such large proportions – recognised the value that artistic representations and spatial organisation hold in the confirmation and support of power structures.[3] Consider the case of *Fahrenheit 451* in which the issue of art and its spatial erasure is connected to a loss of sense of history and, consequently, of personal and collective freedom. Or the film *Equilibrium* in which the war on expressive freedom, emotionality and critical creativity is conveyed by a war on art, source of alternative meanings and emancipatory transgression. In both cases, art is presented, strategically, in unpleasant, hidden, dirty or intimate places, which are made public after transgression. Nevertheless, although the micro structure of society is permeated, in these societies, with oppressive, controlling, serial spaces, these spaces of

---

[2] I am aware that other authors have labelled these utopias as 'canonical', but I am using Tom Moylan's terminology here.

[3] Nazi propaganda machine constructed museums for the exhibition of the 'good' art of the state; relations were made between physical dysmorphia and what was called degenerated art (such as cubism, expressionism, surrealism and other expressive art forms); a national art day was celebrated; and an architectural plan for Berlin was put into march. Sculpture and painting cherished by the Nazis exhibited a frozen idea of perfection of the human figure (which favoured male statuary, representations of women as reproductive beings and little variation among them). When faced by different representations of the body, the Nazis were repulsed and launched their own version of a culture war: their campaign against modern art stemmed from their inability to tolerate any human forms except the most familiar. In architecture, art's new responsibility was towards the psychological effect of space and an ideologically disfigured notion of form. The emergence of this new conception of space, enhanced the earlier effects of Nazi architecture to mould spaces in the image of an ordered cosmos. Classic architectural style was used to impart order and expression to new kind of civic buildings. Hitler recognized the potential classicism held for the promotion of his ideologies. Because it was so distanced in history and venerated as blueprint, classic models gave the Nazi regime the ideal imagery to appeal to the people. Abstraction was, on the other hand, associated with primitivism, one which located the roots of an anti-ethical emphasis on expression instead of supposed ideal form. See the documentary 'The Architecture of Doom', Tobin Siebers' 'Disability Aesthetics' or Nathaniel Coleman's *Utopias and Architecture*.

art act as counter-narratives: they are subversive, free, creative and hopeful spaces, which oftentimes create heterotopias (bubbles of differentiality whereupon dystopian meanings are contested). This concern is made perfectly clear even when art is not the main motive of these dystopias, such as is the case of *1984* and *Brave New World*. In these dystopian texts, art is dislocated to the considered uncivilised parts of society. In this last example, the explicit transfer of art to the proles establishes powerful psychological, social and cultural boundaries between what is and what is not socially acceptable. The proles are filthy, unsanitary, *uncivilised* – underdeveloped – places and their inhabitants treated as little more than animals. By being placed there, art becomes symbolic of these undesirable attributes that have been constructed institutionally. However, once Wilson transgresses normalised social praxis and is in contact with one such space of art – here taking the form of the antique shop – and uses the token he takes from that place as source for transgression, this space becomes also a space of hope, resistance and radical alterity.

The utopian dimension of art has thus been widely debated and conveyed through various means and platforms. In critical theory and philosophy, we can note the influence of Ernst Bloch and Theodor Adorno; in aesthetics and spatial artistic practice, the works of Miwon Kwon, Jane Rendell and Julia Blanco; or in literary studies, Tom Moylan, Raffaella Baccollini or Ruth Levitas. These authors have, notwithstanding, limited their focus to the analysis of the artwork as conveyor of utopian meanings, outside itself as utopian object. Bloch has stressed the principle of hope – and desire – as active transformative propeller towards the Not-Yet-realised utopia; Adorno's negative dialectics has stressed how the conflict within the artwork reveals society's conflicts and articulates dissatisfaction with the transformation of material conditions; Kwon and Rendell wrote on the critical principle of art as a utopian emancipatory dimension for the artwork as well as the benefits of such practice in social art; and Moylan and Levitas on the function of the utopian text in its pedagogical, hermeneutic and critical scope. Despite the value of such contributions for the articulation between utopianism and art, these accounts lack articulation with each other. There is, I argue, a theoretical gap in this issue as although art is deemed utopian because of its functions, the incorporation of these functions in utopian discourse has been severely overlooked, especially if we consider the literary utopia. This theoretical absence is, by and large, the result of traditional utopian's system tendency to holism and deactivation of dissident or critical discourses. How, then, is a text supposed to inspire towards utopia by the depiction of a utopian

society in which there is no utopian impulse, no artistic representative of utopia inside the text? How do dystopias pose a more compelling case for utopian artistic practice than the traditional utopian text? Departing from this perceived gap, these questions have evolved to: what are, after all, the main reasons for this shift in artistic utopian attitudes from utopia to dystopia? And, if it happened between the shift from traditional utopia to dystopia, does the same happen in critical utopias? What is, after all, the utopian function of art in utopia? Is it the same in traditional and critical utopia?

Having established the question-problem, a methodological tool through which these functions and shifts could be analysed became necessary. Given the framework established heretofore it became clear these utopian artistic practices engaged with a form of transgression, which was mainly spatial and contestant of spatial institutions. Similarly, the utopian genre, being defined by its spatial mode or form, provided the exempt background through which these relations could be analysed spatially. In fact, as Robert Tally had argued that 'whole genres can be defined by such a spatial or geographical character, such as the pastoral poem, the travel narrative, utopia, or the urban exposé' (Tally, 2017, p. 1) so here is maintained that traditional and critical utopias can be defined in terms of their micro-topologies: in this case through the analysis of its spaces of art whose character and function will hopefully provide the means whereby the utopian texts can be distinguished. David Harvey suggested something similar in *Spaces of Hope* in which he writes: 'any project to revitalize utopianism needs to consider how and with what consequences it has worked as both a constructive and destructive force for change in our historical geography' (Harvey, 2000, p. 159).

Thus, the first chapter of the present study is devoted to the elaboration of a spatial methodology, responsible for the articulation of art and utopia. This chapter seeks to develop a comprehensive method tracing the shift in sensibilities responsible for a transformation in the relations between art and utopia. This chapter tripartite structure follows a mode of triangulation inspired by both the main three issues here related (art, space and utopia) and by the authors included (p.e., Henri Lefebvre, Edward Soja, Doreen Massey, Jane Rendell and Peter Osborne). These authors write in the tradition initiated by the *spatial turn* that is argued, following Fredric Jameson, to have marked not only a shift in spatial theorisation but of a general aesthetic and cultural sensibility – termed 'postmodernism'.

Modernism is predominantly defined in terms of holistic discourses, polarising (and oftentimes prescriptive) stances on space, art and utopia, and limited in its assessment of the real social relations it is product and producer of. Postmodernism instead seeks to deconstruct in order to construct, dialectically, these binaries in order to comprehend, through 'Othering', how meanings are conveyed fluidly and porously through the interplay of spatial, historical, social and cultural relations.[4] Thus, by embedding the present discussion in a postmodern sensibility, spatial categorisation of art and utopia can be perceived in relation and as fully social categories. This way, social relations will be perceived not only as happening in space but as product and producer of spatial configurations.

Having defined both the methodologic background for the theorisation and conceptualisation of space, these spatial attitudes are applied to the space of art. The following questions are thus answered in the second part of this chapter: what is a space of art? Is the space of art produced by the work of art, through the subject or through institutions? Is there any distinction between the space of art and an art institution – such as the museum or the art gallery? Is there a *proper* place for art or art space proper? What kind of art can be considered spatially? Or, do all types of art produce space? Is art produced by the space of art or is the space of art produced by the artwork? How can the modern/postmodern distinction be applied to the space of art? Can we apply 'Thirdring-as-Othering' in the analysis of the art space? Does it constitute itself the same way other spaces do? How does the space of art interact and produce society? And what is the role of art and its space? Many other questions could be proposed in place of these ones, but for now, we will try to restrict ourselves to the realm of spatiality itself. After having traced the history of the modern museum onto the new postmodern conditions of artistic spatiality and what utopian functions they may assume in utopian texts and societies, the last part of the first chapter will shed light to how this framework will be applied, as method to the utopian texts here under analysis.

Thus, comparably to what Molina and Guinard propose in their comparative analysis of art and urban space, by the end of the present study, we will hopefully be quipped to make judgements on how utopias and utopias' spaces of art can be enriched

---

[4] Many other articulations could be done in this matter, such as political, economic, psychological and so on, however, this study – was not the literary utopia a work of art by itself – is compromised with the utopian possibilities of the work of art, especially how it is conveyed in spatial form.

by the ‘valorization or depreciation of urban spaces and art through the spatialization of art in the city’ (Molina & Guinard, 2017, para. 14). This will hopefully provide us better insight on *yet* another variable on utopian thought and how such variable is employed throughout utopian spectrum, namely, from traditional to critical utopia. For this reason, it becomes particularly relevant to provide a reading of those spaces of art and their role in distinct literary utopias through the analysis of two well-established canonical utopias (*Looking Backward: 2000-1887* by Edward Bellamy and *News From Nowhere, or an Epoch of Rest* by William Morris) and two critical utopias (*The Dispossessed: An Ambiguous Utopia* by Ursula K. Le Guin and *Trouble on Triton: An Ambiguous Heterotopia* by Samuel R. Delany). This will expectedly shed light on the nuances and intricacies that distinguish, on the one hand, and establish, on the other, different texts in the utopian genre.

While Molina and Guinard ask ‘how can arts and their symbolic dimension modify perceptions, representations and social practices of urban of spaces by representing them? [And] also, how can arts – by spatialising in the cities and by *coproducing* [emphasis added] within the urban spaces – modify perceptions, representations and social practices of these spaces?’ (Molina & Guinard, 2017, para. 14), the present study reformulates these questions in the following terms: how can spaces of arts and their symbolic, physical and practical dimensions modify perceptions, representations and sociospatial practices by operating within and in collaboration with them? And, how can spaces of art in a tri-coproduction of space, history and society modify perception, representations and social practices at those places? And what happens when we apply these questions to the utopian genre?

Finally, and because as Warf and Arias argue that

> so many lines of thought converge on the topic of spatiality, space is a vehicle for examining what it means to be interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary, to cross the borders and divides that have organized the academic division of labor, to reveal the cultures that pervade different fields of knowledge, and to bring these contrasting lines of thought into a productive engagement with one another. (Warf & Arias, 2009, p. 2)

Likewise, the present study aims to be perceived as an interdisciplinary method that, much like the critical utopia, benefits from its character as ship instead of island, since it proposes a process rather than a blueprint. It thus intends to be read as a form of Othering, presupposing the deconstruction of disciplinary barriers and following reconstruction of a cooperative practice: open, dialectical and heterogeneous.

Chapter 1. Methodology: Space of Art as Utopia

1.1 Space, Place and the Spatial Turn: A defence of the postmodern space

> *Geography matters, not for the simplistic and overly used reason that everything happens in space, but because where things happen is critical to knowing how and why they happen* (Warf & Arias, 2009, p. 1)

Utilised in everyday discourse, 'space' may refer to the material backdrop against which people and things dwell or simply happen. The term can also refer to a fixed or moving object or location, a location's characteristics, or outer space; or it can also be used metaphorically. The same applies to 'place', which is usually employed as a synonym for 'space',[5] but whose linguistic uses are wider. We may say 'I found a new place', 'Go to your place', or 'I placed the pencil on the table'. All these common-sense uses of the word connote a reference to a location or a form of being in place. The terms can thus be used in a panoply of completely distinct material contexts – or even ideal, mental or emotional context – and are often employed indifferently.

The notions of space and place are so deeply entrenched in our lives that they are hardly given any thought, but are, instead, treated as givens. This naturalisation of the terms, Casey maintains, is inevitable since they are deeply connected to our way of being-in-the-world – both ontologically and phenomenologically:

> To exist at all – to exist in any way – is to be somewhere, and to be somewhere is to be in some kind of place. Place is as vital as the air we breathe, the ground on which we stand, the bodies we have. We are surrounded by places. We walk over and through them. We live in places, relate to others in them, die in them. Nothing we do in unplaced. (Casey, 1997, p. IX)

However, despite spatial determination being fundamental to our experiences in and of the world, their role is not superfluous, univocal or neutral. In fact, the concept of place's taken-for-grantedness – precisely because of its deep intertwinement with everyday life and common-sense knowledge – has been the reason for the ignorance on the variety of meanings it encloses. Thus, if we wish to properly discuss the role of space or place, we must first distinguish and disambiguate the terms, and then define and theoretically frame them.

---

[5] Most Western history has pointed to the ascendency of the notion of space over that of place, from the Hellenistic period, to the Renaissance, through the middle-ages, reaching its peak after Newton's elaboration of the mathematical principles. This primacy was firstly connected to the infinitude of god and then, latter, to the mathematisation of space which would reinforce physicalist and positivist perspectives.

At its most basic level, place means ‘location’ – referring to the exact abstract location of something determined by either a set of measurements or distances. However, the word can also be employed to describe a physical landscape with a particular set of distinct characteristics (i.e., a relaxing place, a religious place, an intimate place), or can even be used to refer to a sense of place[6] (i.e., the subjective meanings that become attached to a given location and that can arise both from an individual or cultural/collective experience, perception or representation), a concept to which we return later.

Place is, thus, initially defined in the present study as in Warf's *Encyclopedia of Human Geography*: ‘typically refer[ing] to a particular segment of the earth’s surface that is characterized by the unique sense of belonging and attachment that makes it different from other places around it. Thus, place is a meaningful portion of space’ (Warf, 2006, p. 356). Based on this concept, ‘space’ is used as a wider concept or class in which different ‘places’ may fit based on the characteristics and modes of being of the particular place. (i.e. space has a wider scope and is used to classify the larger group into which some places belong). In this way, ‘place’ refers to specific locations as they are experienced by the subject and connected to other places, whereas space’s larger conceptual scope encompasses places’ links to wider social constructs or relations.

In fact, the distinction between these terms and the clear definitions provided have been the ground for some dispute among geographers, social theorists and others concerned with spatial studies. Until the 1970s, it was not only physical geographers[7] who considered space exclusively in unidimensional terms. History – and time – was regarded as the main propeller and shaper of human activity, and the social sciences paid little to no attention to the role of space in shaping social structures. Space was thought of as simply ‘being there’, independent or outside of human experience.

---

[6] See Yi-Fu Tuan’s *Sense of Place* or *Space and Place*.

[7] In *The Fate of Place*, Casey traces the history of accounts on place – and, by extension, space – in philosophy in which, he argues, geometrical considerations have abounded until the works of Heidegger, in a first moment, and then in the more clearly spatial form, in the works of Guattari, Foucault, Bachelard and others. A number of collections and dictionaries also point to a shift in spatial consciousness during the 1970s brought about by humanist geography discussion (See J.S. Duncan’s, N.C. Johnson’s and R.H. Schein’s A *companion to cultural geography;* Barney Warf’s *Encyclopedia of Human Geography*; or Dreck Gregory et al The Dictionary of Human Geography). In America, geographical issues were also shifting from the study of landscape morphology to the study of the shifts in specific nodes of space (See Don Mitchell’s *Cultural Geography: A Critical Introduction* and Roger Friedland’s and Deirdre Boden’s (eds.) *NowHere: Space, Time and Modernity*). For more on the theorization of space before the spatial turn, see Soja’s *Postmodern Geography.*

Furthermore, place had been largely subsumed into space in modern discourse. This situation resulted from not only the modern tendency for generalisation and abstraction, but also the historicist tradition that absorbed other 'minor' discourses. These tendencies[8] were divided under two main theoretical frameworks: the realist and the idealist. While materialist perspectives tended to highlight the geometric, abstract features of space, idealism regarded place as a mental representation, subjective in its scope.

Materialist approaches perceived place geometrically and as a part of space, defined by a single spatial metric or grid. According to this approach, place was 'defined and understood through Euclidean geometry (with *x*, *y*, and *z* dimensions) and, for analytical purposes, treated as "an absolute container of static, tough movable, objects and dynamic flows of behaviour"' (Hubbard & Kitchin, 2011, p. 4) (i.e., as a rational and fixed system whose measurability is set by its 'order-ness' and 'limit-ness' of positions). The contrary perspective, however, was equally disempowering. Although highlighting phenomenological inquiry and rescuing the subject as participant of spatial construction, it froze spatial analysis within the realm of mental idealisation.

Objectivist analyses stressed the ontological primacy of geographical inquiry, but subjectivist analyses argued for phenomenological inquiry to be the only available method of geographical investigation. Thus, both streams of thought relegated place to the stage where things happen, 'rather than [adopting] the more holistic view of places as the geographical context for the mediation of physical, social and economic processes' (Agnew, 2011, p. 317).

Henri Lefebvre's influential analysis in *The Production of Space* denounces the double illusion implicit in these perspectives – the illusion of transparency, on the one hand, and the realistic illusion (or illusion of opacity), on the other hand – contesting dualisms that oppose instead of integrate material and mental space. The French Marxist argues that epistemology is missing from the conceptualisation of space in its relation to social practices. Previously, space was overlooked as simply objective or physical – and hence treated as a given – but modern critical thinking fetishised its mental element to validate its theoretical agenda: 'mental space then becomes the focus of a "theoretical practice" which is separated from social practice which sets itself up as the axis, pivot or

---

[8] Both stemmed from a Western cultural, religious and social heritage that divided, on one hand, mind and body, and – mainly from the Illuminism on – was, on the other hand, deeply entrenched in rational philosophy and optimism.

central reference point of knowledge' (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 6). Episteme-philosophical thought[9] was thus limited in the construction of a systematic account of space. This insufficiency meant that space was largely relegated to the realm of the mental, although it ought to be contemplated as a social fact. Hence, providing a generally acceptable notion of what space and place are is not enough; these concepts must be encompassed within a thoughtful and systematic approach to space that unveils its relationship to time and society.

Furthermore, these attitudes towards space and place were the product of a modern Western tendency to prioritise historical progress – which in turn shaped after Western history, development and a perceived shift from barbarity to civilisation – over spatial analysis. Space's ambiguousness, authors such as Casey and Soja argue, largely relates to the overestimation of the role of historicism. There was, Soja tells us, a rise in historicism in the last decade of the nineteenth century, whose practice 'successfully occluded, devalued, and depoliticized space as an object of critical discourse' and undermined 'the possibility of an emancipatory spatial praxis' (Soja, 1999, p. 4). This tendency was particularly visible during the nineteenth century, during which 'space became steadily subordinated to time in modern consciousness, a phenomenon that reflected the enormous time-space compression of the industrial revolution; intellectually, this phenomenon was manifested through the lens of historicism' (Warf & Arias, 2009, p. 2). This historical practice of 'historicism' – which Soja distinguishes from 'historicity' – places extreme and unnecessary emphasis on a historical contextualisation of social life that completely 'peripheralizes geography and spatial imagination' (Soja, 1999, p. 140). Non-Western spaces were theoretically assumed to be in another temporal point of development or evolution, to the extent that these spatial configurations were hierarchically organised in terms of supposed temporal progress.[10]

---

[9] Lefebvre was even more critical of semiology for not giving an encompassing theory of space and doing quite the opposite. He argues: 'when codes worked up from literary texts are applied to spaces … we remain, as we may easily be shown, on the purely descriptive level. Any attempt to use such codes as a means of deciphering social space must surely reduce that space itself to the status of a *message*, and the inhabiting of it to the status of a *reading*. This is to evade both history and practice.' (Lefebvre 7). This semiologist response not only claims that this code can and must be read but also that it is constructed, something which Lefebvre finds implausible.

[10] See Warf and Arias' 'Introduction: The reassertion of space into the social sciences and humanities', in which a resumed account of modernism's subordination of space to time is provided; and Edward Relph's *Place and Placeness* for a deeper understanding of this relation framed in post-colonialist studies.

Under the modern logic, as a cultural logic,[11] place is immobilised under the form of the *lieu* or the 'site': a 'leveled-down, emptied-out, planiform residuum of place and space eviscerated of their actual or virtual powers and forced to fit the requirements of institutions that demand a certain very particular form of building' (Casey, 1997, p. 183).[12]

Foucault studies these sites in his examination of eighteenth century disciplinary and institutional 'spaces' in both *The Birth of the Clinic* and *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of the Prison*. These institutional places, he affirms, are homogeneous, simultaneous and serial (i.e., they successively replicate one another successively). These traits are constitutive to those sites Foucault terms 'spaces of domination' (Foucault, 1995, p. 187), in which surveillance becomes the privileged form of social relations, 'disciplinary power manifests its potency' (Foucault, 1995, p. 187), and space and place become fixed and, hence, sites. In these places, the individual, specifically, and social interaction, generally, are fixed in a set position, suppressing the concept of space. Therefore, an institutional space is a functional one in which the exercise of power is inflicted by the reduction of the subject's possible locations and spatial practice, which is analytically determined. Foucault's assessment of the panopticon follows the same line of thought on which Casey elaborates. Casey, however, is not interested in the dynamics of power and knowledge exercised at these sites, but rather in their status as built places or genuine places. Casey is also concerned with whether these sites fit the category of place altogether – given that they have no hidden places and are completely transparent. According to him, the panopticon is a perfect example of a site, for it can only be grasped in terms of 'a generazible model of functioning' (Casey, 1997, p. 185). The irresistibility of this conversion of place to site, Casey argues, is the product of earlier centuries' neglect of place and emphasis on absolute space and historicism's primacy. According to Casey, '[a] site's defining features of homogeneity, paniformity, monolinearity, and seriality acted to paper over the abyss; they conspired to act as tranquilizing forces in the generation of a "flat surface of perpetual simultaneity"' (Casey, 1997, p. 186). The site destroys the place; site is the place's antithesis or a pharmakon used as a remedy for the epoch's absence of spatiality. What converts a 'place' to a 'site' is its 'instrumentality or

---

[11] Modernism is perceived as a cultural logic of temporal supremacy the same way postmodernism is here theorized by Jameson, as the cultural logic of late capitalism, giving rise to a supremacy of space.
[12] Casey assumes this to be the result of Leibniz's 'new discipline of analysis situs' (Casey 183). See *The Fate of Place*.

functionalism' (Casey, 1997, p. 185), with modern space being the result of an imposition of external logic. Although bound to a historical superimposition, the modern space is not yet the same as the non-place that fetishises and replicates *ad infinitum* a spatial logic – and spatial configuration, as some authors in the postmodern era, such as Soja and Harvey, argue. Still, by being solely constituted on a horizontal axis, modern space neutralises difference by negating opposing discourses and dialectical nuance.

Critical rationality was hence commonly regarded as dominated by the historical and neglectful of geographical imagination. As Soja maintains, radical criticism must therefore recognise that space hides consequences from us, as much as or even more than history does: 'how relations of power and discipline are inscribed into the apparently innocent spatiality of social life, [and] how human geographies become filled with politics and ideology' (Soja, 1999, p. 6). The spatial turn has, in this respect, 'dislodged a putative nineteenth-century dominance of the time in the humanities (whether historical, social scientific or literary) to reintroduce . . . the apparently elided element of space and geography' (West-Pavlov, 2017, p. 291).

What has been generally coined the 'spatial turn' not only changed the paradigm concerning the importance of space and its denunciation of historical hegemony in critical theory – how space and place were defined and how analytical inquiry was performed thereafter – but also brought together previous unidimensional and static perspectives of space under an empowering analysis that encompassed rather than polarised spatial discourse. The spatial turn thus encompasses that reaction that sought to rescue space and spatial inquiry as a category that, as with time, is interwoven in the social fabric and to reclaim material space, the individual's experience of space and sociability as fundamental subjects for geographical inquiry. Soja identifies two main drives of the spatial turn: a) the rapprochement of physical space and those who inhabit it – de-bipolarising previous conceptions of space and place; and b) a reaction against the supremacy and hegemonic canonisation of the historical rhetoric (Cf. Soja, 1999).

The spatial turn rephrased modern discourse on space, delimitating – without subsuming – space and place, and announcing not only a new form of spatialisation and spatial analysis, but also a 'new aesthetic sensibility that came to be understood as postmodernism' (Tally, 2017, p. 2). Certainly, as Skordoulis and Arventis point out, 'originally the transformation of space was a constitutive feature of modernism (Skordoulis & Arvanitis, 2008, p. 106)', and spatial conceptualisation was therefore

endorsed by both modern and postmodern thought. However, by the 1980s, spatial conceptualisation began to be perceived as properly characteristic of postmodernism. Modernism was labelled as temporal and postmodernism as spatial:

> modernism was valorised as dynamic, the site of history, narrative and memory, in short as the potential for change. Postmodernism is characterised as the site of pure immanence, immediacy, stasis, and above all a disorienting and disempowering realm of space. (Skordoulis & Arvanitis, 2008, p. 106)

Fredric Jameson, in *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, advocates that a – if not *the* – crucial characteristic of postmodernism – which he assumes to be the cultural logic of late capitalism – is the transition from a temporal paradigm to a spatial one. Jameson relates this characterisation to the fragmentation of the subject in postmodernism. According to Jameson, social life was not always defined by space, but rather that this shift was the result of the new postmodern identity, which is primarily characterised by a mutation in objective space – a mutation not accompanied by the subject. The subject who inhabits postmodern space is one whose spatial perceptions and habits are formed in an older form of space – that of modernism.[13]

This generalisation is founded on Jameson's crucial premise that through technology, space has become 'postmodern hyperspace', whose existence has superseded the subject's ability to change spatial perception to such an extent that human dwelling and humans' relations to space become irrelevant in an analysis of postmodern space. Time is said to confer stability and narrative continuity, to which the subject can refer back and situate himself or herself as a unitary individual, and the means for subjects to map themselves along a chronological narrative (i.e., in time). However, in postmodernism, temporal continuity collapses – or, as has been announced by the most well-known trope of postmodernism, all narratives end – and space becomes the only way humans can map and situate themselves. Yet, Jameson maintains, this task proves to be increasingly difficult when the expansion of globalisation and networks exposes a greater world space, to which the individual, whose spatial knowledge can only be employed locally, can never completely refer back. This is the spatial logic of late capitalism,[14] he

---

[13] Jameson speaks of 'high modernism' elsewhere but, for coherence sake, this space of high modernism is here labelled as 'modern space' since it is encompassed within the terms modern space is theorised in the present study.

[14] Jameson identifies two previous phases in the spatial logic of capitalism: the first is the spatial logic of the grid under market capitalism in which space is perceived as organized and geometrical; the second is figurative (representational) space under monopoly capitalism. See more in Jameson's *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*.

maintains, whose conceptual space is characterised by simultaneity – at once homogeneous and split – and which is often attached to the notion of hyperspace in Jameson's accounts.

Jameson's exhaustive analysis of the elements of the Bonaventure Hotel in Los Angeles aims at deciphering the building and its architect John Portman as postmodern. Jameson highlights how the building and the architect's vision are simultaneously stripped of their material and subjective connotations 'and treated as a collection of signs presumably inscribed by the creator to a certain audience, who may or may not be able to interpret them correctly' (Lungu, 2008, p. 5).[15] Jameson contrasts the elitist, separating character of modern building and the postmodern building, which is designed to be popular, destined for mainstream consumption and comprised of pieces that form a 'chaotic depthlessness . . .. [F]or Jameson it is – once again – a formulation which deprives the spatial of any meaningful politics' (Massey, 1994, p. 251). This perspective, however, Lungu argues in 'Marx, Postmodernism and Spatial Configuration in Jameson and Lefebvre', stems from a universalising and totalising view of urban space in which the perspective of the city planner, architect, designer or theorist is given primordiality over that of the subject who dwells in the city. Accordingly, she states that 'there is little reason to generalize this observation at the level of the hotel guests and staff, whose perception would undoubtedly be shaped by a wider variety of factors, among which [is] their own cultural background as well as the social role they accomplish within that space' (Lungu, 2008, p. 6). Through this generalisation, Jameson privileges abstract over inhabited space.[16] In fact, although the mutations in architectural space and the organisation of cities 'offer valuable insight to the nature of the society inhabiting it' (Lungu 5), Jameson systematically prioritises the perspective of the designer over concrete practice, homogenising human experience under an abstract categorisation.[17] These oversimplifications, Lungu maintains, would be acceptable if Jameson had reserved his

---

[15] Moreover, by attempting to analyse the hotel narratively and making this analysis the 'cornerstone of his spatial system' Jameson 'infringes upon the democratization of the sign (Lungu, 2008, p. 5) given that 'if architecture is to be interpreted as a language … [it] should necessarily make room to a variety of perspectives' (Lungu, 2008, p. 6). Moreover, Lungu argues, by founding his analysis of architecture and space in narrative and sign-value theories, Jameson's commitment to a sociologic and materialist (Marxist) perspectives are jeopardized.

[16] What is more, Lungu explains, 'although Jameson rejects the principles of semiotics, his analysis of individual building seems to be deeply indebted to them' (Lungu, 2008, p. 2).

[17] Moreover, his analysis can only be reproduced locally despite its pretence of a universalising analytical spatialisation.

conclusions for the field of architecture and only applied them locally; however, the critic expands his conclusions to psychology, universalising the spirit of postmodernism at the level of subjective experience.

In his analysis, Jameson disregards both the subjective logic of the architect in the process of creation and the change of sensibilities that 'triggered the demand for a new spatial configuration' (Lungu, 2008, p. 6) and occasioned a transformation in space. The countercultural movement of the 1960s and 1970s, for example, gave a voice to marginalised groups who demanded the mutation of the existing spatial organisation,[18] which was often binary and segregating in terms of gender, race, sexual orientation, and so on. Those movements prompted 'the emergence of a new type of building – more transparent, more accessible, less centralized' (Lungu, 2008, p. 6). As becomes evident later, in his attempt to develop a comprehensive theory[19] of the new urban condition (i.e., the postmodern), Jameson neglects social construction and the relational character of space. Mediating practices and the exercise of individuality and sociality in the production of differential spaces in this new postmodern city's construction must thus be reintegrated into the construction of space, which can only be built dialectically – top-down and bottom-up. Critical of the fragmentation and heterogeneity of postmodern spatial configuration, Jameson's cognitive mapping – which should guide the subject through the miscellaneous character of postmodern hyperspace – imagines a space constructed independently of the subject. Jameson empties space – and spatial production – and instead produces an abstract space later inserting the subject back into it. However, space, Lefebvre affirms, can never be emptied and reduced to abstract space; it embodies meaning since it is socially produced through practices that encode social meanings. As a result, abstract (or absolute) space cannot exist in human landscapes. In contact with social relations, space becomes relativised, historicised, a 'social product'. Instead of a mere container or innate pre-given, space is made possible only via human production. Drawing on Marx's view of the relations of production in society, Lefebvre theorises how space is socially constructed via praxis. Consequently, spatial layouts and organisation are a result of the superstructure that includes social relationships. He explains:

---

[18] What Doreen Massey calls 'power geometries'. See 'Imagining Globalization: Power-Geometries of Time-Space' or *Spatial Division of Labour*.

[19] In his attempt to form a totalising theory of postmodern space, Jameson severely underplayes the powers that participate in the transformation of spatial configuration, homogenising it and depriving it from the fundamental spirit of postmodernism.

> Space is not produced in the sense that a kilogram of sugar or a yard of cloth is produced. . .. Is space a social relationship? Certainly – but one which is inherent to property relationships . . . and . . . the forces of production . . .. Here we see the polyvalence of social space, its "reality" at once formal and material. Though a product to be used, to be consumed, it is also a *means of production*; networks of exchange and flows of raw materials and energy. (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 85)

Social space is dynamic and revealed in its particularity when undistinguishable from abstract and mental space. Lefebvre intends to prove that such social space 'is constituted neither by a collection of things or an aggregate of (sensory) data, nor by a void packed like a parcel with various contents, and that it is irreducible to a "form" imposed upon phenomena, upon things, upon physical materiality' (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 27). Instead, space is constituted socially and therefore also politically. Although space is shaped and moulded by historical and natural elements, that transformation is a political process. Space is material, but it is also politically and ideologically constituted. There is even an ideology of space, for despite space's homogeneous and objective appearance as pure form, it remains a social product. If space were not socially constituted or constitutive, our birthplace would not shape our vision of the world, nor would our daily activities be circumscribed and affected by its dispositions. Space would remain natural and neutral.[20] In fact, Lefebvre[21]says, each society throughout all of history has possessed a spatial configuration particular to its organisation – its modes of production, social relations, representations and so on.

The notion of 'social space', however, is complex, as it must assign appropriate spaces to the panoply of 'social relations of reproduction' (i.e., the way people interact based on their class, gender, sexuality, race, religion and so on) and the 'relations of production' (i.e., divisions of labour and hierarchised social functions). In addition, social space also encompasses its specific representations, as well as those of the 'social relations of reproduction' and the 'relations of production'. These spatial categories provide society with its specific configuration and ensure its cohesion via the adherence of its members who act and move according to these conventions. To address these relations properly, Lefebvre proposes a conceptual triad of space that articulates the

---

[20] The transition from nomadic ways of life to sedentary, for example, is demonstrative of these relations.
[21]Lefebvre and David Harvey do not work within postmodern spatiality *per se* given that their Marxist/materialist genesis recuperates a modern tendency to subtract diverse discourses under one single narrative. However, as will be proposed later, Lefebvre reveals, with his trialectics and dynamic conceptualisation of space, the path for postmodern thinking. In addition, although his approach is not postmodern, the spaces he envisions take the embryonic shape of postmodern spaces as they will be defined later.

different types of space and ways of grasping them both ontologically and phenomenologically, which is constituted by: *spatial practice* (or lived space), *representations of space* (or perceived space) and *representational spaces* (or conceived space) (see Annex A).

Perceived space is 'a space of surfaces . . ., material, socially produced and empirically verified' (Skordoulis & Arvanitis, 2008, p. 108), as well as the physical processes that serve as backdrop for the constitution of the other two types. Conceived space is, on the other hand, the mental and conceptual representation of the subjects' production of space. Finally, lived space is the space of everyday life, experienced through the symbols and meanings that a specific social group ascribes to them, representing how people dwell and ascribe meaning to the other two types of space. Lived space is thus where our spatial perceptions are contested, debated or resisted. Lefebvre's unitary theory of space gives way to a sociospatial dialectic, as Soja terms it, between the diverse structures of human activity and social relations, and which can be summarised by the term 'historic-geographic materialism'. This term serves to conceptualise space as historically embedded and sociospatially practised: It is not monadic but constitutes itself dialectically.

Thus, I argue that although Lefebvre's trialectics has a Marxist, materialist foundation and therefore presupposes a totality that is associated with the modern emphasis on grand narratives his trialectic analysis enables a postmodern methodology within spatial conceptualisation. That approach allows for the participation of multiple discourses on space that are dialectically related to one another.

It follows from this perspective that space opens new possibilities because it carries the meaning of not only spatial location, but also of the social and cultural order to such an extent that different places create different patterns with diverse meanings through which groups organise, identify and distinguish themselves.[22] As space is socially constructed, it must also be assume that it is socially operative: Everyday life activities are localised in space and endow it with ontological and phenomenological consistency.

---

[22] People cherish the idea that everything has its place, where it belongs so much so that 'relationships between an object and where it belongs is not simply fortuitous, or a matter of causal forces, but it is rather intrinsic or internal, a matter of what that thing actually is. When things are not where they belong, when they are out of place, they cannot truly be themselves' (Curry 48). This relates to what Yi-Fu Tuan coined 'sense of place'. This theory maintained that spatial meaning is attributed through subjective experience – which is, in turn, constituted by a number of feelings, emotions, senses and memories. People can, therefore, become emotionally attached to places. Notions such as that proposed on this note are, if we accept Tuan's assessment, of this kind.

Social place produces and is produced by concrete and abstract activities such that they permanently shape each other's configuration. For the analysis of space and – most importantly for the present study – the distinction between modern and postmodern space, we must recognise this dialogue between society's micro- and macro-structures.

In this way, social space is understood as 'inherently composite, mingling heterogeneous space together in one physical location' (Thacker, 2003, p. 18). Pieces can be analysed individually – as Bachelard's *topoanalysis*[23] does – but they may vary in meaning and are intertwined in a constant flux. This flux is theorised briefly by Lefebvre, who states that 'social spaces interpenetrate one another and/or superimpose themselves upon one another. They are not things, which have mutually limiting boundaries . . . in fact what exists is an ambiguous continuity' (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 87). Through the concept of Lefebvre's social space, even the minutest, most private place is articulated with other spaces – and places. Hence, places cannot be sharply distinguished from spaces; instead, particular places should be understood in a constant dialogue with the wider economic, political, cultural and historical meanings of social spaces. What is more, they reflect – despite their single form and particularities – the various existing discourses of social space. This interpenetration and superimposition of places and spaces implies that the analysis of any fragment of space entails a complex network of social relations. This perspective is evocative of both Bachelard's topoanalysis and the later formulation of Soja's nodality. [24]

The critique of historicism must thus be accompanied by an analysis that reconciles space-time with the social and with everyday life, whose productions of meaning and identity cannot be compounded under a single monolithic narrative. In fact, the shared operational focus of the theories reveals the need for 'the construction of places through social practices' (Agnew, 2011, p. 326) perceiving place as fluid, dynamic, interconnected, diverse and characterised by permeable boundaries.[25]

---

[23] See Gaston Bachelard's *The Poetics of Space*.

[24] Topoanalysis consists not merely on the general investigation of a given place but of all that topos' details and particulars. Topoanalysis refers to the analysis of intimate space, in specific, and the poetic, feeling-based way we know places. The first place we know, he says, the house, is filled with emotional content that is inseparable from the experience of space that becomes imbued in the ways we identify and give meaning to space. (See Bachelard's *The Poetics of Space*.) Soja's notion of nodality argues that nodes enable urban societies to situate and contextualize themselves by giving material form to essential social relations.

[25] As Lagopolous refers, the split in spatiality between the Marxist and the humanistic geographic traditions, bespeaks of the 'pertinence of the signifying dimension for the field of geography' (Lagopolous, 1992, p. 255) that must be able to analyse the roles of social space and attribution of meaning.

Postmodernism, in its suspiciousness of grand narratives that suppress multiplicity and alterity, understands space in its simultaneity, plurality and dislocation. Place is open to different articulations, connections and significances since its experience differs depending on the person and group who experience and dwell in it. Place is considered progressive and relational, and its reassertion 'is as much a political as an intellectual move' (Agnew, 2011, p. 325). Recurring to performative spatiality, place is regarded as associational and never complete, for it weaves together all types of spatial and temporal configurations in further, still non-existent associations (Cf. Agnew 2011). Places are historically specific, and spatial configurations are the product of agents' intersections. Because of these aspects, feminist and postcolonial theorists, for example, have been largely integrated into the postmodern movement. Doreen Massey, for example, points out that introducing 'into the concept of space that element of dislocation/freedom/possibility' would 'enable the politicization of space/space-time' (Massey, 1994, p. 263).

If we accept Jameson's method, the consequence is that we must recognise that there is a major (modern) narrative to which all others must refer back to in order to *map* themselves. Cognitive mapping is a method that aims to chart the subject along a vertical axis through the use of a solely horizontal one, in turn 'based on the acceptance of the concept of social totality' (Skordoulis & Arvanitis, 2008, p. 110). Jameson attacks spatial representability on the grounds of its simultaneity, as if that would necessarily result in loss. However, in consequence of Massey's argumentation, I argue that space's simultaneity escapes representability only when representation means linearity. The consequence of such an analysis, Massey argues, is that 'not only does this reduce space to unrepresentable chaos, it is also extremely problematical in what it implies for the notion of time' (Massey, 1994, p. 264). This view disregards space as relational and as having boundaries that are not strictly defined – as modernism's historical rationale suggests. That is not to say that space is uprooted, but rather that it cannot be fully encompassed within 'a grandiose scheme of . . . pure spatiality' (Massey, 1994, p. 264). Space is thus perceived as the unrepresentable, the chaotic, the plural that must be tamed under historical congruency.

This position becomes extremely problematic when the question of the subject's identity is posed. Cultural geography becomes especially prolific for the postmodern

debate in this respect, stressing the importance of articulating the consequences of actual experience with issues of cultural and social difference.[26] Massey explains:

> If simultaneity was to be annulled under an historical, 'comprehensive' – because linear – narrative, 'ethnic identities' and 'fundamentalisms' would have to be (re)placed in the past so that one story of progression between differences, rather than an account of the production of a number of different differences at one moment in time, could be told. This uniformity of presumed spatial experience is what Derek Gregory, in *Geographical Imaginations*, calls the modernists world as exhibition. That this uniformity cannot be achieved is the real meaning of the contrast between thinking in terms of three dimensions plus one and recognizing fully the inextricability of the four dimensions together. What used to be thought of as 'the problem of geographical description' is actually the more general difficulty of dealing with a world which is 4-D. (Massey, Space, place, and gender, 1994, p. 268)

What Massey means is that historical, spatial or social coherence annuls differences and stultifies identities by seeking to homogenise theory into a single discourse. Critical analysis must, however, be sensitive towards the porous character of space, time and society to the extent that it must be inclusive of the compasses of everyday life that absolutist explanations fail to account for – this is what she refers to when speaking of a 4D epistemology. These spatial attitudes, she argues, tend to oversimplify space and conceal the fact that space is socially constructed, as well as 'differential, conflictual and contradictory' (Skordoulis & Arvanitis, 2008, p. 108). What is missing from previous accounts, whether spatially or historically orientated, Massey argues, is the integration of all four characteristics of social life: space, time, social relations and cultural forms. Instead of creating new dualisms or static analyses that are useless to everyday life practices, spatiality studies should recognise and welcome 'that element of the chaotic, or dislocated, which is intrinsic to the spatial [and which] has effects on the social phenomena that constitute it'. Alternatively, 'spatial form as "outcome" (the happenstance juxtapositions and so forth) has emergent powers which can have effects on subsequent events. Spatial form can alter the future course of the very histories that have produced it' (Massey, 1994, p. 268).

Soja's Thirdspace presents an analytical tool that is comprehensive of the necessary interlocking between space, time, society and practice, upsetting traditional spatial accounts. It is in this theoretical context that Soja's 'thirdring-as-Othering' thrives

---

[26] In *Cultural Geography: A Critical Dictionary of Key Concepts*, the authors reflect on how 'cultural geography has been at the forefront of disciplines relating these experiences and their consequences for thinking society and the global circumstance. Cultural geography, articulating post-structuralist and postmodern critiques, has encouraged the telling of rich and multiple stories of difference (sexualities, genders, 'racings', ethnicities, ages) that would otherwise be excluded, by omission or commission, by dominant narrations of modernism' (Atkinson, Jackson, Sibley, & Washbourne, 2005, pp. 161-162)

as a synthetic and dialectical analytical tool that allows for both a) the integration of the four dimensions Massey introduces and b) the creation of a radical new alternative that encompasses spatial praxis. Hence, Soja does not propose abandoning previous theorisations of space that were the origins of spatial dualisms, but instead rejecting binary ways of thinking, subjecting them 'to a creative process of restructuring that draws selectively and strategically from these two opposing categories to open new alternatives' (Soja, 1996, p. 5). Committed to the postmodern project, Thirdspace allows for the reconciliation of space and time in postmodern spatiality. His postmodern stance, however, is not an anti-modern one that threatens to obliviate previous accomplishments, but one that denounces and deconstructs conventional modern epistemologies and moves beyond simplistic dichotomies. As he points out:

> Singling out a radical postmodern perspective for particular attention is not meant to establish its exclusive privilege in exploring and understanding Thirdspace. It is instead an efficient invitation to enter a space of extraordinary openness, a place of critical exchange where the geographical imagination can be expanded to encompass a multiplicity of perspectives that have heretofore been considered by the epistemological referees to be incompatible, uncombinable. It sees a space where issues of race, class, and gender can be addressed simultaneously without privileging one over the other; where one can be Marxist and post-Marxist, materialists and idealists, structuralist and humanist, disciplined and transdisciplinary at the same time. (Soja, 1996, p. 5)

The disciplinary tendency to focus on the outcomes and consequences 'deriving from processes whose deeper theorization was left to others' in 'an infinite regression of geographies upon geographies' (Soja, 1999, p. 38) has been one of the major obstacles to the constitution of an integrated spatiality. Soja opposes a synthetic and more comprehensive concept of Thirdspace in which previous perspectives are recombined in radical new ways, beyond dualistic terms that fall under the fallacy of the false dilemma.[27]

Most of the endeavour of *Postmodern Geographies* is devoted to establishing 'the conceptual ground for a spatialized, postmodern theory within the broad relations of historical materialism', that 'concludes with two chapters that illustrate what an empirically informed postmodern account might look like' (Hubbard & Kitchin, 2011, p. 382) and that focus on Los Angeles – a perceived privileged place as a template of the new postmodern world. However, Soja's following accounts not only focus on the experience of everyday life as theoretical and empirical analysis, but also make that experience truly humanised by spatial praxis. *Thirdspace* and *Postmetropolis* refine his

[27] The false dilemma fallacy, as theorized by Aristotle, confines discussion to two alternatives when there may be more in actuality.

sociospatial dialectic into the notion of trialectics of being, recognising 'the insight that the ontology of being can only be interpreted by examining the interlocking of spatiality, historicality, and sociality' (Hubbard & Kitchin, 2011, p. 384). With this, Soja confirms how historical materialism is integral to 'spatialized reconstruction through a critical engagement with postmodernism' (Gregory, Johnston, Pratt, J.Watts, & Whatmore, 2009, p. 568).

Consequently, Soja's work reflects awareness of the active production of spaces through social and cultural practices and processes. As Lefebvre argues, social relations – whether of power, knowledge, culture, economics, politics or other domains – are operative, constitutive and constructive of space and, hence, of spatial practices. These dimensions are co-dependent and establish themselves only dialectically; any attempt to separate them would provide only an incomplete and implausible analysis. Thus, the crucial concerns of 'thirdring-as-Othering' are not only ontological and epistemological, but also phenomenological. Place thus equally refers to the world as a form of perception and a form of knowledge – both established by practice. Hence, instead of opposing previous perspectives and forming new binaries, Thirdspace relies on them for the construction of a new kind of spatial awareness. Soja's trialectic does not aim to be 'an additive combination of its binary antecedents but rather . . . a disordering, deconstruction, and tentative reconstitution of their presumed totalisation producing an open alternative that is both similar and strikingly different' (as cited in Hubbard and Kitchin 2011, p. 282). Thirdspace's radical difference is grounded on its triple trialectics, which can be divided as follows:

Spatial Trialectic	**Theoretical Trialectic**	**Trialectic Framework**
First space	Ontological	Historical
Second space	Epistemological	Social
Thirdspace	Phenomenological	Spatial

Table 1. Soja's "triple" trialectics, applied across different spectrums of analysis.

Thirdspace encompasses while it transposes and moves within the first space and second space that represent a traditional binary opposition. Following Lefebvre's line of thinking, Soja's spatiality reflects on the interplay of spatial practices, representations of space and spaces of representation. Thirdspace dialectically interrelates real and imagined spaces, forming a third pole or space. Thirdspace 'is a metaphorical site of what is produced by

the real/imagined binary. It is the site where social difference is produced. It also "represents social power differentials that exist before constructing what is the real-and-imagined conceptualization of space"' (Skordoulis & Arvanitis, 2008, p. 110). Thirdspace replaces and deconstructs the binaries of first (objectivist/materialist) and second (subjectivist/idealist) space that constitute, Soja tells us, a tool of control through which knowledge, space and power are divided. Thirdspace thus refers to spatial praxis – to how people actually move in space, making use of both material space and geographical imagination. It results, then, from hybridity,[28] which enables the enactment of new identities. In its simultaneity, Thirdspace is both real and imagined, mutating into something more with critical potential: 'it is more because each both contains binary ways of thinking about space but also exceeds them with a lived intractability to interpretive schemas that allows for potentially emancipatory practices' (Atkinson, Jackson, Sibley, & Washbourne, 2005, p. 754).

Comparable to Lefebvre's differential spaces, Soja's Thirdspace is critical of the attribution of hegemonic meanings derived from first space for being unable to fully grasp social difference. Lefebvre's criticism – opposing structuralist and poststructuralist conceptions that regard space in terms of its discursive connotations – points to the attribution of spatial meanings as a theoretical shortcoming of actual spatial praxis. While spaces are imbued with constructed meanings, they cannot be reduced by or to them. Instead, the notion of abstract space is connected to hidden ideological content that exacts a discreet but important influence on the members of society.[29] Bearing this in mind, Lungu states:

> Lefebvre draws attention to the deceitful blankness of all representations of space such as maps, transport networks, and city plans which ultimately aim to project this fake homogeneity upon the representational or lived space. This constructed erasure of difference prevents the natural expansion of he calls "differential space" – one celebrating the palpable presence of living bodies, whose diversity of experience undermines centralized discourse. (Lungu, 2008, p. 7)

Modern urban planning is imposed upon the subject's motion, through space and the construction of *differential spaces,* an unnatural rationale that prevents the freedom of the living body. This type of planning does not aim for the dynamic interaction of individuals,

---

[28] The concept of hybridity as it is employed to the notion of Thirdspace is made explicit by Homi Bhabha in *The Location of Culture*.

[29] Hence, such space represents not only ideological hegemony exercised by institutions and the bourgeoise class 'but also the patriarchal values underpinning capitalist society, expressed in the 'phallic erectility' of towers and skyscrapers, symbols of force, of male fertility, and of masculine violence' (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 176).

but rather the imposition of a static hierarchical spatial configuration, which inevitably constrains social relations. The subversive character of differential space is hence taken as an important form of empowerment and evasion of the rational structure of representational space. The point is then not ‘to argue for an upgrading of the status of space within the terms of the old dualism. . ., but to argue that what must be overcome is the very formulation of space/time in terms of this kind of dichotomy’ (Massey, 1994, p. 260) while making room for a true spatial alternative able to encompass the multi-layered connections between space and society. Similarly, the Thirdspace concept proposes a theorisation of space that is operative in terms of people’s livelihoods and the production of counter-discourses. It is also in this manner that Thirdspace becomes fully committed to the postmodern debate.

Thirdspace, as a postmodern analytical tool or concept, provides us with an operative methodology that places a spatialised trialectic at its core. Additionally, it informs us on the particular texture of everyday life spaces that surpasses the incomplete knowledge of modernism as a conventional universalising social theory. Although a slippery term, Thirdspace can be said to represent the privileged space of analysis, moving beyond first space and second space. As Soja clarifies:

> Everything comes together in *Thirdspace* subjectivity and objectivity, the abstract and the concrete, the real and the imagined, the knowable and the unimaginable, the repetitive and the differential, structure and agency, mind and body, consciousness and unconsciousness, the disciplined and the transdisciplinary, everyday life and an unending history. (Soja, 1996, pp. 56-57)

Thirdspace is constructed such that social theory can rest on a triangular foundation that is consummated in social praxis. Social praxis in turn destabilises homogenising and bounded notions of social, spatial and historical theory, opening up spaces while radically transforming and integrating them. Analogous to *Postmodern Geographies*, both *Thirdspace* and *Postmetropolis* – once more focusing on Los Angeles – account for a theoretical, analytical and empirical inquiry.

I argue that in addition to incorporating spatial praxis and, with it, social and cultural difference, Soja’s trialectics fully embodies what Massey theorises as the 4D dimension of critical thinking. Bearing this in mind, practical deconstruction can occur through the operationalisation of Foucault’s concept of heterotopia.

As Foucault maintains in his lecture ‘Of Other Spaces’, places are defined by the particular set of relations they present, but some places connect to other places so as to invert, contradict or confront them. This confrontation can be of two types, he tells us: a)

by presenting an unreal place of perfection that stands as complete antithesis of actual places (i.e., utopia) or b) by presenting a real space that acts as a counter-site and that involves the process of moving from the real to the unreal (i.e., heterotopia[30]). A heterotopia proposes a form of transgressive spatial practice involving a re-conceptualisation of time, Soja asserts. It is a counter-site in which real sites are contested, resisted or inverted. Henceforth, a heterotopia is an imaginative conceptualisation that can nonetheless be enacted locally, in materiality. What Soja calls 'heteropologies' are a form of Thirdspace that offer a journey 'into the spaces that difference makes, into the geohistories of otherness' (Soja, 1996, p. 162) and that are informative of the 'assertion of alternative envisioning of spatiality' that 'directly challenges (and is intended to challengingly deconstruct) all conventional modes of spatial thinking' (Soja, 1996, p. 163).

In Soja's formulation of Thirdspace, the concept of heterotopia is imbued with systematic analysis, used to refer not only to alternative places per se but also to geographical imaginations and practices that seek to destabilise traditional ways of thinking spatially and to thus identify new ways of expanding 'the scope and critical sensibility of our already stablished spatial or geographical imaginations' (Soja, 1996, p. 1). Based on this account, via 'thirdring-as-Othering', boundaries diffuse into each other through the free movement of the individuals attributing a relational, heterogeneous and dynamic character to postmodern space. This practice challenges spatial, temporal and social abstract configuration and representation so much that space-time becomes a strategy of negotiating practices. However, given the fluid and porous character of places, heterotopian logic finds itself intertwined with the overall social fabric. Soja's concept of Thirdspace is permissive of this intertwining: Through spatial praxis, heterotopia can be enacted in mobility. The deconstructive character of this practice is essential to the (re)construction of an alternative analysis based on social space-time. Although social blueprints try to manipulate and normalise certain modes of behaviour, subjects enact such blueprints in new, unpredictable and creative ways through spatial praxis. Michel de Carteau[31] uses the concept of 'strategy' to make sense of and describe these social

[30] Heterotopias, he averts, are not necessarily positive places nor just spaces of resistance per se. Their importance resided in their performative and dialectical abilities.
[31] De Carteau is here used to make a point about spatial practice, theoretically only: for as much as in de Carteau admits space is dynamically constituted via practice, in *The Practice of Everyday Life*, place appears as passive and fixed.

blueprints of space-time practices. The concept of 'tactics' is employed, on the other hand, to refer to the appropriation of time and space circumstances for unconventional and idiosyncratic ends. 'Tactics' allow for the transgression and disruption of strategies, fragmenting and communicating their meanings through the movement of the city walker or the *flâneur*. Analogous to the Thirdspace conceptualisation, small-scale tactics subvert overarching strategies; through practical knowledge, such a tactic:

> transforms and crosses spaces, creates new links, comprising mobile geographies of looks and glances as people walk through and walk by these given places. Strategy claims territory and defines place; tactics use and subvert those places.
> The strategic vision of power and theory are thus transformed by small-scale tactics. (Hubbard & Kitchin, 2011, p. 109).

Hence, it is possible to reclaim the power of the city through inhabitation. It follows that the whole is made from regional pieces assembled together. Although made an apparent totality, actual space is a mashup of different perspectives that, although apparently clashing, are dialectically constructed.

Thirdspace is an empirical analysis and methodology that points to and enables practices through the recognition of the mobile and relational character of place. Postmodern spaces, as they are presently considered, are, unlike their modern counterpart, not closed, sealed things formed solely from internal processes. Instead, such spaces are the product of a connection to other places through communication, mobility and co-dependence. This does not mean that these spaces are innately 'good' or 'desirable' – or that difference is not often fetishised in postmodern buildings – but these places are the product of the intersection of movements and practices, instead of an unconnected island rooted in a sole internal logic. However, 'postmodern spaces' or 'spatialities' should not be confused[32] with postmodern buildings. Instead, these spaces refer to a way of being of and in places, and they suggest a radical way for analyses to track spatial, social, historical and cultural differences – which may in turn be applied to specific places. 'Thirdring-as-Othering' enables the inclusion of these differences and lateral excursions to other places, times and social situations.

[32] Similarly, the present concept of postmodern space is not used as a periodizing concept but instead as a conceptual one: postmodern space is the antithesis of the site, while being comprehensive and inclusive of some of its features, via, again, 'thirdring-as-Othering'.

Accepting Soja's – and Massey's[33] – premise that space is relational does not mean, however, that we must abandon other conceptions of space but, rather, that we must integrate them dialectically. 'Place' still means 'location', but this location presumes both that spatial interaction occurs between places (through the mobility of people, objects, ideas, relations and so forth) and that social relations must be understood flexibly, through the series of locales where everyday life takes place. However, space also presupposes a sense of place, through which meanings and identities are constructed and articulated. Moreover, it must be recognised that place mobility is an important tool of sociality. In *For Space*, Massey asserts that this spatial connectedness is heterogeneously constituted. Space is open, relational, multiple and unfinished. Her spatial analysis is devoted to the recognition of difference and alterity in spatial constitution. Hence, Massey demands not only a comprehensive spatial methodology but also a conceptualisation of space and place that integrated perception and meaning attribution in social space: 'how, in other words, one formulates the concept of space or place radically shapes one's understanding of the social world and how to effect transformation in and of it' (Hubbard & Kitchin, 2011, p. 299). Epistemological and ontological accounts of space must thus be aware of their role in the production of spatial knowledge and, consequently, of social practices, seeking to encourage and empower such knowledge and practices. This intersectionality enabled by Thirdspace as a postmodern practice aims at the dissolution of rigid representations of space; of inequalities, segregation and exclusion[34] permitted by established power geometries[35]; and is guided by emancipatory spatial praxis, place and the configuration of contextual changes. New technologies should thus be integrated and regarded as part of new 'place-making projects' (Green, Harvey, & Knox, 2005, p. 807), rather than disregarded as uprooted or defective sociospatial imagination and mapping – as Jameson's explanation of postmodern 'hyperspace' does.

As suggested by Skordoulis and Arvanitis – although their aim is pedagogical – postmodern curricula can change sociospatial critical-thinking, as well as create spaces of and for transformation by using Soja's Thirdspace methodology (i.e., spatial praxis). Spatial praxis offers a new theoretical and conceptual framework through the

---

[33] In *The Spatial Division of Labour*, spatial analysis is focused on the investigation of objects – people, events, identities, social relations and so forth – relationally. These are always localised and are product of the interchangeability and communication between places.
[34] See 'Increasing the Openness of Thirdspace' in Soja's *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Spaces*
[35] See Doreen Massey's *Imagining Globalization: Power-Geometries of Time-Space.*

operationalisation of Thirdspace in the deconstruction of dominant discourses, such as the historical one, as well as by rethinking issues such as place identity, social difference and transformation and by mapping the subject. Massey says, in this respect:

> You're taking a train across the landscape - you're not traveling across dead flat surface that is space: you're cutting across and myriad the stories going on. So instead of space being this flat surface, it's like a pink pincushion of a million stories: if you stop at any points in that walk there will be a house with a story. Raymond Williams spoke about looking out of the train window and there was this woman clearing the grate, and he speeds on forever and in his mind, she's stuck in that moment. but actually, of course, that woman is in the middle of doing something, it's a story. maybe she's going away tomorrow to see her sister, the really before she goes, she really must clean that grates out because she's been meaning to do it for ages. So, I want to see space as a cut through the myriad stories in which we are all living at any moment. space and time become intimately connected. (Massey, Doreen Massey on Space, February 1, 2013)

What this means is that space is inherently simultaneous in its formulation, presenting us with the existence of the Other – the subject Other, the historical Other, the cultural Other, and so forth. Perspectives condemning or denying the simultaneity and multiplicity of space nullify difference and dilute it in a linear historical trajectory. The possibility of an alternative can only be theorised if one accepts the porous nature of space. Globalisation makes this recognition urgent because place can no longer *only* 'be defined as a distinct, coherent, and bounded locale, associated with a culturally given community' (Antonsich, 2011, p. 334). Space must be constructed dialectically as a product of real-and-imagined spaces, encompassing the modes of production, reproduction and distribution; historical, material, social and cultural conditions; and voices that demand transformation through transformative differential spatial practice.

An alternative mode of analysis is thus necessary: one that not only rescues space from temporal hegemony, but also integrates human sociality. Space must be considered a 'meeting-place, the location of the intersection of particular bundles of activity spaces, of connections and interconnections, of influences and movements' (Massey, 1991, p. 28) that come together at a particular point in time.

The postmodern treatment of space, as comprehended in this study, incorporates this synthesis that Massey speaks about between historicity and spatiality. It is grounded in spatial praxis (Thirdspace), encompassing both the overall, abstract perspective of the city with a specific spatial organisation (first space) and the representations of space by its inhabitants (second space). In contrast to the modern tendency to categorise and generalise concrete experience into abstract terms or to jeopardise analytical thought and spatial empowerment by relegating space to the realm of the mental, postmodern analysis invests in the synthesis of the two, opening to the living experience of actual people and

providing both analytical and concrete foundations. It is the actual effects of the places that matter when conceptualising place on an abstract level: Place is used as 'a meta-concept that allows for the telling of particular stories associated with specific places' (Agnew, 2011, p. 318). This new possibility enables the production of place in multiplicity through the rhythms of being that constitute and are constituted within it.

1.2 Spaces of Art: Postmodernism and the utopian impulse

> *I have been told there are no more unknown islands and that, even if there are, they would not be the ones to be taken from the quiet of their homes and the ferryboat's good life to go on oceanic adventures, seeking an impossible, as if we were still in the time of the tenebrous sea, And did you not tell them about the unknown island, How could I tell them about an unknown island, if I don't know it, But you are sure it exists, As sure as the sea being tenebrous.* (Saramago, 2007, p. 27)[36]

Although there is much literature devoted to the space in art, this study is devoted to the study of the artwork in space. Art is socially produced, and thus, if we accept the claims of the previous chapter, the artwork condition of happenstance in space must always generate a type of space that is the product of an encounter between social, spatial, historical and cultural relations – or, at least, that is one of the claims this chapter makes. Thus, very simply and broadly put, the space of art primarily refers to the space where art presents itself ontologically as 'being-in-the-world':[37] The artwork must be placed somewhere, and that somewhere is here termed the 'space of art'. The space of art can be, for example, a museum, art gallery, library, street or studio. However, although it is generally recognised as fundamental as background, the space – in its full Lefebvrian or Sojian form – of the work of art was hardly admitted previously to what was unsystematically called the 'spatial turn' and, in a more accepted way, 'the urban turn' in art and aesthetics.

To be fair, place has more or less been considered essential in performance art, such as dance or theatre; other types of art, such as painting, music and literature, however, have been mainly theorised in terms of their temporality in modernism: painting as a static representation of time; music as unfolding in time; and literature as featuring a

---

[36] Original text: "Disseram-me que já não há ilhas desconhecidas, e que, mesmo que as houvesse, não iriam eles tirar-se do sossego dos seus lares e da boa vida dos barcos de carreira para se meterem em aventuras oceânicas, à procura de um impossível, como se ainda estivéssemos no tempo do mar tenebroso o, E não lhes falaste da ilha desconhecida, Como poderia falar-lhes eu duma ilha desconhecida, se não a conheço, Mas tens a certeza de que ela existe, Tanta como a de ser tenebroso o mar".

[37] Borrowing Heidegger's term.

linear, chronological narrative. However, as far as space has been theorised, every type of art produces space. The space of art is artistic in itself 'because it has not lost touch with the non-artistic space. The work of art's autonomy is a dialectical moment of its heteronomy' (Maleuvre, 1999, p. 93). What seems to divide theorisations – similar to what the first part of this chapter has noted – is the type of space art produces: either ideal (mental, imaginary) or material (abstract, real). Once more, it is this modern dualist construction of space that we try to deconstruct. These aesthetic attitudes towards artistic spatialisation before the revision of the art space, especially the museum and art gallery, are coined the 'modern space of art', following the distinctions made in the previous chapter. It follows that modern spaces of art, similar to other spaces before the spatial turn, were mainly horizontal, homogeneous, bounded and institutionalised.

In the idealist school – largely inspired by Hegel – historical attitudes were mainly those of historicism, and aestheticism was perceived as bound to the placement of the subject – not a socially, historically and spatially bounded subject and not just any subject, but an ideal subject whose character was reduced to that of the Eye.[38] The materialist perspective's historical attitude, on the other hand, placed great emphasis on material reality, paying increasing 'attention to perceptual detail for its own sake', to which was accompanied 'a tendency toward superficiality, a reluctance to present grand philosophical ideas, and an increasing disengagement from moral issues' (Davies, Higgins, Hopkins, Stecker, & Cooper, 2009, p. 56). This overinvestment in the formal qualities of the object as functional aesthetic by its mere existence as an ontological category imbues the subject with little to no autonomy of his or her own. Recalling both Lefebvre's and Soja's critiques, these attitudes' deep entrenchment in historicism expresses the double illusion of transparency and opacity. These attitudes' full neglect of spatiality makes their blockage even more explicit. Although aiming for universality, these attitudes fall far from their original intentions by often disregarding spatiality, non-Western historicity, modes of production, social relations, the average social individual and so on. This is not to say that the debate altogether dismisses the question of the space of art, but that modern thought is not preoccupied with spatiality, such as the field Soja proposes in *Postmodern Geographies:* Art space, as it is positioned at the intersection of the spatiality of the city or the urban, must necessarily shape art's role and perception

[38] O'Doherty refers to the Eye as the disembodied, abstract mode of perception that is super-imposed in the white cube.

and, consequently, social relations. As far as the artwork always comes into existence materially, it is bound to material (physical or real) space. In a similar fashion, as art always comes into existence in society and as a product of society, it is bound to social space. In this respect, Didier Maleuvre states that 'art never occurs in an absolute contextual vacuum' (Maleuvre, 1999, p. 33). Conversely, art cannot be reduced to a mere idea – or to an 'image' or 'fiction', as Hegel suggests – as this would mean that art would never appear materially or that the artwork would have the ability to abstract itself from the empirical framework. The immediate consequence of this notion is that the modern museum or gallery wall must mediate between the artwork and material reality, as these *topos* must provide the minimum amount of context in their detachment from other spaces. The modern art space, as built and theorised, nevertheless cultivates a form of being and identification that is concealed by what they lack, which is attached to both space and the artwork, producing history 'in an essentially different way than other artefacts do' (Maleuvre, 1999, p. 3). With this remark, Maleuvre alludes to the modern museum, but his statement could also serve to critique spatial analysis and artistic practise in modernism in a broader form. In fact, the modern museum provides an exemplary case for the theorisation of the modern space of art,[39] which is why it is used, along with the modern art gallery, as a case study.

Bearing this in mind, one can note that the museum as modern space is not only homogeneous and historicist in its spatiality, but that 'from its official inception near the turn of the nineteenth century . . . has manufactured an image of history' (Maleuvre, 1999, p. 1). Therefore, the museum's spatial configuration and the type of spatial practices it produces are horizontally orientated and bounded: In the search for an internal logic that would preserve art as either a formal or ideally detached object – despite imposing on its mode of exposition and surrounding environment an external historical, ideological and identitary logic – the museum severs the artwork from space and society, deeming it 'cultural in the sense suggested by the [modern] work of art: a liberation from "culture"' (Maleuvre, 1999, p. 4). Hence, despite the previously suggested theoretical differences regarding the status of the space of art, spatiality was mostly excluded from the discussion; time was the supposed foundational axis on which all space was considered.

[39] The modern museum and art gallery are produced both by the idealist and materialist schools as it is the very creation of a fissure and the illusion of dichotomy that produces the modern space of art as result of a conflict that denote the same historical and spatial disconnectedness and that, thus, imbue art and space with their own univocal, ideological identities.

This temporality and historicism produced by the art space was nevertheless somewhat particular to it. According to Brian O'Doherty in *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space*, the modern space of art tried to serve as the background for the unfolding of history, history was perceived in stativity, and the artwork was preserved as an eternal nomad. The modern space of art provided not only a vision of history and time through space, but also an ideological, identitary vision that negated the possibility of change of its own conditions. The artwork was permanently frozen in space, and the space of art was permanently frozen for the preservation of the artwork. This movement denaturalised both artwork and art space as social fact – both as product and as producer.

To be sure, the museum first appeared as a de-privatisation movement in the nineteenth century. Museums sought to obtain artworks from private owners, landlords, noblemen and clerics and to make them national property, cared for by expert scholars and connoisseurs. However, the modern museum formed a new elite, and the artworks remained private[40] objects – even if available to a larger circle. The spatialisation of art within the museum space, *museifies* it, reducing it to a mere object rather than praxis, or even a social fact.[41] The context or space of the modern museum or art gallery is one that expects the lack of that context.

In the first part of *Inside the White Cube*, O'Doherty describes this space as one that seeks to simultaneously keep the artwork in and the outside world out. He states that 'The outside world must not come in, so windows are usually sealed off. Walls are painted white. The ceiling becomes the source of light . . . the art is free, as the saying used to go, "to take on his life"' (O'Doherty, 1986, p. 15). By extricating art from life, its relation to history becomes problematic; the museum preserves history as a 'residue or ruin' (Maleuvre, 1999, p. 9), not for the consumption of the present but for posteriority. Historicity gives way to historicism[42] in the modern art space, as 'art exists in a kind of

---

[40] 'Historically', Sheikh says, 'the art institution, or museum, was the bourgeoisie public sphere par excellence, a place of rational – critical thought and (self) representation of the bourgeoisie class and its values' (Sheikh, Public Spheres and the Function of the Progressive Art Institutions)

[41] Initial criticism of the museum included its uprootedness, elitism, detachment from everyday life and lack of authenticity: the museum was said to endanger 'artistic and cultural authenticity by removing artworks and artifacts from their original location and placing them in galleries where they can only be gawked at , and never . . . lived with. Loss of contexts, loss of cultural meaning, destruction of a direct connection with life, promotion of an esthetically alienated mode of observation, instigation of a passive attitude towards the past and debilitating mood of nostalgia' (Friedland e Boden 1) were some of those preoccupations.

[42] Similarly to Soja's criticism of modernism's obsession with historicism rather than historicity in the social sciences, which circumscribed both time and space theorisation, so too Maleuvre makes a connection between the modern museum tendency to exclude the artwork from space and from time via its removal

eternity of display. And though there is lots of "period" (late modern) there is no time. This eternity gives the gallery a limbolike status; one has to have died already to be there' (O'Doherty, 1986, p. 15). This form of eternity and historicism is typical, he argues, of religious buildings, which are also built to be isolated from the outside world, refusing otherness. These spaces are 'specially segregated', a 'kind of non-place, ultra-place or ideal space where the surrounding matrix of space-time is symbolically annulled' (McEvilley, 1986, p. 8). Such buildings cease, in this matter, to be space as a trialectic product and are instead converted into sites. In parallel, as the space gives way to the site, the artwork gives way to the monument, and aesthetic autonomy gives way to a modern exclusive sensibility: 'monumentality surrounds the artwork with the ceremonial aura that keeps the spectator at bay' (Maleuvre, 1999, p. 58). Although spatial, the monument inflicts a temporal, social and aesthetic disjunction, as it makes room for an absence. The artwork as monument stands equally distant from the past and the present, no longer presenting 'an esthetic experience' but a '*model* of subjectivity caught in history' (Maleuvre, 1999, p. 6).[43] The museum is crucial to this reduction, as it severs art from experience to 'serve as insignia of taste and certificates of special culture' (Dewey, 1980, p. 9).

This space requests not only the immortalisation of the aesthetic, but also a type of sensibility: 'by suggesting eternal ratification of a certain sensibility, the white cube suggests eternal ratification of the claims of the caste or group sharing that sensibility' (McEvilley, 1986, p. 9). The ideal, eternal character of what O'Doherty calls the 'white cube'[44] grants its sameness, homogeneity, boundedness and muteness to other spaces. In its pursuit to establish an ideal, mental or imaginary space for art to be freed from culture for the sake of its autonomy, the white cube stands as a perfect site; it 'censors out the

---

from history. He says: 'In lifting art out of the hurly-burly of historical survival, the museum strips the artwork of its historical existence. It replaces historicity with historiography' (Maleuvre 57).

[43] Maleuvre proceeds: 'Tipped to the side of the object, culture in Balzac emerges essentially as a culture of death' (Maleuvre 6). As John Dewey claims, by removing the artwork from its original status, the artwork is *reduced* to fine art. Fine art is, according to him, a reduction of the artwork's status for, rather than elevating art to the autonomous state, it alienates it from its source and transforms it into the product of elitist contemplation.

[44] The 'white cube' refers to the typical art gallery space, whose lack of context is assumed, in modernism, to provide the fewer context possible to the artwork so that it is made truly ideal and the cut between its perceived interior properties be severed from the outside world.

world of social variation, promoting a sense of the sole reality of its own point of view and, consequently, its endurance or eternal rightness' (McEvilley, 1986, p. 9).[45]

The museum testifies to institutional validation in the same way Foucault's[46] account of institutions does. Modern spaces of art are institutional per se, if we accept Foucault's use of the term,[47] since they order the practices and discourses allowed within them, classifying both art and space according to a set of specific rules that validate art through its emplacement and the type of spatial practices allowed within these spaces. In its search to accommodate art's autonomy, the modern space of art annuls that autonomy under institutionalisation. The bounded character of the modern art space and its seriality as a quasi-religious institution of horizontal and ideal permanence 'gives the space of presence possessed by other spaces where conventions are preserved through the repetition of a closed system of values . . . So powerful are the perceptual fields of force within this chamber that, once outside it, art can collapse into secular status' (O'Doherty, 1986, p. 14). Furthermore, these places for art, via the fabrication of history through the chosen form of exhibition, gather people towards an identity that does not assume itself to be such. Denying ideology, identity, space, history and society for the sake of art's autonomy, the museum space remains ideological, identitary, spatial, historical and social, despite being constituted by the curator and sameness instead of practice, plurality, alterity and difference. The artwork is denied its autonomy in the very constitution of space. It is assumed to be unable to produce its own space; therefore, space constitutes an external part of its ontology that is injected into it – on a white canvas or in a white cube – in which the artwork is removed from the world and lacks agency apart from individual or elitist representation.

[45] It could also be argued that without the museum, 'the idea of art as a cross-cultural, transhistorical phenomenon, which underpins even Dewey's account, would not have achieved social visibility' (Mattick 432) and would be relegated to the status of mundane object or artefact. So, what is implied here, is not that the museum removes art from itself , but rather that before accommodating the notion of the spatiality of the artwork besides itself, the museum 'commodified', homogenised and stultified art as a token of a given society and a given class sensibility: as a historical and ideological symbol whose social connections were solely defined by an elitist and negative aesthetic that was not self-reflexive. Art's autonomy an even its negative aesthetic was jeopardised and limited given their ideological co-option.
[46] Museums shared the qualities of Foucault's and Casey's sites being instrumental and functional, 'capable of inducing a reform of public manners' (quoted in Naylor and Hill 71) to which the autonomy of art was oftentimes the prescription of, via the exercise of institutional power over artistic form. Surely, this is not a completely linear prescription and as Foucault's concept of heterotopia or De Carteau's tactics, these perspectives are always resisted in one way or another by the practices of the public.
[47] See Foucault's *The Birth of the Clinic* and *Discipline and Punish* for primary resource and Mark Yount and John D. Caputo's (eds.) *Foucault and the Critique of Institutions* or Miloje Grbin's 'Foucault and Place' for further reading.

There are one or more assumptions about sociality and identity inherently involved in the process of the institutionalisation of the modern art space in which the spectator is disembodied as the Eye,[48] as O'Doherty discusses. The spectator is expected to comply with the role and consequent spatial practices he or she has been assigned. The frame strives to contain the picture as the art space strives to contain the viewer. O'Doherty says, in the words of McEvilley, regarding the expected spatial practices of the white cube (returning to the analogy between modern spaces of art and religious spaces or sites):

> In *classical modernist* galleries, as in churches, one does not speak in a normal voice; one does not laugh, eat, drink, or sleep; one does not get ill, go mad, sing, dance, or make love. Indeed, since the white cube promotes the myth that we are there essentially as spiritual beings . . ., we are to be understood as tireless and above the vicissitudes of chance and change (McEvilley, 1986, p. 10)

Instead of the artwork being a productive force for the construction of the space of art, it is devoured by that space, becoming it. In fact, the quest to clear the space of context and expose the artwork in a vacuum for the preservation of the same artwork constitutes the downfall of modern artistic attitudes and discourses, as made explicit in the various waves of institutional critique movements that followed. The stress on de-contextualisation is formative of an ideology of the artwork (and its space), whose ontology consequently depends on the context-premise – or its negation. However, the negation of context negates itself: if the artwork is independent of context, its ontological status of being art is thus dependent on the lack of context. This lack necessarily defines it if we agree with the presupposition of the autonomous artwork. This relationship is problematic in two distinct ways: not only is the white cube, despite its lack of complex visual stimuli, a context in itself, but by being defined in terms of the negation of context, the context – or the lack thereof – also defines the artwork, whose definition requires annulment.[49] The modern space of art's lack of context is then merely superficial:

> The white wall's apparent neutrality is an illusion. It stands for a community with common ideas and assumptions. Artist and audience are, as it were, invisibly spread-eagled in 2-D on a white ground. The development of the pristine, placeless white cube is one of modernism's triumphs – a development commercial, esthetic, and technological. In an extraordinary strip-tease. The art within bares itself more and more, until it presents formalist end products and bits of reality from outside. (O'Doherty, *Inside the White Cube* 79)

---

[48] The modern museum rejects the Spectator of its intrinsic qualities as sentient and empowered subject and reduces it into an abstraction from which the artwork and the space of art lives without.

[49] For Heidegger[49], for example, the aesthetic, musified perception of art declares the triumph of the object over the real ontology of the artwork (or the 'work-being'), it is reduced to mere form – the inverse move, however, produces the same consequences.

Since the lack of context condition cannot be fulfilled, there cannot be art in the sense proposed by the modern idealist conception. As Simon Sheikh, in a recent review of O'Doherty's text, so persuasively puts it, 'the spatial arrangement overdetermines – consumes – the works . . . to the degree that context becomes content' (Sheikh, 2009, n.p.). In place of this, O'Doherty explains, both abstraction or mental space and real or abstract space should be implicated in the space of art since the 'exclusive division between them has blurred the fact that the first has considerable practical relevance – contrary to the modern myth that art is "useless"' (O'Doherty, 1986, p. 38). Arriving at the same conclusions Lefebvre does regarding the double illusion of modern thinking about space, the critic contends that these modern discourses have resulted in a theorisation of art that removes it from space, history and society. Although deeply embedded in a temporal narrative, the modern art space negates the concept of the artwork as historically founded. Although a space, the modern art space negates the artwork's spatiality. Moreover, although orientated towards the formation of a specific society – as all spaces are, according to Lefebvre – the artwork is deemed asocial, useless or an end in itself.

Although necessary at some historical point for salvaging the artworks from private collections, the modern art space, as it has been defended in the form of the museum or art gallery, alienated the artwork from space and society. In trying to elevate it to a transcendent, ideal realm, freed from materiality, the modern art space instead quarantines the artwork, as Maleuvre expounds:

> This quarantining of art constitutes a political feature because it defines social spaces, their mode of integration and their content . . . [they] remove artworks from involvement in the polis, neutralize their political thrust, freeze their contents as esthetically remote forms. By its very existence, the museum legislates against the direct participation of art in the polis. (Maleuvre, 1999, p. 39)

On that matter, O'Doherty points to the anti-formalist tradition, presented in works such as Duchamp's *1200 Coal Bags* (1938) and *Mile of Strings* (1942). In these works, Duchamp seeks to destabilise the traditional spatial conception and heralds the spatialisation of art practices and discourses. He also seeks to occupy and transform the space of art itself and to defy it as an ideal abstraction of space. In *1200 Coal Bags*, Duchamp subverts the usual spatial configuration by 'traversing the space from floor to ceiling . . . design[ing] the doors leading in and out of the gallery', installing 'revolving doors, that is, doors that confuse inside and outside by spinning what they trap. This inside-outside confusion is consistent with tilting the gallery on its axis' (O'Doherty,

1986, p. 68). Thus, Duchamp exposes the issue of context in art, 'of the container and the contained' (O'Doherty, 1986, p. 68). This invention – attributed by O'Doherty to Duchamp – reportedly initiated a series of practices inside the gallery and a growing awareness of a 'seepage of energy from art to its surroundings' (O'Doherty, 1986, p. 69). That shift accelerated the spatialisation of art, on the one hand, and decreased the mythification of the modern art space, on the other hand. This movement found deeper expression during the 1960s and 1970s with the emergence of the institutional critique and the postmodern debate.

Yet, the first discourses that aimed to challenge the modern art space, such as Duchamp's, only made sense inside that space and, to that extent, maintained it. However, these attempts worked at the level of transforming these spaces and initiated[50] a discourse that could then be made spatial, rather than fixed under the old notions of art and art space conceptualisation. Andy Warhol's *Brillo Boxes (Soap Pads)* (1964), for example, exposed not only that the artwork is situated in place, but also that it is fundamental to the constitution of that place. The artwork thus 'molds the space around it, gives it texture and visibility, and situates us in that space. Warhol's Brillo boxes ask us to consider the esthetic space of art not as something extraneous to the work of art, but rather an effect of the work, one of its creations' (Maleuvre, 1999, p. 56). These artistic practices, despite being implemented from inside the modern institution of art, were transformative, tentative[51] and inclusive, and they proposed an alternative that did not seem 'to occur to idealist and radical social planners' (O'Doherty, 1986, p. 86).

Thus, it is no surprise that the institutional critique was both 'a critical method' and 'an artistic practice' of the modern institution of art – mainly the modern museum, but also galleries and collections – that took the form of artistic practices, criticism and activism. Initiated as 'a critique of their [art institutions] ideological and representative social function(s)' (Sheikh, 2009, p. 30), and their self-proclaimed status as the neutral

---

[50] Criticism took some time to accompany what had already been taking place for a long time. The case is in point when we look at the spatial critique that has been taking place by artists, such as Duchamp or Mondrian, well before the 1970s and the accompanied spatial turn – although still framed within that discourse it tried to critique. William Morris, whom will be analysed later, provides a sharp example of such artistic sensibility, predicting realities to come.

[51] The architecturalisation and spatialisation of the arts – in its various forms – surpassed the modern white cube as they create a new reality for the artwork: no longer would 'painting and sculpture . . . manifest themselves as separate objects, nor as 'mural art' which destroys architecture itself, nor as 'applied' art, but *being purely constructive* [would] aid the creation of a surrounding not merely utilitarian or rational but also pure and complete in its beauty' (O'Doherty, *Inside the White Cube* 85).

container of art's perceived essence of autonomy, the institutional critique sought to denounce the art institution's production and reproduction of a form of being and identity that often nullified the artwork. Instead of preserving the artwork, as Robert Smithson argues, they acted as spaces of 'cultural confinement' that threatened the aesthetic, political, social and theoretical status of art. The whiteness of the white cube did not make it neutral, but sterile.

There was then an awareness – as David Livingstone argues in *Putting Science in its Place* – that museum architecture is not simply devoted to solving specific social or practical problems, as architects or designers usually do – but to constructing a 'symbolic writing of space' (Naylor & Hill, 2011, p. 38). The museum's layout, content, order of display, boundaries, light, location and so on have often been used to impose cultural or ideological values onto those spaces – especially, as the institutional critique and other postmodern positions claim, if we consider the museum's modern function, which comprised the reinforcement of an established historical narrative of progress and hegemony of Western countries, whose annulment of spatial difference was enacted via institutions, such as the traditional modern museum, and other spatial forms.

Naylor and Hill refer to Lewis Mumford, who, as early as 1938,[52] spoke about how the museum represents 'the most typical institution of the metropolis, as characteristic of its ideal life, as the gymnasium was of the Hellenistic city or the hospital of the medieval city' (as cited in Naylor and Hill, 2011, p. 66) and how this was central to the reinforcement of the modern project. Object disposition in the modern museum, for example, 'operate[s] like a map – bringing "the world into an apparent single, rational framework, with unified, ordered and assigned relationships between nature, the arts and cultures"' (Naylor & Hill, 2011, p. 68); offering a static and apparently coherent vision of the world; and ordering the gaze and movement of the visitor in alignment with a historical or ideological narrative. The organisation of objects[53] is aimed at the reflection

---

[52] See Lewis Mumford's *The Culture of the Cities*.

[53] Naylor and Hill tell us: 'by the late nineteenth century the display of human history was organized around the temporal development of people and their possessions' (Naylor & Hill, 2011, p. 69) denoting a tendency by the museums 'to impose a temporal history onto human history (Naylor & Hill, 2011, p. 70)' – one of progress – not only through architecture, object displaying and spatial layout, but also through a set of 'exhibitionary policies' (Naylor & Hill, 2011, p. 70). Object display by the beginning of the twentieth century was 'reorganized into a typological schema where objects of the same type from different places was grouped together and then arranged in a sequential order, with objects considered 'more natural' and organic at the beginning of a series and more specialized and 'complex' at the end, such that an evolutionary progression of material culture was suggested' (Naylor & Hill, 2011, p. 70). This emphasis on temporal, historical narrative of progress disregarded the spatial and identitary qualities of the displayed objects,

of a specific set of beliefs: It is always identitary in this respect, but also personal – reflecting the curators' set of values or beliefs. Maleuvre states that 'however neutral the museum estheticization of art appears, it is nonetheless fraught with political overtones. Art is not the only thing the museum neutralizes' (10-11). The museum neutralises aesthetic contemplation, spatial practices, social relations, an image of history and the status quo. The emptying of space and the apparent liberation of art from culture transforms it into a recipient of a unilateral and unidimensional vision. This attitude is largely what the institutional critique stands against.

The institutional critique[54] thus established new links and modes of inquiry between artistic practices and spatial discourses, announcing a closer relationship between artistic and geographic inquiry. As Sheikh states, 'one can then see institutional critique not as a historical period and/or genre within art history, but rather as an analytical tool, a method of spatial and political criticism and articulation that can be applied to the artworld, but to the disciplinary places and institutions in general' (Sheikh, 2009, p. 32). This view promoted the institutional critique as demanding the cooperation and interdisciplinarity of art practices, especially geography and art.

All these new conditions have propelled, as Soja tells us in 'Taking Space Personally', a 'sort of' spatial turn (Cf. Soja, 2009) in the arts. Jane Rendell adds that:

> The turn to spatial theory in the late 1980s and early 1990s highlighted the importance of space rather than time in the postmodern period. Academics from all kinds of disciplines, from art history to cultural studies looked to geography for a rigorous and theoretically informed analysis of the relationship between spatial and social relations, and of place and identity. (Rendell, 2006, p. 35)[55]

This spatial turn considered that most essentialist modern art forms ignored in their construction as art-things the sociospatial demands in which the works of art were

---

which bespoke of a historicist tendency to homogenise social relations under a grand modern *modus operandi*.

[54] The institutional critique not only was made from the outside of the art space but also from the inside, by curators and critics besides artists. Sheikh says: 'Analysed in terms of negative dialectics, this would seem to indicate the total co-option of the institutional critique by the institutions' (Sheikh, Notes on Institutional Critique , 2009, p. 31)thus making it futile, as would argue critics such as Adorno. However, 'such a conclusion would hinge around notions of subjectivities' that would confirm the status of authenticity of the artist and reaffirm the ideas the institutional critique tried to deconstruct. In fact, 'if institutional critique was indeed a discourse of disclosure and demystification of how the artistic subject as well as object was staged and reified by the institution, then any narrative that (again) posits certain voices and subjects as authentic' (Sheikh, Notes on Institutional Critique , 2009, p. 31) would turn the critique back on itself by co-opting their ideological and ideal discourse that created the institutionalisation of the artwork in the first place.

[55] See Michael Keith's and Steve Pike's *Place and the Politics of Identity* for a more detailed analysis on the relationship between identity and space.

included in their ontological and phenomenological status. The artwork is nevertheless constituted in and of a triad that implicates the art space.[56] Once time, as a source of representation, becomes insufficient in the production of value, a crisis in 'almost every other form of representation [follows]: language unhinges from the objective world of linguistics, the realist narrative line is abandoned in literature, homogeneous, perspectivist space is replaced by relative and heterogeneous spaces in arts (cubism and collage) and science (relativity)' (Friedland & Boden, 1994, p. 31). More importantly, this new approach has allowed, Warf asserts, for aesthetic-spatial investigation to explore the spatialities of artistic practice where artistic practice, and not just the artwork, is deemed to be meaningful in its own right. In this sense, 'artistic practice not only is a means by which art is produced but also constitutes particular sociospatial networks' (Warf, 2006, p. 14) This new consciousness decentralised spatial practices that sought to somehow remove art from the dualist conceptions of modern space integrating both art and geography.[57] These 'critical creative spatialities',[58] as Harriet Hawkins calls them, not only aim to critique dominant ways of thinking about space and culture – calling into participation the autonomous, negative character of the aesthetic – but also, in a reconstructive[59] postmodern manner, 'offer the potential to think (and practice) space differently' (Hawkins, 2011, p. 468).[60]

The geographical interpretation of art itself has come a long way from modernism to postmodernism via the spatial turn, shifting from an iconographic approach – highlighting the study of symbolical meanings represented in landscape art[61] – devoted to interpretations of the internal structures of the artwork, its reception and its relation to

[56] See Osborne's 'Non-places and art spaces'.
[57]Movements such as the feminist landscape, public or site-specific art demanded a less institutionalised, more social space of art that would emancipate it by making it inclusive of different types of discourses.
[58] Soja's 'thirdring-as-Othering' would represent, in this way, a critical-creative spatiality in the sense Hawkins propose it – issue to which we will be returning.
[59] It was not the white wall of the modern space of art that needed to be transgressed but the territoriality the artwork demanded to produce its own space and for this space to be fully understood through spatiality.
[60] They rise issues and questions such as: 'how much space should a work of art have . . . to breathe', if artworks determined 'their own terms of a occupancy', how could they declare this occupancy, where should artworks be and how should they dictate what other works could take place in the same place as they do, and so forth.
[61] The term was coined by Dennis Cosgrove and Stephen Daniels, following the cultural turn in geography which allowed for an interpretative method of art to rise. Differing from previous geographical approaches to art, iconography did not seek to establish general rules about landscape and identity (i.e., for a sole, definite truth in landscape art but rather to deconstruct its meaning). Besides the immediate content of the work of art, iconography examined the artist's choice of colour, technique, texture, perspective and scale in order to get a deep understanding of the work's relations to the broader social, cultural and political contexts. See 'Geography and Art' entry in Barney Warf's *Encyclopedia of Human Geography*.

its environment. This change, Hawkins claims, meant 'a shift from examining "a view of the world" to exploring "a point of view in it; a foregrounding of the experience of being-in and moving-through landscapes rather than understanding their symbolic content"' (Hawkins, 2011, p. 466). The shift meant a move from mapped, static perspectives to dynamic ones that regard both culture and spaces as plurally constituted. Don Mitchel[62] discusses these other types of visions, such as the iconographic tendency to reinforce the dominant ideological discourses and the erosion of difference from meaning constitution and physical production of space. In the landscape, the outside is framed by the horizon, O'Doherty tells us, so much so that 'such pictures . . . are poised between infinite depth and flatness and tend to read as pattern' (O'Doherty, 1986, p. 19). Now, pattern involves a symbolic interpretation that excludes otherness, and consequently investigation may be jeopardised. Moreover, with the spatial turn brought about by new global spatial conditions, such a mode of inquiry becomes theoretically insufficient.

This shift, argue Friedland and Boden, was heralded by a change in perspective within visual representation itself, which moved from a linear perspective to experiments with the fragmentation of light, colour and line, 'making the spatial dispositions arrive from the modulations of colour' (Friedland & Boden, 1994, p. 2). This shift especially applied to cubism,[63] which 'fractured the space-time barrier itself, providing simultaneous images of the same moment from different points in space and multiple views of a single scene at various points in time' (Friedland & Boden, 1994, p. 2). The cover of the two authors' book, *NowHere: Space, Time and Modernity*, is no coincidence in this respect. In *The Red Bridge* (1989), Hockney challenges the fixed point and its relation to its static spectator and instead depicts the tension between 'everywhere' and 'nowhere' – between presence and absence – assuming 'a painter/observer who is an embodied subject in motion, involved in a temporal relationship with the objects, the picture and the fiction itself' (Friedland & Boden, 1994, p. 2). Hockney's painting incorporates different perspectives and points to a spatiality that is now practised and embodied, cross-sectioned among a multitude of references (i.e., spatial, historical and social): '*now* connects to *then*, *here* to *there*' (Friedland & Boden, 1994, p. 3). Time and

[62] See Don Mitchel's *Critical Geography: An Introduction.*

[63] Here, cubism is not being defended as a spatial practice or even a spatial in itself since, following O'Doherty, this 'Attack on painting in the sixties failed to specify that it wasn't painting but the easel picture that was in trouble' (O'Doherty, 1986, p. 25). In fact, this movement failed so much that this critique of the easel and of the space outside the painting – which constituted the institutional critique agenda – that, to some extent, only ended up postponing the institutional crisis we would witness later.

space cannot be fully separated from each other – and this claim is transdisciplinary in its scope. The failure to accommodate such a perspective in both the arts and the construction of the space of art results in the emptying out of both concepts. However, the new global conditions imply precisely the connection between 'local times, spaces and people with global agendas, standardized time horizons and constantly shifting spatial arrangements' (Friedland & Boden, 1994, pp. 3-4), translating to a spatial turn not only in the social sciences, but also throughout an array of fields. While geography considered itself confronted with the challenges posed by its newfound interdisciplinarity, art history, criticism and practice faced a shift via emerging movements and discourses,[64] whose demands were both spatial and social.

This mode of inquiry brought about by postmodernism and the new global spatial conditions contended that the interpretation of the work and the space where artistic practice took place were constitutive of the work. The mode also allowed for a new relationship between geography and art, unmediated by the work's content. (Presupposing the spatiality of the work of art has allowed for geography's engagement with other types of artistic production, in addition to the study of landscape art or positive and negative space.[65]) The production of alternative links between geography and art 'offer[s] an implicit critique of the conditions of distance, objectification and control that were central to the interpretation of classic landscape images' (Hawkins, 2011, p. 467).[66] This new geographic perspective (sometimes referred to as 'new cultural geography'[67]), in addition to the (often feminist) postmodern critique, provided a new take on the interpretation of art that focused on how art and society simultaneously affect each other – in other words, how art is constructed by and constructive of social relations.

---

[64] Such as some of the avant-gardes, the institutional critique, minimalism (and postminimalism), public art, land art, social art, installation art, feminist art and others.
[65] In art theory, positive space refers to the space occupied by the subject of the artwork – be it a person, an animal, a vase, etc. – while 'negative space' refers to the space between the artwork's subject and the world. The definition of 'negative space' is not a consensual one, especially if we consider the variety of types of works of art that are passible of having one (consider, for example, the case of sculpture in which 'positive space' would be the sculpture in itself and 'negative space' that part of the sculpture that has no material, meshing with the surrounding space).
[66] New developments on geography and art has, thus, progressively given emphasis to the relation between art and visual culture. In fact, production, reproduction and distribution of visual imagery is power connoted so much so power relations are forged in both representations and interpretation of art. Power relations between genders, for example, can be extrapolated from Western art long history of female representation that usually portrayed women as naked, fragile, innocent, passive and beautiful: a perfect container for the male gaze. This type of representation of women were symptomatic of social relations: of the subordination of women and their domestic enclosure and of male identity in the construction and viewing of art.
[67] See entry on 'Cultural Geography' on *The Dictionary of Human Geography*.

It was thus inevitable for artists, curators, art critics and geographers alike to ignore that art was 'an integral part of the urban fabric' (Molina & Guinard, 2017, para. 1). This condition was exacerbated by time-space compression, as Harvey puts it, in the post-industrial era. Hence, spatiality discourses[68] redefined not only 'spaces and places in the city', but also their 'functions and relations to the urban environment. Consequently, one can wonder to what extent art – in its various forms (sculptures, murals, performances, etc.) – is urbanized in that process and the degrees to which cities are subsequently aestheticized or "artialized"' (Molina & Guinard, 2017, para. 1). The spatial turn has thus been produced from both within and 'without' artistic production, stemming from the new social, spatial and historical conditions and demands, as well as from artistic practice itself, which revises its own happenstance as artistic practice. Molina and Guinard add that 'with the – mostly urban – spatial turns of arts initiated in the 1970s in European and North American cities, a new porosity appears between art worlds and urban worlds, creating a dynamic coproduction between arts, societies and cities. Thus, art is made "in" and "with" urban spaces' (Molina & Guinard, 2017, para. 9) Miwon Kwon notes, however, that the immediate consequences[69] of the traditional critique resulted in a materialist view of space as an isolated construct in the search for a break with the historicist and ideological axis of the modern space of art. Later movements sought, on the other hand, to recuperate this dimension, allying it with the new progress – mostly made by the minimalists, who emphasised the role of experience in epistemologies of space and place – and with society. This is where we can trace the spatial turn proper and the consequent establishment of the postmodern space in and of art. Kwon explains:

[68] The connection between geography and arts remain, notwithstanding, a fragmentary form of inquiry, with little systematization, and the Spatial Turn is a movement that although significant – and most frequently put under the label of 'Urban Turn' – in artistic expression and practice, lacks theoretical elaboration. Urban studies about the role of art and art spaces have been mainly concerned with the issue of gentrification, highlighting the interactions between artworks and city rather than to the internal organisation of the spaces of art. the exclusion a coherent assessment on the internal organisation of these spaces are, then, often times, fragmented, reason why they will not be given a greater entry fees on the present study.

[69] As Rendell points out placement outside the gallery or the museum – Robert Smithson calls the site – does not mean that art cannot be commodified or co-opted by institutional and monetary power. What is important in this critical moment if the questioning of the limits of the modern art space and the traditional status of the artwork. Later, the notions of site an off-site as they were proposed by land art would be called into question – as some of them created another type of social exclusion centred around mobility. The point is, hence, not the placement of art outside the gallery space per se but the transformation of spatial and artistic spatialisation: in fact, these places play an important role both in the placement of art and its differentiation from the everyday, which has allowed for it to survive the perils of time and history. The subsequent reformation of museums and galleries has allowed for a restructuration of their spatial qualities so to open up space to society and plurality and move beyond modern spatial logic.

'dispersed across much broader cultural, social, and discursive fields, and organised intertextually through the nomadic movements of the artist – operating more like an itinerary than a map – the site can now be seen as various . . . it can be literal, like a street corner, or virtual, like a theoretical concept' (Kwon, 2002, p. 3). The definition of site-specific art put forward by Kwon makes this theoretical shift evident: while art produced in the aftermath of the institutional critique of the 1960s and 1970s needed the spatial permanence of artwork, and while that static notion of space was perceived to confer ontological stability to the artwork, more contemporary approaches to site specificity 'imply not the permanence and immobility of a work but its impermanence and transience' (Kwon, 2002, p. 4). These approaches also suggest its relation to social space, rather than just abstract or mental space.

Following Peter Osborne's definition of contemporary art, I argue that this new spatial paradigm is postmodern in both a constructive and reconstructive manner, being critical of the linearity of the modern space and establishing a dialectic between modern art and the new global conditions. The postmodern space, which extends through the entire social sphere, has been particularly expressive in the space of arts, shifting the ontological status of the artwork itself. In fact, we can no longer speak only in terms of an ontology of the artwork, but of a phenomenology. The artwork no longer only *becomes* in the space of art but *happens*, *is* and *co-produces* that space. Again, a dialectic is established between place as a location and place as a process – between place as static or dynamic, as material, ideal and practised. Opposite to the empty, bounded abstraction of the modern white cube supposed to grant autonomy to the artwork (the space makes art), contemporary art not only happens in space but also 'make[s] space happen' (O'Doherty, 1986, p. 39).

The artwork's autonomy no longer results from a frozen nominalism and aestheticism of modern art stabilised by a space produced outside of it. Rather, it is in the production of space that art becomes autonomous, critical, subversive and disruptive of everyday life. The postmodern art space[70] no longer simply labels the artwork as such,

[70] Postmodern spatiality in art, of course, encompasses various arts forms (from post-minimalism to installation arts, from the avant-garde critique to contemporary arts), labelling a form of thinking - or even aesthetic attitude as Jameson would have it – that defies modern historicism, institutionalisation and ideological assumptions of the artwork that would have spatiality and sociality removed from artistic practice. The postmodern space of art can, yet, assume the form of the museum or the art gallery – indeed, the history of the museum showcases just how diverse it is its nature in present time, the institutional critique was successful so far. Modern spaces did not cease to exist, but now their variety has grown in

but, aware of the limits of those assumptions, creates a 'place of display of objects by their shared character as "works of art"' (Mattick, 2009, p. 432). Although largely critical of the modern overemphasis on autonomy in its aesthetic and spatial attitudes, contemporary art in postmodern space remains autonomous, but its autonomy is distinct: it is derived from the entropy announcing modern art's destruction beyond its nominalism. Contemporary art, aware that space is both produced and producer, although able to be materialised 'anywhere', binds artistic production and happenstance to its specific place – which can be forever moving. Autonomy thus depends on the fact that the artwork is not merely an ideological piece, meant to be isolated or protected from the world. Instead, the artwork is a tool through which that world is transformed. The theoretical discourse's recent emphasis on practice testifies to this newfound spatiality. Far from removing autonomy from art, conceptualising these spaces as postmodern recognises their autonomy, but not for autonomy's sake.

Modern autonomy has, in turn, conferred on the modern gallery, O'Doherty argues, a sort of religious status of spatiality. The search for the artwork's autonomy as a sort of divine, eternal and/or unchanging category implies an underlying 'political interest of a class or ruling group attempting to consolidate its grip on power by seeking rectification from eternity' (McEvilley, 1986, p. 8), promoting spatial – and, hence, status quo – stativity via the promotion of artistic values. On the other hand, in the postmodern space of art as theorised in this study, although an autonomous work of the artist, the artwork is always localised within Thirdspace, at the intersection of space as location and space as process. As long as art always happens somewhere, and as long as spatiality is ontologically inseparable from it or necessary to it (although the location may vary), it must be productive and produced by social relations. What the postmodern space has granted to art and its space is its release from the modern site and passivity: it is not only art as far as mental or second space that is autonomous, but also as first space and Thirdspace. This regained autonomy allows art to reach its full utopian capacity. As Zsolt Czigányik makes clear, 'a work of art that criticizes a certain political reality will not be fully understood unless that reality is taken into consideration' (Czigányik, 2017, p. 7). Therefore, the artistic practices enabled by the postmodern space are self-reflexive in mediating among social, spatial, subjective and historical relations. The space of art

---

order to accommodate the new demands brought by new forms of spatialisation, on one hand, and artistic practices, on the other.

becomes real, imagined and real-and-imagined space. Space is clarified not only in the picture, but also in the place where the picture hangs.[71] Postmodern space joins the picture plane as a unit of discourse.

Consequently, the space of art unwraps itself to encompass the particular epistemologies of the spectator, who has been increasingly perceived as emancipated.[72] This shift has been accompanied by the reorganisation of the art space as spatial layout and object display, bringing awareness to the multitude of stories that can be told in this space.

Thus, postmodern artworks obtain this classification (postmodern) not only based on their spatial practices but also on their critical practices. Lefebvre's production of space, De Carteau's tactics, Massey's progressive sense of place and Soja's Thirdspace are attempts to grasp the new conditions hidden by space. As Kwon expresses,[73] site specificity should be accommodated 'as an analogous artistic endeavour' that 'can be seen as both compensatory symptom and critical resistance' (Kwon, 2002, p. 8). Abstract space, says Lefebvre, 'tends towards homogeneity, towards the elimination of existing differences and peculiarities', as does the narrative of modernism, which – located between an idealist and materialist view of the world – annuls difference under sameness or identitary compulsion. He continues: 'a new space cannot be born (produced) unless it accentuates differences'. In other words, whatever space follows that of modernism must be embedded in the radical notion that space, history and society are differential and constituted through a panoply of sometimes divergent discourses and stories. Kwon elaborates, adding that 'if the universalizing tendencies of modernism undermined the old divisions of power based on class relations fixed to geographical hierarchies of centres and margins only to aid in capitalism's colonization of 'peripheral' spaces, then the articulation and cultivation of diverse local particularities is a (postmodern) reaction against these effects' (Kwon, 2002, p. 157).

---

[71] O'Doherty asks: 'the fragment from the real world plunked on the picture's surface is the imprimatur of an unstoppable generative energy. Do we not, through an odd reversal, as we stand in the gallery space, end up *inside* the picture, looking out at an opaque picture plane that protects us from the void? . . . As we move around that space, looking at the walls, avoiding things on the floor, we become aware that that gallery also contains a wandering phantom frequently mentioned in avant-garde dispatches – the Spectator' (O'Doherty, 1986, p. 39).

[72] See Jacques Ranciére's *The Emancipated Spectator*.

[73] In *One Place After Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity,* Kwon makes use of critical theory, postmodern thought and debates on identity politics and public sphere in order to deconstruct identitary notions of spatiality and spatially-oriented artistic practices such as phenomenological formulations of sense of place and critiques on displacement and placelessness that make use of the identitary argument.

For Kwon, then, site-specific art emerges as a recent attempt to rehabilitate the institutional and anti-idealism critique of the 1960s and 1970s. This critique 'incorporated the physical conditions of the particular location as integral to production, presentation, and reception of art' (Kwon, 2002, p. 1), while improving their positivist formulation via the reformulation of artistic practice. At the core of this revitalisation are the co-option and absorption of the term by institutions and readymade notions that spatial awareness is an automatic signifier of criticality or progressiveness. Site specificity is not, however, employed here 'exclusively as an artistic genre but as a problem-idea, as a peculiar cipher of art and spatial politics' (Kwon, 2002, p. 2), framing the artistic problematic properly under the spatio-political one – and this is what is of particular significance for this study. Rosalyn Deutsche has labelled this process an 'urban-aesthetic' or 'spatial-cultural' discourse of art, which relates 'ideas about art, architecture, and urban design, on the one hand, with theories of the city, social space, and public space, on the other' (Deutsche, Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics, 1996, p. XI). Consequently, it is not simply the positioning or self-awareness of the role of space in artistic practice that makes it critical per se. In fact, the first wave of site-specific art cultivated a space that was bounded and homogeneous; its dialogues were closed and difference muted, fostering a modern spatial logic. To avoid this situation and to emphasise the crucial role of understanding spatiality trialectically, Kwon refers to Homi Bhabha's concept of 'relational specificity' to demonstrate how objects, people and places relate to each other, recognising – similarly to Massey – both the relational and mobile character of and within spaces. Rendell explains that 'akin to James Clifford's notion of site as a mobile place, located between fixed points, Bhabha's concept suggests an understanding of site that is specific but also relational' (Rendell, 2006, p. 32). Accordingly, artistic practices must be constituted and produced dialectically with space, history and the subjects, recognising the relationality of both art practice and the heterogeneous, transient character of the borders of its spaces.

Following Kwon's analysis, Rendell unites artistic processes and practices with space, revisiting the role of the subject (as both artist and viewer) and the role of the specific stories associated with the spatial matrix. Spatial practices become places of evasion and subversion of the modern art space (and world), as well as of the economic and political structures that seek to reify and neutralise artworks by stabilising and standardising their institutionalisation. Postmodern art places, Rendell suggests, interact with other places and society's macro- and micro-structures through spatial practice: that

of the artwork itself, that of the artist, that of the (it is hoped, emancipated) spectator and that of the communities with which they interact. Spaces of art are thus not, I argue, differential or heterotopian in the sense envisioned by Lefebvre and Foucault, respectively: they are not counter spaces per se, although the concept aids their negative (critical) conceptualisation. Rather, it is more useful to think of them as relational. This does not mean that art and art places do not produce differences – indeed, they are differential. Instead, in that relationship they are not limited to an internal, negative logic: they are progressive places, in the middle of the space of flows, and their theorisation implies both interiority and exteriority. Kwon's and Rendell's investigations of artistic practices *in situ* allow us to conclude that these spaces form a type of constellation, proving correct Massey's assessment of place as 'unfixed, contested and multiple'. Although the space of art can occupy a specific spatial moment in the social relations network, this apparent immobility is contingent, unbounded and amenable to change. Unquestionably, this relational character of postmodern spatiality does not dispense with the need to recognise spatial specificity and its abstract qualities but demands an investigation of such qualities be made with a comprehension of space within a network of spaces. The goal here is thus not to deny the need of the space of arts or to deprive it of its material or mental conditions.

However, when artistic practices move beyond traditional spatiality, Rendell states that 'the parameters that define it are called into question and all sorts of new possibilities for thinking about the relationship between art and architecture are opened up' (Rendell, 2009, p. 1). However, this social positioning does not necessarily mean that art or the spaces of art need to produce a solution to existing social problems; rather, they can adopt a critical attitude. While acting in social space,[74] these artistic practices, by engaging in critical thinking, are capable of a double critique: an outward critique of social space and an inward critique due to its embeddedness in social space. Therefore, Rendell proposes that we call this critical function of art in public space 'critical spatial practice'.[75] This practice permits transformation rather than mere description: 'If we can, then, only talk about the public sphere in plural, and in terms of relationality and negation, it becomes crucial to understand, situate and reconfigure art's space – institutions – as

---

[74] Critical spatial practices have, Rendell tells us, been variously described (and inscribed) 'as contextual practice, site specific art and public art' and in architecture as 'conceptual design and urban intervention' (Rendell, 2006, p. 12).

[75] This critical practice is influenced by De Carteau's tactics and Lefebvre's representations of space.

public spheres' (Sheikh, 2006, n.p.). To do this, one must recognise, on the one hand, that the space of art is a relational, heterogeneous space where points of view and perceptions are confronted with and beyond one another; they are a battleground, according to Pierre Boudierre and Hans Haacke. On the other hand, those spaces are not autonomous or neutral, as they claimed to be under modernism. Rather, they are inserted in the space of flows and are social spaces that interact with and are produced by other spaces, a characteristic evidenced 'in critical theory and critical, contextual art practices' (Friedland & Boden, 1994, pp. 3-4). These practices are admittedly interdisciplinary, 'almost anything can be considered an art object in the appropriate context, and . . . more than ever before work with an expanded praxis' (Friedland & Boden, 1994, pp. 3-4), dialoguing with architecture, design, philosophy, politics, sociology, science, and so forth.

Admittedly embedded in Soja's method of 'thirdring-as-Othering',[76] critical spatial practice is said to confer the artwork with a spatial, historical and social dimension. Comparable to Soja's approach, Rendell's theorisation of art practices and spaces seeks to deconstruct binaries and move beyond preconceived polarisations. What happens phenomenologically and functionally is that some supposed binaries benefit from being employed co-operatively rather than concurrently – as do Lefebvre's, Soja's and Massey's accounts. 'The radical move deconstruction offers', Rendell upholds, 'is to think "both/and" rather than "either/or", putting deferrals and differences into play and suggesting instead "undecideability" and slippage' (Rendell, 2006, p. 25). As Molina and Guinard note, 'the role played by other artistic or cultural forms which are still more marginal, discreet or recent has given rise to an emerging body of research' (Molina & Guinard, 2017, para. 9) This role is aided by the integration of postmodern discourses and theorists (e.g., Soja and Massey) highlighting how marginal discourses can be integrated within an inclusive, plural, heterogeneous, porous, relational and mobile spatiality. The alterity of these factors is not achieved by the negation of materiality and location, but via the integration of apparently binary relations, features and modes of being in a relational (and even trialectic, we may be so bold to state) framework.

Artistic practice thus demands a dialectical move that unites the practice of design – and its functionalism – and the aesthetic autonomy of fine arts, proficiently constructing

[76] Reason, she reveals, of the tripartite structure of her book.

a series of differing reactions to space. Art, of course, is not functional in a traditional way, but its role resides in its criticality, self-reflexivity, emancipatory thrust and 'wishing-in-practice' character enabled by its engagement with spatial discourse. Utopian possibilities, unravelled in the artwork, are enacted and find practical/critical realisation in (trialectic, postmodern) space. Thus, art's critical practice 'serves to describe both everyday activities and creative practices which seek to resist the dominant social order' (Rendell, 2009, p. 2). As a critical theory, art's critical spatial practice aims not only to prove a specific hypothesis or a particular methodology, but 'in myriad of differing ways . . . [to] offer self-reflective modes of thought that seek to change the world' (Rendell, 2009, p. 3).

Considering this, we are apt to suggest that artistic practice in postmodern space is, in the terms presented in this analysis, always radically compromised by this critical practice. Spaces are, furthermore, postmodern since they are vertical in addition to horizontal, physical in addition to mental, same in addition to other; they allow for plurality, relations, multiplicity and dialogue to be established. They do so by bringing the social – both its macro- and micro-structures and modes of being – to the art space and by bringing the artwork to society, without placing it in particular hands. As O'Doherty puts it, 'with postmodernism, the artist and the audience are more like each other' (O'Doherty, 1986, p. 76), revealing the social factuality of the artwork and making room for utopian realisation and alterity.

Spatial critical artistic practice involves a 'transgression', a removal 'of perceptual constants', a 'dissociation of the senses', a radical dialogue and sometimes even boredom. Such practice establishes radical, in the sense of alternative and open to difference, spaces that engage with society and history, not just artistically but through sociospatial practice. Such created spaces 'are, then, metaphors for consciousness and revolution' (O'Doherty, 1986, p. 76) and are thus compromised by the emancipatory imagining of alternatives – or utopian methods.

Rendell states that if, in fact, 'there is such a practice as public art . . ., then I would argue that public art should be engaged in the production of restless objects and spaces . . . that provoke us, that refuse to give up their meaning easily but instead demand that we question the world around us' (Rendell, 2009, p. 1). It is precisely this characteristic that marks the artwork as utopian. This function, as theorised by Rendell, has more to do with critical utopia than its traditional counterparts, given their continuing and constitutive

processual nature that demands the impossible through *practice*. Nevertheless, a distinction of the utopian functions of art is overdue. Certainly, both modern and postmodern art – and thinking – are utopian; however, each approach's to utopianism – and utopia – is largely distinct in nature. Ernst Bloch has been one of the most influential and most cited authors on the role of utopia in art, which is regarded as constitutive of artistic practice altogether. For Bloch, the utopian impulse is both an anthropological and ontological contingency of all artistic and cultural production in its longing for a better world that is not-yet, but whose mere existence as utopian discloses its own possibility as a function of desire. This utopian impulse is, for Bloch:

> ubiquous in human culture, but its expression is necessary historically variable, and often oblique and fragmentary. Among the varied social forms that have a utopian content, Bloch discusses not just fairy tales and myths, but alchemical quest for a process that will transmute metal to gold, travellers' tales, ... Bloch argues that there is a generic utopian content in this, a vital attempt to grasp the possibility of a radically different human experience. (Levitas, 2007, p. 53)

Sousa Dias upholds a similar perspective in his article 'A utopia intíma da arte', which he opens with the following sonant lines:

> the artwork creates, simultaneously to its own reality, its own possibility, and there is no art, no art criteria, outside that creation, that delimitation, of that extension of the horizon of possibility. Art is the confrontation of an impossibility and the realization that, without it, it would have remained not only unrealized but impossible. (Dias, 2000, p. 75)[77]

By this, the author implies not only that the utopian considers itself realised in art, but also that art, in its very creation, necessarily creates the utopian that enables the creation of the artwork altogether. Art *is* the creation of a utopian possibility, which in turn permits the creation of art. If we ask which was created first, we find ourselves confronted with our own inability to provide a definite answer due to the very structure of the two objects – art and utopia. The constitution of each implies the other. There is, Sousa Dias continues, a fundamental utopia in the happenstance of the art practice, be it implicit or explicit, which is the product of the intersection of not only socio-historico-spatial relations and dialogues, but also artistic practice and creation (i.e., utopia can only assume form as/in the artwork). Their relation is thus biconditional in addition to necessary. Sousa Dias states that 'precisely, as possibilities entail creation, those possibilities could not

[77] Original text: "A obra de arte cria, ao mesmo tempo que a sua realidade, a sua própria possibilidade, e não há arte, não há critério de arte, fora dessa criação, dessa delimitação, dessa extensão do horizonte do possível. A arte é o afrontamento de uma impossibilidade e a realização do que, sem ela, teria permanecido não só irrealizado como impossível

preexist that act of creation; they did not exist already as pure possibilities. On the contrary, they were strictly impossible, and without that creation they would never even be conceivable'[78] (Dias, 2000, p. 75).

Osborne, tracing the history of contemporary art through the various artistic movements that gave rise to it and regarding the new spatial conditions of urban life brought about by globalisation, defines contemporary art as a synthesis of previous movements; it is both conceptual and aesthetic – and contextual. Derived from the conceptual art critique of the aesthetic essentialism of modernism, conceptual art maintains aestheticism, but no longer as a necessary condition for the artwork's ontological status. Similarly, conceptualisation by itself is no longer enough in the eyes of contemporary art, which now demands the synthesis of aestheticism and conceptualism. These concepts serve as materials, Osborne explains, while space serves as the medium. Thus, aestheticisation and conceptualisation concern the artwork's static being, whereas space has the phenomenological condition of coming into possibility. Reflecting on both Osborne's theorisation of contemporary art and Sousa Dias's – and Bloch's – defence of the utopian dimension as ontologically necessary for the artistic moment, I argue that both the aesthetic and conceptual dimensions are different modes of the utopian function in art. As Levitas argues, following Bloch's account, utopia is essentially a method – which she names the 'imaginary reconstitution of society' (IROS) – for artistic/literary practice and critical study that is enacted on impulse. This impulse may express itself differently in its function,[79] not fixating on this or that utopian form. Instead, 'it provides a way of addressing the utopian aspects of a variety of cultural forms and expressions' (Levitas, 2007, p. 53)Although seemingly fragmentary and episodic, this broad definition, Levitas says, enables us to consider how cultural aspects and artefacts denote shifts in 'utopian energies' (Levitas, 2007, p. 54).

---

[78] Original text: 'precisamente como criação que é, esses possíveis não preexistiam essa realização, não existem já como puras possibilidades. Pelo contrário, eram rigorosamente impossíveis, e sem essa criação jamais seriam, sequer, concebíveis'.

[79] Utopian function may be, moreover, rhetorical or revolutionary, especially when one considers artistic critical spatial practices. For more on the rhetorical function of art see Marlana Portolano's *The Rhetorical Function of Utopia: An Exploration of the Concept of Utopia in Rhetorical Theory*; for the revolutionary role of utopian artistic practices see Julia Ramírez Blanco's *Artistic Utopias of Revolt: Claremont Road, Reclaim the Streets, the City of Sol.*

From this point of view, one could argue that aestheticism and conceptualisation constitute two distinct functions of utopia in art: positive and negative,[80] respectively. Under this polarisation, the synthesis of the two would imply a new utopian function encompassing both and moving beyond them which is here being coined 'critical spatial practice of art', borrowing Rendell's term.[81]

Art's **positive function** represents utopia rather than being utopian itself; it aims to inspire us in the 'utopian program' (Jameson), which is presented as perfect. This function is more related to traditional utopian writings and idealisation – regarding both art and utopia. Utopia becomes prescriptive and is presented as an ideal vision of what a perfect society would look like. This utopia can be either aesthetic or conceptual, but is usually the first, in which the artwork's meanings are closed off, as aesthetic pleasure is perceived to be constitutive of utopian society. This utopia has been tendentially deemed compensatory, as Levitas argues in *The Concept of Utopia*, as it tends towards abstract form or static blueprints permeated with 'wishful, but not will-full, thinking' (Levitas, 2010, p. 144). Modern art as ideal- or aesthetic-orientated promotes an ontology of artistic production around the notion of creativity, which is supposed to 'effectuate a radical break with the past . . . and by doing so to give a new start to a new future' (Groys, 2008, p. 90). Moreover, according to this ideological stance, modern artwork is supposed to establish a 'conduit between the self and his imagination' (Maleuvre, 1999, p. 210) and the Platonist world of ideas, in which the artwork is thought to reside. The artwork is a representation of itself and links to the subject as representation: the aesthetic subject believes that the work of art is thus a 'mere extension of his psyche. Down-graded to a plaything, the work of art is a receptacle of subjective projections' (Maleuvre, 1999, p. 211). The particularities of the artwork and its relation to material conditions and social relations are disregarded and overshadowed by the possible ideological meanings extractable from the artwork (similar to what iconographic inquiry was said to do). The utopian then becomes static in the modern work of art. Hence, despite the efforts to fight the dominant discourse and ideology, these attitudes are reactionary rather than

---

[80] This distinction is inverse to the one Levitas' elaborated in *The Concept of Utopia*, in which she identifies the negative function of utopia as obstructive of revolution and the positive function of utopia as the one that instigates transformation (such as is the utopian function defended by Bloch). My inversion here has to do mostly with Adorno's formulation of negative aesthetics, as becomes evident later.

[81] Further could be said about utopian function and, perhaps more importantly, about the utopian function of art, but we will here restrict ourselves to those that relate specifically to the ones that can be correlated to the modern and postmodern debate, on one hand, and/or to spatial studies, on the other.

sensitising, tending to neutralise differences and poles under figurative representation.[82] The neutralisation process is also one of deterritorialisation of the 'ideological parameters' of one social situation, which gives way to the construction of something new.

The **negative**[83] **conceptual function** allows for the instigation of utopian transformation and practice, providing 'the basis of a new thinking of time and history' (Wegner, 2007, p. 119). For Bloch, who stands on the optimist side of the spectrum, this (negative) utopian function constitutes art's *raison d'être,* as it is responsible for 'the imaging of a different world' or of 'anticipatory illumination', which unravels the condition of possibility 'for rearranging social and political relations to produce *Heimat*, Bloch's word for the home that we have all sensed but have never experienced or known' (Ashcroft, 2012, p. 5). Art serves as an analytical and revolutionary tool for education in utopian desire of the 'Not-Yet present'. This characterisation of the utopian dimension of art as negative allows the impulse and opens up desire for utopia, representing the horizon towards which human society must walk towards; in other words, art 'presents imaginary realizations of what is Not-Yet-Actual' (Zabel, 1990, p. 83). Art's negative dialectic permits art's utopian function as critique to be articulated in a third moment of utopian function – and form. In this respect, art criticises the present to build the future. This exposure of the present order is essential for the construction of utopian projects; art is 'the social antithesis of society' (Adorno, 1997, p. 8). Thus, artworks can have a social function – they are social monads whose internal conflicts expose those of society – and a mode of investigation of the causal functions between artworks and their social contexts

This reflection is what Adorno calls the 'negative dialectics' of the artwork, whose status as both a concept and a social fact reflects that perceived opposing forces meet within the artwork. The 'truth content' of the artwork permits precisely the realisation of a lack, negatively depicting reality, challenging it while leaving it (materially, at least) unaltered. Although material, the artwork critiques the very material conditions that gave it origin, necessitating a space that is cohesive with the lack of context that the artwork needs to detach itself from society and politics and to avoid being co-opted by either.

---

[82] See Louis Marin's *Utopics: Spatial Play*.
[83] Also termed as facilitating or emancipatory by Levitas and as heuristic by Miguel Abensour.

What Adorno's considerations lack, despite his efforts to critique the idealist traditions,[84] – and thus to tip the discussion towards materialism and hence to the side of the object[85] while maintaining it as an autonomous and social entity – is the integration of the spatial dimension of the artwork. This implies, then, a neglect of a constitutive feature of the artwork as a dialectical and critical monad and, simultaneously, the construction of an alternative to the production of autonomous art. According to Adorno, although social, the artwork must preserve the autonomy of its own production. This means that both the artwork and artist, although influenced by social relations, must be severed from these relations in order to create a 'truthful' artwork. The artwork becomes social, not in a critical, spatial or active form, but in a reflective one. The problem, Ray reports, can 'be traced to a theoretically unjustified overinvestment in the work-form of modernist art' (Ray, 2009, p. 83).

As has been argued, the ideal perspective on the space of art – as much as the materialist, whose expression was secondary in modernism – not so much protects art from politics as protects politics from art. Art's utopian dimension, the imaginary and critical ability or function of creating an alternative that is Not-Yet, resides precisely, Maleuvre states, in its 'place of its appearance'. He continues, in a witty tone:

> Outside the polis – in the museum, for instance – the image-making aspect of artistic mimesis is benign because it is perceived as unambiguously illusory and apocryphal; in the forum it is easily mistaken for politics, that is, for the 'real' production of reality. As the creation of museums: they do not so much protect earth from politics as politics from art. (Maleuvre, 1999, p. 41)

The idealist notion of art's autonomy – as creative and negative – is fixed on its paradoxical self-reference. In 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Production', Walter Benjamin speaks of the loss of aura as a loss of the original context of the artwork in the space of flows, which, according to him, imposes a displacement on the artwork via the networks of mass communication, production and reproduction and negates the artwork's aura. Borys Groys, in turn, reiterates that perhaps it would be more coherent to theorise the aura not as lost in this space of flows, but as only capable of being theorised in this new context. 'In fact', he asserts, 'the aura, as described by Benjamin, only comes into being thanks to the modern technique of reproduction' (Groys, 2008, p. 73). It is

---

[84] Of Kant, on the one hand, that distinguishes noumena from phenomena, and Hegel, on the other, in the construction of the absolute spirit

[85] For Adorno, the very materiality of the object serves as counter-pressure and critique of the materialistic conditions of society: its 'power of resistance is that a realized materialism would at the same time be . . . the abolition of the domination of material interest' (Adorno, 1997, p. 40).

precisely via this ‘inclusion in a certain context, in a certain installation, through its topological description’ (Groys, 2008, p. 74) that originality is established in postmodern artistic practices, and not through its formal features. He suggests that what has often been theorised as the loss of the authenticity or autonomy of the work of art concerns the fact that new spatial, historical and social relations of production and reproduction have allowed not for the displacement of the work of art but for its dislocation. Artworks are no longer bounded to abstract or mental space but are productive of a trialectic art space. This new topology is not synonymous with a loss of autonomy, but with a dialectical movement that no longer binds art – or utopia – to normative logic. Indeed, the ‘topology of today’s networks of communication, of generation, translation, and distribution of images is extremely heterogeneous . . . In this sense, a copy is never really a copy, but rather always a new original in a new context. Every copy is by itself a flaneur’ (Groys, 2008, p. 75). The space of art is radically produced by ‘proposing the new criteria for telling a story’ (Groys, 2008, p. 76), for establishing, through critical spatial practice or through ‘thirdring-as-Othering’, the trialectic between the past, the future and the present, thereafter proposing a true radical alternative.

Groys goes further, arguing that ‘we have no outside position in relationship to installation practice. That is why the installation is so pervasive and avoidable . . . and that is why it is also truly political’ (Groys, 2008, p. 77): it demands that spatial decisions be made actively, and it is a ‘space of decision making’ in its trialectic resolution. In its negativity and radical commitment to authenticity and autonomous debates, the modern artwork is paradoxically negated in its claim to truth; the modern artwork excludes itself from reality and hence is dispossessed of real action.

Indeed, this tendency to detach art from life and compromise it with an ideal reflection of society is why art must truly become social. Social art, contrary to both the idealist and materialist schools, does not reinforce the status quo but reflects and acts on it. Social art’s mode of action may be implicit – as it instigates change – or explicit – when art is used as a weapon of resistance and revolution to combat present conditions. Social art becomes utopian dialectically; it reflects society and hence reflects on its own conditions, being able to critically transform its own matrix at every step. In contrast to the modern view of art’s utopian functions – namely, that this function can only be exercised on the condition that artistic practice remain immutable – it was the inherent stable autonomous conditions of the artwork that permitted its negative reflection on

society as a detached, hovering, transcendent presence. Postmodern attitudes and critical spatial practices contend that the artwork's utopian critical function and active engagement with transformation demand that artistic practice revise itself and accompany the changes happening in society. As art is understood relationally, it must be permeable to dialogue to be practised critically and utopian-ly.

This leads us to our final utopian function, the **critical spatial function**, which is posited as being committed to spatiality, specifically a postmodern spatiality. The purpose of these utopias is not to provide a blueprint or to just instigate change through a negative dialectics, but rather to synthesise utopia as method and utopia as picture. Critical utopias are 'open-ended situation[s]' (Bauman n.p.), recognising their own conditions of instability through which they can be founded on the real life and experience of their own time. These utopias do not present static, perfected blueprints of anthropological optimism, but base their vision on the utopian impulse as an active and continuous forcefield of utopian society. Critical utopias (or the utopian function) are pedagogical in scope, as they demand political responsibility for 'what is to be done, and how it is to be done (Moylan, 2014, p. XIV)'. Here, utopia represents a constant process of transformation and the integration of difference, rather than offers a 'fixed blueprint' (Moylan, 2014, p. XIV) in which 'one size fits all'. Peter Filing, Tom Moylan tells us, highlights how these critical utopias are organised around the politics of everyday life and revolutionary transformation. Hence, in the critical utopia people do not need to fit themselves into a homogeneous, recognisable mass; instead, society's transformation accompanies the diversity and plurality of its constitutive agents. The term 'agents' is used because these actors are called to action to develop and maintain that society. As Fitting so aptly argues, the critical utopia offers the reader 'the look and feel and shape and experiences of what an alternative might and actually be, a thought experiment or a form of "social dreaming"' (Fitting as cited in Moylan, 2014, p. XVI). Thus, deconstructing traditional utopian functions and modes, the critical function of utopia synthesises the positive and negative functions. Its utopian role is constitutively methodological, plural and heterogeneous.

The u-topos of utopia becomes a topos of a real-and-imagined social space of freedom and difference. Once more, the agglomerating movement that has been pervasive throughout this study emerges and is, at last, encompassed as the critical utopian function. The critical function thus highlights the spatial character of utopia and, in parallel, the

utopian character of art practices as critical spatial practices. Comparable to postmodern art spaces, they are not absolute but relational. Thus, one could argue that the critical utopia and/or critical utopian function is that which is proper to artistic practice and that cannot be enacted in any way other than spatially.

'The porosity between material and symbolic spaces [of art], between worlds represented in/by art and the worlds of social groups (symbolic world represented in art being inspired by social representations of their context of production and reception) participate to the minority's identity building and claiming' (Molina & Guinard, 2017, para. 18). This capability is crucial for the integration of spaces of art in utopia, as it creates the framework for the establishment of difference and, hence, of an alternative. It not only may be integrated in utopia but also is utopian itself – actively participating in the deconstruction of dichotomies and the construction of u-*topia*.

1.3. A geocritical approach to the spaces of art in utopia: Methodology and the Practice of Space in Utopian Texts

> *The undiscovered island is something that does not exist, it's just a creation of your mind, the King's geographers have seen the maps and declared that there are no more islands to discover, that has been over for a long time . . . We've been looking for a better place to live and decided to take advantage of your trip.* (Saramago, 2007, pp. 36-37) [86]

> *'Theory' only makes sense as an attitude; otherwise the generalization of the very concept of 'theory' is pointless. Part of that attitude is the endorsement of interdisciplinarity, of the need to think through the relations between areas where a specific theory can be productive, and of the need to think philosophically about even the most practical theoretical concepts, so called 'tools'.* (Bal & Inge, 1994, p. 8)

Having thus defined how art relates to space and utopia, affording a privileged medium for the theorisation of utopian function and the (more evident) relation between space and utopia, we must establish a coherent approach to the literary texts under scrutiny – namely, Bellamy's *Looking Backward: 2000-1887* (LB), Morris's *News from Nowhere, or an Epoch of Rest* (NFN), Le Guin's *The Dispossessed: An Ambiguous Utopia* (TD) and Delany's *Trouble on Triton: An Ambiguous Heterotopia* (TOT) – based on the conclusions made so far. The issue shifts from art *as* utopia to art *in* utopia, and a new trialectic is recognised.

[86] Original text: "A ilha desconhecida é coisa que não existe, não passa duma ideia da tua cabeça, os geógrafos do rei foram ver nos mapas e declararam que ilhas por conhecer é coisa que se acabou desde há muito tempo . . . Andávamos à procura de um sítio melhor para viver e resolvemos aproveitar a tua viagem".

The choice of 'modern' and 'postmodern' spaces as definitions and tools for the distinction of space and spatial attitudes before and after the spatial turn is not coincidental in this matter: as 'the aftermath of the spatial turn, a "planetary turn" has caused many traditional discourses within modern language and literary studies to make fascinating connections among the local, regional, and global circuits of cultural production' (Tally, 2017, p. 4). Hence, literary production within utopia has shifted as well.

All literary texts, Robert Tally claims, provide the reader with 'descriptions of places, situating them in a kind of imaginary space' that helps them 'understand the world in which they live' or even how '*others* [emphasis added] have lived, currently live, or will live in times to come' (Tally, 2017, p. 2). Spatiality is always explicitly (using maps, references to real spaces or itineraries) or implicitly (through the activation of imaginary spatial relations) present in the text. Tally contends, in this respect, that 'creative writers engage in a form of literary cartography by which they figuratively map the real-and-imagined spaces of their worlds, both within and with reference to a space outside the text' (Tally, 2017, p. 8). To this engagement the prefix 'critical' should be added 'to stress the distance from an effortless mapping of represented landscapes in literary texts' (Thacker, 2017, p. 33) to the articulation with more complex issues, such as to 'how space and geography affect literary forms and styles' (Thacker, 2017, p. 33). This critical attitude towards the relations established between space and text – contrary to geographical and geopoetics[87] approaches – provides an analysis of the representation of space and the interpretation of its signification or role in the text itself. This critical notion of literary geography thus focuses not only on the spatial form or spatial representations of the text, but also on its social relations and its political impact on the literary production of space, which distinguish it from a mere inventory of how literature represents these realities.

Embedded in such 'geocritical practice', as Tally defines it, the present study recognises interdisciplinarity not only as necessary but also as a contingent tactic for analysing the selection of utopian texts chosen, bringing together art history and criticism, geography and literary studies. This geocritical approach is postmodern since it 'work[s] to map possible worlds, to create plural and paradoxical maps, because it embraces space

[87] The geographical approach focuses on the context in which the texts were produced and geopoetics on the form of space creation.

in its mobile heterogeneity' (Westphal, 2011, p. 73).[88] In the utopian genre in particular[89], this heterogeneity is achieved through the act of the artist who 'pretends that things known to be impossible are not only possible but real, which creates mental spaces redefining – or pretending to redefine – the impossible' (as cited in Tally, 2013, p. 147). This approach implies that the spatialities of the text require two journeys: from the real to the imagined and, back again, from the imagined to the real. Consequently, the literary geographical imagination, although other to the geospace, cannot be completely severed from it, interweaving real and imagined into a creation of a real-and-imagined space, a whole new world that may serve as a lens for examining and thinking critically about *real* space, time and society. The utopian format is exempt from this encounter with the Other in a privileged spatial mode.

From utopia's point of origin – as becomes obvious after the deconstruction of the word 'utopia' itself (u = no; topos = place) – the act of narration is spatial in essence. Although utopian spatial form has evolved from an imaginary island to whole countries, continents, the world or even other worlds, and although its spatial fix is a highly variable one, utopia, as a literary genre, is one whose 'imaginary restructuring of society' is always articulated with a spatial imagination that seeks to articulate real, imagined and real-and-imagined space through and for transformation. The utopian space does not reproduce the real, but 'actualises new virtualities that had remained unformulated, and that then go on to interact with the real . . ., fiction detects possibilities buried in the folds of the real, knowing that these folds have not [yet] been temporalized' (as cited in Pietro, 2011, p. 20). In fact, literary production's true value, Westphal maintains, 'does not limit itself to the mimesis of reality, but it actualizes new virtualities hitherto unexpressed, which then *interact* with the real according to the hypertextual logic of interfaces' (Westphal, 2011, p. 73). Despite describing and taking place in places that are not, utopia is produced by real space and aims at its transformation. Thus, utopian space, situated at or just beyond the margin of our own environment, constitutes the archetypical real-and-imagined space of Soja's formulation, as it annexes the real-and-imagined conditions of space and offers an alternative to them and to the present social relations in a new spatial axis. Even when

---

[88] For Westphal postmodernism and the spatial turn have brought about a more complex and dynamic view of space which allows for the transgression of the traditional geographical practice between real and imagined space. As Tally explains: 'Wesphal maintains these three broad categories: spatiotemporality, transgressivity and referentiality' (Tally, 2013, p. 141).

[89] Although a similar argument could be made for fantastic and science fiction literature.

the spaces or places of utopia do not hold an explicit reference to real spaces or places in the world – as with most critical utopias whose hybridity with science fiction sometimes implies the construction of a wholly different world, as in Le Guin's and Delany's utopias – utopian space is always, at least implicitly, embedded in real spaces:[90] there are still at least the mental spaces of the school, hospital, house, park, studio, investigation centre and others, even when their reformation is complete.

The utopian text, Tally argues, although dependent on a greater level of suspension of disbelief, can only be established based on the presumption that a genre's rules are adhered to. He persuasively makes this case by referring to the fantastic space of *The Hobbit*'s Middle Earth:

> the Lonely Mountain is a single mountain arising from relatively flat surrounding lands, the Misty Mountains are enshrouded in mist, Mirkwood is a rather murky forest, Rivendell is set in a valley through which a river flows, and Hobbiton is a town of Hobbits . . .. The generic place-names in *The Hobbit* suggest that its narrative takes place not in a particular, identifiable region, but in some kind of generic space that the knowing reader can recognise [....]. Within the fairly limited and mostly circumscribed space of Tolkien's Middle-earth, the imaginary places are accorded almost the same level of reality as many 'real' places, of the kind that is to be found in historical romances or medieval literature. (Tally, *Spatiality* 151-152)

Similarly, utopian spatiality survives and is linked to the readers' and author's geospace despite having no visible connection to it, being solely imaginary in this respect. This, Johannes Riquet maintains in 'Island Spatialities', 'points us to an important departure of many utopian islands, namely the illusion of a pure space untouched by reality' (Riquet, 2017, p. 218),[91] to the extent that utopia's temporal and spatial forms are often opposed to those of daily life, whose lack of one or the other lies at the core of utopian form.

Defining the spatial conditions of utopia and the spatial-utopian dimension of art, the spaces of art are distinguished according to their artistic spatial modern or postmodern attitudes. Unilaterality, functionality, boundedness, horizontality, univocal/identitary, homogeneity, stativity and neutrality (via institutionalisation), which are the characteristics attributed to the modern space (of art), will, it is hoped, be proven to be characteristics linked to the traditional utopia; and *trialecticality*, unboundedness, four-dimensionality, plurality/multiplicity, heterogeneity, dynamism and progressivity (space as process). These are the physiognomies attributed to postmodern spatiality, which are

---

[90] Or, as Tolkien puts it: 'creative fantasy is founded upon the hard recognition that things are so in the world as it appears under the sun; recognition of fact, but not a slavery to it' (Tolkien, 2001, p. 55).

[91] The utopian production of pure space via the island mode of space is not exclusive, Riquet makes explicit in her broader analysis of islands in text form, to the genre but is part of 'the persuasive textuality that characterizes many Western island narratives' (Riquet 219).

hypothesised as being more pronouncedly present in the critical utopia, distinctions are made in the text via a quasi-topoanalysis[92] of the spaces placed in one category or another, as follows:

Modern Space of Art	Postmodern Space of Art
Unilateral – The space of art is described in terms of its formal material qualities (as abstract space) or in terms of the ontological status of the artwork (as mental space). Both these approaches are normative upon spatial relations and practices.	Trialectic – The space of art is not described through opposition between material and metaphysical perspectives but as integrating these with spatial practices.
Functional – Space of art functions either as aesthetic space, in which art is gawked at but not lived with (in the sense of actively engaged); or as functional space in which it serves as setting for some other activity, to testify society's utopian-ness or as adornment.	Critical – Space of art functions not only as space of aesthetic contemplation or as formal or functional entity but also as critical practice, being actively engaged with the utopian society and its citizens.
Bounded[93] – The space of art obeys a specific layout that serves to present the artwork in a rigid way (following the author's or the society's aesthetic judgement on what should be consider a *proper* art form). They are closed to alternative artistic or social practices, discourses or identities. These boundaries may be mental or psychological or appear as having clear physical limitations that exclude certain identities, objects or practices.	Unbounded – The space of art does not have fixed borders but is malleable to the social, spatial and artistic practices of the utopian citizens. It is not exclusive to particular art forms, identities or practices. This character also confers flexibility to space, which can be opened to other spaces and worldviews. This unboundedness can express itself physically (allowing for the free mobility and dwelling) or mentally/psychologically.
Horizontal – Art spaces obey an historical logic of perceived linear progression or development to a point of eternalisation. They are to be achieved via the enactment of an ideological or material ideal and then maintained as quasi-religious entities.	4D – Besides progressive in time, art spaces are shaped after social relations and material conditions. Space is not constituted horizontally, but vertically and diagonally, constantly adapting to changes in the network of spaces, histories and societies [and forming constellations].

[92] In *The Poetics of Space* Bachelard defines topoanalysis as 'the systematic psychological study of the sites of out intimate lives' (8). Here, however, I refer to topoanalysis not as a psychological study but as a study of the particularities of a space via thirdring-as-Othering. The term is, thus, here used, ad verbatim.
[93] This is not a synonym of closed space, the same way 'unbounded' is not an automatic signifier of open space.

Univocal/Identitary – Space of art is to be experienced as an identitary entity that assumes a hegemonic aesthetic perspective on artistic practice that is assumed to be shared, universally, by everyone.	Plural/Manifold – Space of art is produced and perceived through the practices and discourses of different, multiple perspectives.
Homogeneous – Space of art has no recognisable distinctive trait that allows differentiation with other art spaces (due to its unilaterality). At the same time, artworks are fixed according to an external logic and separated from the space they occupy.	Heterogeneous – Space of art is constituted without a superimposed order or organization and, hence, is distinctive in itself. The artwork and its space are seen constitutively produced and productive of each other.
Static – The artwork and its space are maintained as fixed entities, immutable to change, apart from society's transformations or compasses. Their utopian functions are either positive or negative but not critical.	Dynamic/Processual – The artwork and its space interact with society: they are product and producers of social relations. Their utopian functions are critical, besides positive and negative.
Neutralising (Institutional) – Space of art is ideologically charged, neutralising forcefields that cancels the artwork as object in itself. It does not stimulate transformation or critical thinking but an ideologically charged view of the space of art and the artwork whose normative character reinforce the status quo, which is offered as perfected vision or blueprint.	Progressive (Relational) – The space of art relates to other places and object, as method or tool, recognising its simultaneous Sameness and Otherness. Its unboundedness permits mobility and fluidity and, hence, change. It stimulates difference, resistance and transgression of its own conditions and the conditions surrounding them. It is not defined in terms of location but in terms of process, mobility and dialogue.

Finally, some practical distinctions must be made before proceeding to the analysis of the texts: first, what will be here considered as art or artistic practice; second, what spaces will enter the category of art space based on the previous delineation; and, finally, how will data be gathered in order to elaborate a convincing explanation for the claims made so far.

Regarding the first issue, art is distinguished from both design (or 'craft', as Morris also calls it) and artefact. Art is regarded as an object by itself (which can be aesthetic, conceptual or both) that may or may not detach itself from the background and demand a response (e.g., psychological, political, cultural or social) and that can assume the form of a painting, sculpture, mural, poem or even building. In contrast, design, which can assume the form of any decorative object, is defined in terms of its solution-based

aestheticism. Finally, an artefact may assume the form of an ordinary object or a design piece symbolic of a given era, culture or society. The space of art is, accordingly, the space where art is, in a very crude, logical, positivist manner.[94] This being said, the space of art can appear as the setting, zone of action, projected space, marker or route, based the descriptions of Patti et al. (See Annexe B).

Finally, the data acquired and the analysis of the spaces of art in the utopian text are interpreted in the conclusion both in quantitative and qualitative terms. The quantitative analysis is based on the number of occurrences and mentions of overall spaces of art, modern spaces of art and postmodern spaces of art, which are indicative of the level of spatial criticality employed in the role of art in utopia. The qualitative analysis departs from the description of the space of art as modern or postmodern and of its relation and function in relation to the utopian text's formal qualities. Inspired by Franco Moretti, the quantitative approach submits the texts to a 'process of deliberate reduction and abstraction' (Moretti, 2005, p. 1) to produce explanations rather than simply interpretations. The present study's commitment to both quantitative and qualitative analysis aims at confirming that the study of the space of art, due to the characteristics and relations established so far, functions as a system of the genre – and subgenre – it is connected to.

[94] This relation may be, as we have seen, more complicated than in the terms here described but in order to facilitate the analysis, this was considered the most useful definition.

Chapter 2. Art in Utopia: The case studies of Bellamy, Morris, Le Guin and Delany

2.1. The modern space of art from traditional to critical utopia: the cases of Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward: 2000-1887* and William Morris' *News from Nowhere, or, An Epoch of Rest*

> *To search for the undiscovered island, the man answered, What undiscovered island, the king asked masking his laughter, as if a madman stood in front of him, of those that had the mania of navigation, and with whom it would do no good to contradict right from the beginning, The undiscovered island, the man repeated, Nonsense, there are no more undiscovered islands, Who told you, King, that there are no more undiscovered islands, they're all on the maps, In the map there's only known islands, And what undiscovered island is that that you are looking for, If I could tell you, then it would not be undiscovered.* (Saramago, 2007, pp. 14-15)[95]

Falling asleep in the Boston of 1887, Julian West wakes up in the Boston of 2000 to find himself in the midst of a utopian society whose bases are industrial, equalitarian and solidary. In this new city of Boston, plenty and harmony abound, poverty and inequality have been eradicated, industry has shifted from private to public ownership, education assumes a crucial role and is equally available to all citizens, human solidarity has become a basic maxim, and overall improvement in apparently all sectors of society has been made to the point of perfection concerning both material conditions and social relations. This new, transformed Boston is the product of Bellamy's concerns about the unequal, chaotic and capitalist society in which he himself lived; the new Boston provides an astounding solution to what he perceived as the major problems of the nineteenth century's first years of industrialisation. Coming from an aristocratic background himself and confronted with the unjust conditions in which the working class lived in the nearby mills, Bellamy sought in LB not to overthrow this industrial society, but to turn it into what he saw as the natural result of its just, humane management.[96] Faith in the progress of science and the sheer logic of economics, paired with anthropological optimism, was

---

[95] Original text: "Para ir à procura da ilha desconhecida, respondeu o homem, Que ilha desconhecida, perguntou o rei disfarçando o riso, como se tivesse na sua frente um louco varrido, dos que têm a mania das navegações, a quem não seria bom contrariar logo de entrada, A ilha desconhecida, repetiu o homem, Disparate, já não há ilhas desconhecidas, Quem foi que te disse, rei, que já não há ilhas desconhecidas, estão todas nos mapas, Nos mapas só estão as ilhas conhecidas, E que ilha desconhecida é essa que queres ir à procura, Se eu to pudesse dizer, então não seria desconhecida".

[96] The utopia of LB stands as: 'plea for the rule of expertise, . . . hope for a disciplined and dispassionate elite of professional managers, . . . scorn for capitalism, . . . critique of democratic politics, . . . rejection of proletarian or revolutionary socialism, . . . admiration for technology, . . . insistence on a planetary utopia, . . . dismissal of the possibility of alternatives to the advancing utopian society. Reason, common sense and history made the scientocratic utopian inevitable' (Wagar, 1988, pp. 116-117).

the catalyst of Boston's change from 1887 to 2000. He expected that transformation would not occur following a great revolution, but as the necessary consequence of the growing dissatisfaction of all sectors of society with the industrial system that had gained the material and monetary means to guarantee everyone's quality of life and push humanity towards its utopian future. Consequently, the Boston of 2000 is said to be the end result of the transition from capitalist to nationalist (which, for Bellamy, meant socialist[97]) society; the improved management of resources and waste, achieved through a healthier relationship between human progress and nature; and the consequent improvement of basic human conditions, which in turn meant the betterment of humankind as a whole.

Arriving in this new Boston, Julian West finds that the city where he was born and lived all his life has become irrevocably foreign. In fact, if not for the natural landscape and the preservation of most of the streets' layout, he would remain unconvinced that this was indeed Boston at some other point in time. Bellamy's traditional utopia is thus one in which spatial re-ordering orients the journey through utopia, with the improvement of society made evident through the shift in spatial organisation.[98] John Mullin and Kenneth Payne argue that the most interesting contribution of LB is its 'devotion to the urban' (Mullin & Payne, 1997, n.p.) and the conviction that planning, as a governmental activity, could improve social wellbeing, further political responsiveness and result in greater freedom. Hence, for Bellamy, improving material conditions via industrial power and the consequent urban form is seemingly the most effective method for achieving equality, solidarity and freedom. Therefore, 'his Boston of the year 2000 is dense, highly developed and full [of] magnificent boulevards, parks, fountains, and shopping districts of great cities' (Mullin & Payne, 1997, n.p.). The 'great city' (Bellamy, 1986 (1888), p. 55) constitutes the spatial fix of Bellamy's utopian society – the central focus and ordering force of the utopian model. As Mullin reminds us in 'Edward Bellamy's Ambivalence: Can Utopia be Urban?', 'there is scarcely a mention of the suburbs or the countryside in the book: the

---

[97] In the introduction to the Penguin edition of *Looking Backward, 2000-1887* by Cecelia Tichi, she refers how nationalism meant the nationalisation of industry and the equal division of resources for the population, which are the basic principles of socialism. This socialist stance, also called Fabianism, was a prominent in Britain in 1880s.

[98] According to Mullin and Payne, LB is, through and through, 'a city planning text' since it deals with issues such as 'land use, industry, commerce, housing, open space, amenities and the environment' (Mullin & Payne, 1997, n.p.). Although I agree with this perspective, what Mullin's and Payne's accounts lack, in my opinion, is the articulation of the spatial (not urban) issue with the form of the utopian genre in general.

city was to serve as the central place for government, culture, recreation and shopping' (Mullin, 2000, p. 52).

The pervasive themes in Bellamy's spatial-utopian transformation are 'the need to break up the monotony of the city, to create environments where nature and technology could co-exist, and to ensure that parks, open squares, sculptures, and fountains were plentiful, for both aesthetic and health reasons' (Mullin & Payne, 1997, n.p.). Bellamy focuses on the need for 'broad streets', 'large open squares', 'streets shaded with trees', 'building enclosures that stretch in every direction', 'statues [that] glistened and fountains [that] flashed' and 'public buildings of colossal size and architectural grandeur' (Bellamy, 1986 (1888), p. 55). All these spatial remarks point to how urban form is connected to his utopian vision in which space is open, green, natural, regularised, ordered and large enough to fit everyone. For Mullin, these urban attitudes could point to the fact that 'the city is simply not a place of utility: it is a grand place where the people are celebrated' (Mullin, 2000, p. 52), being the industrial district (of which we know nothing except its utility) the functional counterpart of the city. This view points, however, to a structural lack in Bellamy's account of utopian space: although apparently solidary, free and inclusive, these spaces are hardly ever inhabited, except for Julian West and the Leete family itself, and the description of the population seems to homogenise it into a coherent, recognised middle-class crowd whose wants and wills have been distilled into a single narrative. The absence of spaces of art or alternative spatial practices testifies to this point. The city may be for the people, but 'people' is used homogeneously and abstractly. Space is not lived space but the abstract space of the city planner. The Boston of 2000, Mullin adds later, is 'a cold place', reflecting Bellamy's 'distinct dislike of the crowd' (Mullin, 2000, p. 54). While most of West's depictions of the nineteenth century's portray its spaces as awfully overcrowded and its inhabitation as decadent, the twentieth century Boston is 'architectonic', as it is 'ordered, straight and proper. It is almost a stage setting or a backdrop for human interaction that is to occur privately' (Mullin, 2000, p. 53). The contrast between the amount of space devoted to descriptions of private versus public space is astounding. Bellamy's city of 2000 is still a modern city in which abstract space takes priority over mental and social space. It imposes an order upon the gaze, representation and spatial practice. Mullin contends that 'Bellamy seems quite

comfortable with some of the military concepts that were used to develop the Castrum,[99] standardization, repetition, regularization and a sense of strong centralized control' (Mullin, 2000, p. 54).[100] Casey's and Foucault's accounts of modern institutional spaces/sites may come to mind while reading these descriptions. Indeed, Bellamy's faith in scientific, industrial and human evolution clarifies his modern stance. In LB*,* city space is abstracted upon an ordered, univocal gaze and not through the spatial practices of its inhabitants.

Morris's critique of Bellamy's utopia is directed towards this 'un-mixed modern' temperament, which results in a utopia that is both 'unhistoric and unartistic; it makes its owner perfectly satisfied with modern civilization, if only the injustice, misery and waste of class society could be got rid of' (Morris, 2004b, p. 354). Although in this remark Morris is referring to the positivist and industrial character of modernism, I want to follow up on some of its consequences. Bellamy's overemphasis on the modern form is what renders it perhaps unconvincing and cold. In his planning, Bellamy perfectly organises relationships, space, the economy, labour and education under a definite, bounded system so as to correspond to a vision of the world. However, it is precisely this modern attitude that maintains the very society he is trying to criticise, immobilising it. To prove this, I will now focus on the spaces of art and their function in the utopia depicted by Bellamy. Three main spaces are considered for this analysis: the shopping centre, in which there is a statue of the ideal of Plenty; the music room; and some loose marks of spaces of art. I also address the organisation of the production and exhibition of artworks and literary works.

In the first instance, the space of art appears as a marker. Arriving at the shopping centre, West notices a statue 'above the portal, standing out of the front of the building, a majestic life-size group of statuary, the central figure of which was a female ideal of Plenty, with her cornucopia' (Bellamy, 1986 (1888), p. 52). In this space, the artwork assumes the position of a monument, functioning as a sign for the space it is in. The description of the work as representative of the ideal of Plenty, in conjunction with its

---

[99] Mullin is here referring to the Roman Castrum, whose definition is, according to Britannica, as follows: 'The Romans' castra, or military garrison towns, were protected by ramparts and ditches and interconnected by straight military roads along which their legions could speedily march' (Britannica).

[100] Bellamy's own biography may corroborate the military predisposition. Cecilia Tichi says: 'The young Bellamy's dream of a military career ended in 1867, when he failed to pass the physical examination for West Point' (Tichi, 1986, pp. 10-11), ambition and vision he carries through in LB, as made clear by the military-like organization of the Industrial Army.

placement in a shopping centre, confirms and stabilises the space. It is open and social in the sense that it is made available, but its meanings and practices are bounded: The statue, similar to the modern museum, is meant as an ideological piece, serving almost as a decorative mouthpiece rather than as an artistic object in itself. Mental space is disregarded, as well as spatial praxis: the artwork is institutionalised via the view of the perfected vision of utopia, in which practices and perspectives are pre-ordained. These practices and perspectives are disregarded under the ordered, univocal view of the city planner (in this case, Bellamy), who provides a preferable standpoint and interpretation of the statue and its spatial meanings.

The statue of Plenty exemplifies what Kwon means when she states that not all land art or site-specific art engages in critical spatial practice.[101] Instead, although art is placed in a public space, it still preserves the modern form, as well as the form of the modern art space. Art is unable to create its own art space and rather assumes the tensions between the mental and material spatial dichotomies of the modern artwork. The statue of Plenty is a continuation of the building in front of which it stands. It represents a mute continuation of Bellamy's utopian vision[102] – it is institutional in this sense, as it confirms the status quo and the place it is in. Unlike, for example, Duchamp's and Warhol's installations analysed in the previous chapter, which took place in physically bounded places but subverted them, the statue of Plenty refuses to be seen as distinct from the scenery of the shopping centre; its physical unboundedness obscures its mental or relational boundedness. As Massey argues, being bounded does not mean that a place is reactionary, nor is being unbounded an automatic signifier of progressiveness.

Although the entry of the shopping centre is an art space in the ontological sense, by negating the artwork's critical capability, the art space as an ontological entity establishes no dialogue and no relation, except one of subordination to the space of the shopping centre, which requires the space of art not to host truly social art – as no one participates with it – but of functional art. In this matter, although devoid of any apparent actual aesthetic virtues, the function exercised by this statue cannot be understood in negative terms as it acts as a perfect relaxant, confirming the good life and the aesthetic

---

[101] The statue and the space it is forced to occupy – as the artwork does not produce a space of its own – stands as virulent anti-thesis for installations such as Richard Serra's *Tilted Arc*, whose happen-stance was inextricably compromised with spatial critical practice – even if a disruptive one.

[102] It is precisely from this standpoint of confirmation that Manheim traces the distinction between ideology and utopia in *Ideology and Utopia*.

taste of Bellamy's utopia. Its aesthetic function is maintained so as to confirm the beauty of LB's perfectly ordered city.

In 'The Utopian Vision of Edward Bellamy and Thorstein Veblen', Rick Tilman traces the similarities between the two authors' utopian visions. This work compares Veblen's functionalist aesthetic to Bellamy's in LB. Comparable to Bellamy, Veblen's functionalist aesthetic follows his considerations of the relationship between culture and both wasteful consumption and unproductive employment. Based on this, Adorno critiques Veblen's analysis of culture as one-sided in his search to explain it in terms of 'a display of booty, power, and appropriated surplus value' (Tilman, 1985, p. 889) that neglects other aspects of cultural phenomena and hence treats all cultural products as commodity culture. Comparatively, in LB artistic practice is allowed only with permission from the Industrial Army, on the condition that people – whose education homogenises artistic consumption and neutralises difference – find the artist's work valuable. Artistic production is thus articulated in terms of value, and although Tilman abstains from drawing further comparisons between Veblen's and Bellamy's stances on art – given the latter's reluctance to include more of it in his utopia – I argue that Bellamy's aestheticism is largely similar to Veblen's functional aestheticism and is often articulated as a sign. As Tilman states, 'Veblen's parsimonious aesthetic (when pushed to its logical extreme) would indict as mere manifestations of ceremonialism the paintings of Rembrandt and Hals, the poetry of Shelley, and the sculpture of Rodin' (Tilman, 1985, p. 889). Similarly, I argue that Bellamy's aesthetic preoccupations and placement of art reveal his own view of the artwork's ceremonial character, opposing a logic of sign value that fails to escape the institutionalisation or *museification* of the artwork. His overemphasis on the private consumption of art, demonstrated by the music room and private library (the only one he mentions throughout the novel), although accessible to everyone, serves as function in the text.

The music room is described as 'an apartment finished, without hangings, in wood, with a floor of polished wood' (Bellamy, 1986 (1888), p. 98) and, frustrating West's expectations, has no musical instruments. Instead, there is a card that 'b[ears] the date "September 12, 2000" and contain[s] the longest program I ha[ve] ever seen' (Bellamy, 1986 (1888), p. 98). One can select the desired instrument and type of music, and the music is played live, according to a 24-hour programme, which is divided into hours. Sitting comfortably in the music room, Julian West sees that, 'at once the room

was filled with the music of a grand organ anthem; filled, not flooded, for, by some means, the volume of melody had been perfectly graduated to the size of the apartment' (Bellamy, 1986 (1888), p. 98). The music, Edith Leete explains, is provided from music halls scattered throughout the city and connected via telephone to 'all the houses in the city whose people care to pay a small fee, and there are none, you may be sure, who do not' (Bellamy, 1986 (1888), p. 99). Furthermore, different programmes are 'simultaneously performed' and can be reproduced in any house at any point of the day. A striking characteristic of this organisation is that musical production is organised much like the Industrial Army, and artistic practice is mostly disregarded as functional labour rather than as art in itself. The relation to the music piece seems to be cultivated as a detached one in which the artist is reduced to the performer of a perfectly organised musical production. The spectator, once more, is abstracted as a homogeneous consumer whose mood may vary, but not his or her taste or practices towards the art object. After these first remarks, however, let us pay attention to the space, the music room as art space in itself.

Bellamy is critical of religious institutions for being used 'by the dominant class in self-serving ways' and enriching the clergy, but he fails to see how spatial institutionalisation itself enacts ideologies and power through the control of their spatial conditions. Thus, although he removes religion from churches and art from the modern museum (although apparently public galleries still exist), seeking to make religion and art available to everyone instead of privatised according to personal interest, these spaces' apparent openness and publicness only enact the modern art space outside the modern museum.

The bareness of the room – which is not a white cube but a wooden cube – and the emphasis on the private fruition of art – also made explicit in the private library of every citizen – seem to follow the modern tendency to regard the artwork as an ideal category. As the statue represents the ideal of the harmonious and plentiful utopia of Bellamy's vision, music is regarded as an ideal object, whose artistic practice and production assume an ethereal character. The artwork requires a vacant, empty space in which art as detached ideal can be consumed, once more *museifing* it, reducing it to mere object rather than a praxis – social or otherwise. The fact that music is available to everyone does not mean that it transgresses the space of the modern museum, but that it reproduces that space for everyone. Art is not to be lived with, in the sense that it does

not dialogue with its space, history or social relations. Although part of everyday life, art is not relational, processual or dynamic; its form is fixed under an ideal, its discourses are muted in communication with other structures of society, and their boundaries are impermeable to process. Art is not creatively produced but follows formal and pre-established rules of what art is.

Just as the statue of Plenty confirms the wealth and harmony of the utopian Boston, so do music rooms and private libraries merely serve as plot devices that attempt to tackle the issue of art via its publicness. Despite art being made for the people, this shift in art consumption disregards the subject and the community as a heterogeneous source of meanings, constituted of atoms whose livelihood and taste escape those of the imposed superstructure, while the role of the individual as an artist whose motivations may vary is wholly absent. In Bellamy's utopia, artistic practice, consumption and exhibition have a conservative function, assisting in the perpetuation of the new order of utopia just as the modern form of artwork and art space preserve the older Boston. Education,[103] said to be the vehicle through which art was popularly 'elected' – when governments were not – follows the same blueprint: it teaches people to judge and appreciate art and their environment according to a superimposed notion of good taste that is at once universal (as Dr. Leete says, it is a natural aptitude of every human) and acquired (as it requires education on artistic sensibility). Thus, education – on art and other subjects – does not endorse critical or alternative attitudes that would create alternative creative practices. Bellamy's concerns with art and culture exhaust themselves in the public availability that confirms that his utopian society is indeed egalitarian. Once education was made available to everyone, citizens could choose, by 'vote' or consumption, based on the formation the educational system provided them (a system that was conservative and homogenising by itself), what type of art could be produced. 'The opportunity for formal education', as with access to art, 'would be qualitatively increased so that all citizens would share equally among them' (Gutek, 1964, p. 252) so that the status quo's perceived perfect blueprint would be maintained and artistic practices frozen in time.

Moreover, true subjective mental representations of space are disregarded under the critique of individualism, instead of employed critically in Bellamy's utopia. Equality

[103] See Gerald Gutek's 'An Analysis of Formal Education in Edward Bellamy's Looking Backward'.

is achieved on the condition that the public is converted into a homogeneous entity[104] whose spatial or identitary transgression is considered antisocial or individualistic: 'utopian Boston is a caring, homogeneous community where equality, grace, dignity, and innocence are manifest – provided one agrees with the goals of the state' (Mullin and Payne, 1997, n.p.). The fact that 'people of the new age have no difficulties in recognising this urbane middle class gentleman [West], so similar to themselves' (Geoghegan, 1992, p. 76) speaks to the homogenising and identitary fixity that Bellamy ascribes to the entire population of the new Boston.

The connections he establishes between history and space are also problematic in this respect, as, similar to what happened to the modern museum, art is severed from public life and social relations as process. For Mullin, 'Bellamy's New Boston is built on the old one' (Mullin, 2000, p. 53). Bellamy's walk and pinpointing of old locations is meant to highlight history and the continuity between the old and the new Boston in terms of institutional space that has finally been cleaned and ordered. Moreover, Mullin states, 'Bellamy's fusion of past and future allows the reader to be aware of this "process" of the creation of a utopia' (Mullin, 2000, p. 53) in which the old structures are not only dismantled into new structures but also re-ordered according to his vision. Rather than replacing the city of his time, Bellamy orders, cleans and embellishes it. He thus opens the streets of his own time to fight the crowdedness, flanking them with similar buildings but in an organised, well-ordered form and making space 'stretch towards infinity' (Mullin & Payne, 1997, n.p.). However, although a linkage to the past is established via the spatial orientation and natural disposition of 1887 Boston, Vincent Geoghegan conclusively argues in his comparative study of historical attitudes in Bellamy's LB and Morris's NFN that 'this notion of the seed of the new in the old exemplifies the deeper level of continuity underlying the supposed discontinuity between past and present. The move from old to new is portrayed as a smooth, seamless transition. In this conception, the past is in no way stimulating, shocking or threatening to the new society' (Geoghegan, 1992, p. 76), rather, the past is a sealed off entity whose interest constitutes mere scholarly curiosity. Not only the past but also the future is sealed off, with being in the present the only state of permanence left for the theorisation of time. The past is neutralised, and the

---

[104] Much criticism has focused on how all the inhabitants of Boston of 2000 belong to the same race, religion or class. Equality has been achieved on the condition Otherness is annulated. For an account on these issues, especially devoted to its implications on Bellamy's view of globalisation and race, see Robin Balthrope's 'Bellamy's *Looking Backward 2000–1887*, Globalism, and Race'.

present made eternal. Bellamy's LB denotes the modern emphasis on temporal form, but in a way that points to an identitary categorisation: The future is recognised as, on the one hand, the end product of scientific evolution and, on the other hand, an eternal monad in which evolution has finally assumed its *proper* form.[105] The crossing between space and history is, thus, one in which both are abstracted into pure form, and not dialectical criss-crossed with social and cultural forms. Utopian space is the product of linear historical progression and is only considered in the form of abstract (or first) space, as reflected by Bellamy's take on the modern art form.

The space of art in LB is of two types and is univocal and unidimensional in all instances: first, functionally aesthetic and abstract spaces, in which institutionalisation is achieved in the form of monument (e.g., the statue of Plenty); and second, aesthetic and mental spaces, in which institutionalisation is achieved by the private reproduction of the modern museum as music room or private library and in which aesthetic form confirms the pleasurable utopia's function. These two forms of static representation of art and spaces of art deem it asocial (as its meanings are sealed off from social relations), bounded (as it refuses dialogue with other spaces), static (as it is immutable), horizontal (as it fosters a historicist logic of eternalisation of the artwork form), unarticulated with space and society, and homogeneous (as it refuses difference in both its representations and social praxis as well in their distinction from other art spaces).

Its function is derivative of this modern spatialisation and aestheticism that serve as a continuation of the perceived perfect form of this utopia – a positive one – and as testimony to a vision of utopia that has already been achieved, refusing alterity and dialogue.

Throughout the book, remarks about statues, architecture, literature and art publishing, and exhibition point to an institutionalised, sometimes even mercantile logic of the status of the artwork in the Boston of 2000. Artists are only excused from their jobs to dedicate themselves to their art if people find the work valuable to society or buy the work; artworks only become integrated in public space after the vote of the people; artist and art critic are not considered valuable jobs per se, but only on the condition that they are *useful*. This perspective means that artworks that are not a continuation of utopia and that are instead critical, differential or processual of the established order can never be

[105] The modern obsession with time assumes, in Bellamy, the role of historicism rather than of historicity if we accept the Geoghegan's conclusions.

made public.[106] The publishing system, which is considered to 'encourage literary vocation' and 'discourage mere scribblers' (Bellamy, 1986 (1888), p. 103), not only homogenises artistic production but rests on the presumption that there is a privileged format for art, just as there is a privileged way in which it should be displayed – mass spatial-public testimonies or private static monads. This presumption is grounded on polarisations of good versus bad, useful versus useless, and tasteful versus distasteful, according to homogeneous standards. Art is reduced to an evident, readymade consumer good, whose spatial disposition must confirm its (positive) utopian function.

Although critical of late nineteen century Boston, Bellamy recreates the same modern spaces he encountered in his own period as abstractions. He adopts, for example, 'a set of nineteenth-century conventions concerning the relative attractiveness of pre-industrial towns as against industrial cities' (Wilson, 1977, p. 49). He institutionalises space, stratifies social relations and homogenises spatial practices under his ideological view of utopia. The institutionalisation of art, discussed in the previous chapter, is mimicked by Bellamy, whose futuristic urban Boston, although radically different in aspect, remains the same, as modernism would have it; it obeys the same spatial logic that eternalises the modern form of art – and history. While elites have been eradicated, art production and exhibition remain regulated under an appointed mass, whose wishes cohesively reproduce those of the city planner.

One could argue that the space of art is simply not an important issue given the sparseness of the examples[107] provided by Bellamy. I suggest, alternatively, that if we take on this quantitative approach, the connections between the few accounts of art – and, hence, spaces of art – and the traditional utopia are even more striking. Despite numerous descriptions of space and economic, labour or education relations, other details lack imaginative transformation. How people live, dress and express themselves; how art is made; and how people go about their daily lives all lack depth or are maintained intact.[108]

---

[106] Of course, this issue has, again, to do with the homogeneity with which Bellamy invests both the utopian population and education.

[107] Henry Holiday writes, some years after the publication of LB in 1888, an article on the artistic aspects of LB, 'The Artistic Aspects of Bellamy's 'Looking Backward'', in part in the defence of it from some of the criticism done in the aftermath of the publication, in part as recognition that these aspects could have been made more explicit in the novel.

[108] As Mullin so aptly summarises, the new Boston of 2000 is: 'ordered, regularized and standardized. It is a place where the fundamental needs of all citizens are met and where there is extensive choice for the citizens – provided they accept society's cultural norms . . .. It is an efficient, controlled place where the mob, the crowd and the different are dispersed. There is little sense of joy, anger, whimsy and serendipity' (Mullin, 2000, p. 56).

When the analysis of the city is confronted with that of the spaces of art, the spatial character of Bellamy's utopia and its function as utopian text become clear. In LB, the city space is abstracted upon the ordered gaze of the planner: it is uninhabited and homogeneous, and although apparently inclusive, the regulating process imposed on both the population itself (via the nullification of differences between them) and their practices (via the stipulation of ordered functionality) testifies to the exclusiveness of the spaces depicted. These spaces are not prepared for difference, but for standardisation, pattern and industry. The spaces do not contribute to Bellamy's goal of making a fair society in which art is accessible to everyone, but turn everyone into an acceptable spectator, whose learning must be orientated to belong to the ideal class, which Bellamy perceives as the educated middle class to which he himself belongs.

Bellamy's utopia is one in which the modern holistic spatiality of the artwork has been fully integrated and in which such discourse maintains the ideological, univocal perspective of modernism, despite Bellamy's criticism. This form of spatial configuration reveals the positive function of art, confirming the emphasis on the uniformity, harmony and perfect form of the traditional utopia. LB's modern spatiality, whose fixed spatialisation is almost military, reveals a 'sense of control [that] did not allow for the avant-garde, the counter-culture or the unique' (Mullin, 2000, p. 62). Art production in LB lacks heterogeneity, criticality and a 'thirdring-as-Othering' altogether. After all, Glenn Altschuler reminds us that 'a perfect society . . . has no need for conflict, change, or a dialectic between individuals and the environment' (Altschuler, 1989, p. 952). As the analysis of the modern art space confirms LB as a traditional utopia, so does the traditional utopia confirm the modern art space and the artwork in their positive function.

Morris wrote NFN largely as a direct response to LB. The antagonism between Morris's aspirations and those of what he considered 'the unmixed modern' attitude of Bellamy became the main motive for his work, blatantly contrasting the two in terms of labour conditions, building design,[109] spatial layout and artistic creation. His critique of Bellamy[110] is hence based on his considerations (or lack thereof) of art and urban

[109] Morris had firstly thought on pursuing an education in architecture and, because of that, worked in George Edmund Street's office for over a year, this experience influencing his perspectives on architecture – as well as his sensibility toward the topic in the construction of his utopian vision. For a further analysis on the relation of Morris with utopia see Ana Margarida Barata's Master Dissertation *Arquitectura e Design na Ensaística de William Morris e Walter Gropius.*

[110] Bellamy's utopia society would be, accordingly, 'even more meaningless than a capitalist one, ruled by impersonal diktat and the laws of supply and demand, with no true community, no nature, no sense of the past and nothing to hope for but freedom from work' (Wilmer, 2004, p. XXXIV).

spatiality, which are perceived to disrupt labour as creative work by mechanising it and uprooting community- and identitary-based spatiality. As a response to Bellamy's well-ordered, symmetric, planned utopia, Morris wrote NFN in an organicist way. Morris's utopia's spatial, social and historical configurations and descriptions are usually phenomenological, presenting a general lack of institutions and an abstract overview of this utopian society, except through what Ruth Levitas calls the 'archive of the feet'. This archive of the feet presupposes that space is mostly felt, rather than perceived. It constitutes an abstract entity and is invested with a deep sense of memory and historical embeddedness. Levitas describes this phenomenon, applying the term invented by Simon Schama, as a kind of bodily memory of sense of space.[111] Of course, the archive of the feet possesses much of the *flaneur's* and the second space's subjective quality of space perception, which fits perfectly with the type of spatial affirmations Morris makes throughout the text and that serves as nostalgic experience in contrast to Guest's (and Morris's) social background.

In the book, the new London is revealed through Guest's mapping in his own London. At each step, his childhood, recreated as representing a pre-industrial society, is recuperated.[112] The text thus acts as an 'appeal to individual memory both in its construction and initial reception, most clearly a memory that is embedded in a specific place' (Levitas, 2007, pp. 29-30). The loss felt, however, opens the way for the creation of utopian possibilities, here an attempt to recuperate a sense of place that is more attuned to the natural landscape and communal life of Morris's childhood and less attuned to its destruction for the production of capital.[113]

Levitas recognises that it is precisely the intersection of space and history in the recuperation of space of a medieval past in the construction of the future utopia social space that constitutes Morris's IROS (Levitas, 2007, p. 47). Morris's utopian vision thus provides a 'base outside', which, when used as an archaeological tool, may unveil

---

[111] Levitas explains 'the archive of the feet' in the following terms: 'our embodied sense of physical place, the way in which our body knows where to go, which way to turn, is laid down very early. When street layouts, rather than specific buildings, change, what is generated is a dream-like sense of dislocation and an embodied sense that something is wrong. . . . William Morris said, in NFN: 'I thought I knew the Broadway from the lie of the roads that still met there'. Physical obliteration also represses, or at least compounds, the forgetting of the social performances previously enacted in them. It creates an absence in what Schama calls 'the archive of the feet' (Levitas, 2007, p. 25).

[112] Levitas points to the fact that utopia is a reaction against the 'loss of rural Hammersmith' and the 'recent changes' in the landscape that his contemporary audience would have recognized.

[113] The sentiment of recuperation is a recurring one in NFN – oftentimes granting it the (misplaced, in my opinion) coinage of pastoral utopia. See Roger C. Lewis' '*News from Nowhere*: Arcadia or Utopia?'.

'significant silences in place of Morris's holism' (Levitas, 2007, p. 66), namely, the underlaying narrative of place and its relations to the individual, society and history. Hammersmith as a good place and yet-to-be-good-place stresses the dialectics between utopianism as concept and physical infrastructures.

The encroachment on real space as a catalyst for utopian longing is, in turn, inseparable from artistic interest and practice, which must consequently become manifest in people's actions and, perhaps more importantly, in the environment (i.e., utopian space). Departing from the same despairing 'nightmare of commercial ugliness' (as cited in Dowling, 1996, p. IX) of Bellamy, Morris's aestheticism is, by contrast, 'able to imagine art in such a situation [that] might possess a great power of redemption' (Dowling, 1996, p. IX). Aestheticism consequently informs both his political stance and his utopian vision. His aim is the 'democratization of beauty' (Dowling, 1996, p. X) or the establishment of an 'aesthetic democracy' (Dowling, 1996, p. XII), as Linda Dowling terms it.

Society, art and space are co-extensive concepts among themselves,[114] being the source of human experience. This ambition 'impelled him [Morris] to seek not simply a set of decorative arrangements or artistic relations but the social political ideal', an aesthetic utopian democratic transformation 'by which the unanimous yet uncoerced bond between the citizens and their polity approximated the relations between aesthetic perceivers and the beautiful' (Dowling, 1996, p. 50). He thus sought participation, with all citizens sharing in beauty and artistic practice to bring about happiness and social betterment. Hence, Morris 'strove continuously so 'that the Arts might be re-created and knit together into one vital organic Art, feeling the whole of life. And he strove that *the people* be re-created and knit together into one vital organic commonwealth' (Dowling, 1996, p. 50).

Following Ruskin, Morris structures is thought around the belief that the only path for human happiness and social equality is 'creative freedom' (Wilmer, 2004, p. XII). Furthermore, Morris upholds that beauty and taste are part of humans' natural faculties and that only by the exercise of these intrinsic desires for the aesthetic can happiness thus be achieved. For Morris, this view means that art is not only a necessity of life, but also

---

[114] Morris's definition of art as 'the complete work of applied art, the true unit of the art, is building with all its due ornament and furniture' (as cited in Vieria 2006, p. 463) is co-implicative with his notion of society – and of social space – serving as its truth referent (Cf. Vieira 2006, 463).

a precondition for the dignity of labour. This instinct had been thwarted by industrial modernism but redeemed through utopian aesthetic commitment. The emphasis on medievalism and its architectural correspondent, the Gothic, follows these convictions, as the return to such artistic conditions would also mean the return to freedom; free labour; artistic creation; and a rooted relation to space, nature and the community, whose reality is unmistakably dissonant with Morris's own reality. Thus, against the aristocratic – and capitalist – tendency to seclude art from everyday life and the separation between arts and crafts, the revival of medieval craftsmanship[115] would recuperate this lost practice that seeks art not for art's sake but for the sake of the community. The division between arts and crafts is the result of the dehumanisation of (creative) labour, which is coincident with the abandonment of workshops, the industrialisation of craft-making and the consequent displacement of 'the lesser arts' to factories and of 'high art' for commercial use. The opposite of this situation is the intertwining of art with craftsmanship,[116] which would lead to a free society lacking elitist distinctions. Moreover, with labour being the reflection of artistic expression, everyone could enjoy their work and rejoice in their status of free creators. The cultivation of the creative everyman and the return to craftsmanship in labour are hence foundational for utopia's realisation. This artistic cultivation is in turn reflected in the paradigm of artistic creation as 'the medieval guild'; Morris particularly admires 'the paternalistic moral force that the guild ideally exercised over its members' (Davis, 2009, p. 228), encouraging them to work cooperatively and for the community. What is more, this artistic cultivation is also reflected in how people perceive and experience space[117], an idea that is carried in the architecture of Nowhere. Accordingly, in NFN, there is barely a distinction between decorative and fine art, as the preference for the latter over the former is identified as the cause of the loss of qualities and possibilities in both.

---

[115] Medieval craft labour, he believed, knew 'no distinction between brain and hand, art and manufacture, pleasure and work' (Geoghegan 83).

[116] The Arts and Crafts movement, of which Ruskin and Morris are its most relevant figures, was an international trend in the field of design that sought to recuperate it as a valuable form of art and labour. Morris's representation of art also follows his own artistic endeavours as founder figure of the Arts and Crafts movement and pattern designer himself.

[117] While in nineteenth-century London, living space is being replaced by space for industry and machinery – and living conditions more and more unequal and pleasurable –, in the decentralised towns of Nowhere 'both shores had a line of pretty houses, low and not large, standing back a little away from the river; they were mostly built of real brick and roofed with tiles, and looked, above all, comfortable and as if they were, so to say, *alive and sympathetic with the life of the dwellers in them*' (Morris, 2004c, p. 48).

Gothic architecture is central to Morris's utopian imaginary, as it is a perfect paradigm of the reconciliation between art and human life, and between these and nature. Gothic buildings are perceived as natural, while the neoclassic buildings of his own time struck Morris as 'cold, impractical and snobbish', the style's revivalism the mark of an elite who accepted a 'cultural hierarchy', conveying 'a particular social message' (Wilmer, 2004, p. XXIV).[118] The erection of these buildings was then not a matter of taste or coincidence, but of the preservation of a specific ideological and psychological attitude that sought to maintain (and even reinforce) the status quo. The Gothic was, in turn, identified as an architectural style in which 'freedom of expression'; 'feeling for natural beauty' (Wilmer, 2004, p. XXV); and the conjunction between arts and crafts and art and labour could be fully expressed.

Uncoincidentally, the first art space is a Gothic building. The Guest House of Nowhere is described as 'handsomely built of redbrick with a lead roof, and high above the windows there ran a frieze of figure subjects in baked clay, very well executed, and designed with a force and directedness which I had never noticed in modern work before' (Morris, 2004c, p. 53). This frieze is an example of the detail and craftsmanship employed in all spaces, and especially the new buildings replacing the old ones. The Guest House's Gothic style is representative of the architecture and space of utopia, being repeated in every major building prior to the revolution. Furthermore, most of the buildings that were not torn down[119] conform to the Gothic style or were constructed during the Gothic revival, such as Westminster Abbey and Westminster Palace, respectively.

What Morris intends with this approach is to overcome the unartistic visions of the social order of his own time, as well as the separation between aesthetic fruition and everyday life. Combined, however, with the lack of creative, reflective art forms, these descriptions of art space have two main consequences: first, that art's function is solely aesthetic and thus testifies to Morris's utopian ideal; and, second, that there is a proper

---

[118] As Morris himself suggests in his lecture 'Gothic Architecture': 'the narrow superstition of the form of the Greek temple was not a matter of accident, but was the due expression of the exclusiveness and aristocratic arrogance of the ancient Greek mind, a natural result of which was a demand for pedantic perfection in all the parts and details of a building; so that the inferior parts of the ornament are so slavishly subordinated to the superior, that no invention or individuality is possible in them' (Morris, 2004a, pp. 334-335).

[119] In a broad mode, every building that did not conform with the Gothic style and deemed 'worthless, and public nuisances' (Morris, 2004c, p. 69) was tore down and built anew as they were considered unpleasant and ugly.

form for art and its space that is univocal, respecting the aesthetic rule of the Gothic.[120] Art is not articulated in the form of concept or spatiality, but as a general aesthetic abstraction. Moreover, although we are offered various descriptions of buildings and utopia's architecture, these are artworks solely based on their aesthetic qualities, being described in abstract form and respecting the utilitarian prescriptive form of space and utopia, whose object-ness is mediated rather than having intrinsic value. Hence, although replacing Victorian art forms and space, Morris appears to maintain the ideal, aesthetic and univocal character of the modern art space. What persists is the sense that Morris, despite his efforts, 'remained an unwitting prisoner of precisely the aristocratic assumptions he had overtly rejected' (Dowling, 1996, p. 56).[121]

Interior spaces of art, however, are slightly different in terms of narrative exposure and spatial perception, although maintaining the same function. The artworks of these spaces conform to the same artistic form – medieval-inspired pattern design, ludic murals, tapestry art, decorated arcs and others. Regarding the descriptions of these interior spaces, phenomenological perception is the main operative mode of narration. As we enter the Guest House – a communal space, as most of Nowhere's art spaces are – we find a hall exhibiting 'a floor of marble mosaic and an open timber roof', with 'no windows'. On the side opposite to the river are arched entrances leading to chambers, 'one of which showed a glimpse of a garden beyond, and above them a long space of wall gaily painted (in fresco, I thought) with similar objects to those of the frieze outside' (Morris, 2004c, p. 53). This space is said to generate 'that exhilarating sense of space and freedom which satisfactory architecture always gives to an anxious man who is in the habit of using his eyes' (Morris, 2004c, p. 53). The space is finely decorated with paintings, murals, little statues and patterned tapestries, whose functions are mainly ornamental or of pleasurable extension. The images depicted on such murals refer to fairy tales and myths; statues act as continuations of space, and literature is said to be escapist or fantastic, according to Clara. Pinkney elaborates on this, adding that, 'the complex psychologism of the realist novel is rejected by Ellen's great commination on the genre, and it has been replaced in

[120] Morris upholds in his lecture on Gothic Nature that 'there is only one style of Architecture on which it is possible to found a true living art, which is free to adapt itself to the varying conditions of social life, climate, and so forth, and that that style is Gothic architecture' (Morris, 2004f, p. 292).

[121] Although critical of the revivalist style of neoclassicism for recuperating Greek aestheticism and architecture, which were the mutual by-product of the unjust and aristocratic character of its society, Morris, nevertheless, revived himself the medieval art forms and architecture as displays of that time value of craftsmanship, disregarding, however, the injustices and miseries lived by the people who were deprived of education, health or living conditions.

the new culture by the one-dimensionality of Grimm's fairy stories or of historical friezes that decorates the walls of the Hammersmith Guest House' (Pinkney, 2008, n.p.). Hence, despite these spaces being functional as well as aesthetic, (fulfilling the function of dining rooms, meeting-places, guest houses or others), as spaces of art, they most often lack negative or critical functions, but are pleasurable continuations of the ideals represented in the works of art themselves. As such, they acquire purely aesthetic and positive societal functions. They are lived spaces but lack assorted spatial practices; hence, we cannot say that they involve 'thirdring-as-Othering', as they serve a holistic narrative in which difference is absorbed or negated.

In addition to those spaces that are properly utopian – as they were created by Nowhere's citizens post-revolution – some old buildings of Guest's own London remain, despite their original function having been subverted, as a memoire, contrast[122] or useful site. However, even those buildings constructed in the same style as utopia's other buildings, such as some Houses of Parliament – Westminster Palace among them – are repurposed and 'used for a sort of subsidiary market, and a storage place for manure' (Morris, 2004c, p. 80).

Nevertheless, the key cases of maintenance (and subversion) of spaces in Nowhere that can be perceived as spaces of art in more than an ontological sense are the old factories, modern museums (e.g., the British Museum and National Gallery) and the slums.[123] Regarding the modern museums, although their original function is maintained as a shelter for art (and other artefacts and memorabilia), their practices and the ideological, elitist overtones they formerly maintained are disrupted.

In fact, the very term 'museum' has been lost. All museums are now called 'national galleries' after the National Gallery of London. For the Nowherians, the museum has become 'a place where pictures are kept as curiosities', with 'a good amount of them up and down the country' (Morris, 2004c, p. 80). The National Gallery in

---

[122] Dick tells us that these 'silly old buildings serve as a kind of foil to the beautiful ones we build now' (Morris, 2004c, p. 80).

[123] In *London Rookeries and Colliers' Slums*, Robert Williams describes the slums in the following terms: 'It may be one house but it generally is a cluster of houses, or of blocks of dwellings, not necessarily dilapidated, or badly drained, or old, but usually all this and small-roomed, and, further, so hemmed in by other houses, so wanting in light and air, and therefore cleanliness, as to be wholly unfit for human habitation' (Williams, 1985 (1893), p. 13). In *Exploring the urban past: Essays in urban history by H. J. DYOS* the point is made that there is a connection between the proliferation of slums with the rapid growth of the urban form and the suburbs, reason why, perhaps, Morris refers to the urban form as origin of many social evils, dissolving it – as well as the idea of suburbs – in NFN.

particular is described as 'an old building before the middle of the twentieth century' in 'a queer fantastic style not over beautiful; but there are some fine things inside it, too, mostly pictures' (Morris, 2004c, p. 53). The paintings and the space itself nevertheless have a merely historical function, as their meanings are apparently closed: few people seem to go there, and there is an overall lack of interest in artworks that are not produced according to the presently accepted style. Previous pieces primarily function as historical relics or artefacts, rather than as actual artworks with meanings of their own. However, museums' preservation as spaces of art reveals not only a dialogue between history and space, horizontality and verticality, but also their function as disruptive, negative forces; they are radically different from the surrounding utopian environment, and their descriptions as mental and lived spaces disrupt the original aura of sanctity or permanence they once had. People disrupt abstract spaces and instead live in them, flirt in them and dwell in them in ways other than what the spatial geometry had envisioned, reflecting the negative function with which Morris imbues these buildings. The descriptions of and interactions in the British Museum are proof: the instant the British Museum is described – with a sense of nostalgia on the part of Guest – Dick states how this 'familiar' space is where his 'great-grandfather mostly lives' (Morris, 2004c, p. 85).

The museum, presented to us in a diachronic manner reflecting Guest's own *representations* and *sense of space,*[124] above and beyond housing a 'wonderful collection . . . of all type of antiquities' (Morris, 2004c, p. 86), is the accommodation home of Old Hammond, Dick and Clara's flirting. The space of the museum no longer imposes a set of fixed spatial practices and protects its objects as quasi-religious entities but is dynamic and open to new explorations and meanings. Of course, artworks are maintained, as Dick puts it, as 'curiosities' or 'records'; still, their openness to a negative discourse highlights Morris's attunement to the problem of spatiality and artistic museification – which he considers a necessary evil no longer needed in his utopia.

The factory, a major industrial and capitalist indicator of the Victorian period, is another building whose maintenance we may find unexpected. Factories are maintained not for their original purposes, but are recycled into 'banded-workshops' where 'people collect who want to work together' when 'convenient' or 'necessary' (Morris, 2004c, p.

---

[124] Morris writes: 'we walked straight into the forecourt of the Museum, where, except that the railings were gone, the whispering boughs of the trees were all about, nothing seemed changed; the very pigeons were wheeling about the building and clinging to the ornaments . . . as I had seen them of old' (Morris, 2004c, pp. 85-86).

81) – a habit regarded as 'pleasant'.[125] Thus, not only are usual spatial practices transgressed, but the metaphor of social and spatial transformation also completes itself: in the same way the factory is transformed into a workshop, 'useless toil'[126] is transformed into a communal creative practice.

Finally, the slums, despite having been dismantled altogether, the 'memory of [them] abides' since the location upon which they once stood has been repurposed:

> Once a year, on May-day, we hold a solemn feast in those easterly communes of London to commemorate The Clearing of Misery . . .. On that day we have music and dancing, and merry games and happy feasting on the site of some of the worst of the old slums, the traditional memory of which we have kept. On that occasion the custom is for the prettiest girls to sing some of the old revolutionary songs, and those which were the groans of the discontent, once so hopeless, on the very spots where those terrible crimes of class-murder were committed . . .. It is a curious and touching sight to see some beautiful girl, daintily clad, and crowned with flowers from the neighbouring meadows, standing amongst the happy people, on some mound where of old time stood the wretched apology for a house, a den in which men and women lived packed amongst the filth like pilchards in a cask; . . . to hear the terrible words of threatening and lamentation coming from her sweet and beautiful lips, and she unconscious of their real meaning: to hear her, for instance, singing Hood's Song of the Shirt[127], and to think that all the time she does not understand what it is all about--a tragedy grown inconceivable to her and her listeners. (Morris, 2004c, p. 104)

By preserving memory as location through the act of festival, which here implies the act of artistic practice as festival,[128] the nineteenth-century spatial creation of the slums is *negatively* comprehended. Artistic celebration becomes an act of spatial transgression with conceptual functions, but most importantly, it acts as a social fact, not for the utopians, but for the reader. The 'utopian slums' function as real-and-imagined spaces once we stand outside the text itself, given that for the citizens, most of the spatial meaning of the artistic celebration of the tragedy of the slums has been lost. For them, the festival is an act of pure aesthetic fruition. However, the conflict it presents to the reader as imagined space unveils the very contradiction of the real space. The space of art is univocal in its stance, representing – as mental space – the very ideology underlying the making of Nowhere in particular. It is relational only as far as it relates to the space outside of the text, since its space is rather static; artistic practice is merely reproduced, and its spatial meanings are closed off for its practitioners. These arts spaces lack

---

[125]In there, Dick explains, they may 'make pottery and glass', for example, as they are equipped for the needs of such craftsmanship, being replicated all across country as artistry is made available for everyone, especially given the fact that everyone receives formation on the arts and crafts from very young age. Moreover, they are 'nice place[s] inside, though as plain as you see outside', besides 'throwing the clay . . . be[ing] a jolly work' (Morris, 2004c, p. 81).

[126] See Morris's lecture 'Useful Work *versus* Useless Toil'.

[127] The reference is to a popular ballad of 1843, a protest poem against labour conditions.

[128] See Julia Ramírez Blanco's *Artistic Utopias of Revolt: Claremont Road, Reclaim the Streets, the City of Sol.*

articulation and, most importantly, dialogue. By emphasising a sort of iconoclastic reading of the beautified landscape that has replaced the slums and been transformed into space of art, Morris inadvertently supports the very system he aims to criticise and replace. Indeed, as Nathanael Gilbert warns, 'a number of critics have argued that the creation of a national, English countryside through landscape art in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries merely served to reinforce and validate the unequal, oppressive social systems that were already in place' (Gilbert, 2005, p. 22), a position argued in the first chapter. What the landscape[129] overview implies is that space and art can be and must be perceived from a single perspective – historical meaning and otherness remain outside.

Admittedly, there is no formal censorship of 'aesthetic expression such as may be found in Plato's *Republic*' (Davis, 2009, p. 227) or in the form of popular democracy in Bellamy's LB. Nevertheless, 'introspective, visionary, avant-garde, or critical aesthetes and intellectuals are a rarity in Morris's craft utopia, a breed apart tolerated rather than encouraged in a thoroughly socialised world in which artistic activity is judged primarily by the gender-coded 'manly' criterion of social usefulness' (Davis, 2009, p. 227). What is more strikingly modern in these spaces of art, however, is that artistic spatial form comes into being only as aesthetic objects and that the artist is homogenised into the very utopia in which he or she lives. Thus, although they possess both positive and negative functions, it is always in confrontation with the real space of the reader and never to the artist-citizen of utopia that a negative or critical function implying the notion of conflict emerges, which is absent from the traditional utopia.[130] Furthermore, artistic practices themselves, as social relations, are not depicted in their 'exact conditions', but serve as general, 'timeless' or symbolic abstractions of what human and artistic experience should be like under the ideal conditions Morris envisions for them. While Morris may offer accounts of space as lived space, since these descriptions not only

[129] Space of art thus oftentimes acquires abstract character not of the city planner but of the landscape designer, even when space is presented to us as second (and less commonly, third) space, in which the beautiful pieces are part of the beautified landscape-society portraited. To be sure, the iconoclastic character the space of art does not always limit itself to mere numeration of objects establishing 'relationships between those things' (Gilbert, 2005, p. 23).

[130] Nowhere, unlike many of its traditional peers, does not completely deny conflict: Dick and old Hammond confirm that violence still occurs although sporadically, Ellen's grandfather shows discontent over the lack of literary and artistic interests of the people of Nowhere and Ellen herself critics the lack of historical consciousness. However, Nathanael Gilbert counterposes, 'the social landscape of Nowhere is such that while it does not conceal these acts, it in some sense absorbs are heals the consequences, not with any form of official punishment [as there is none] but through the sheer power of its aesthetic wholeness' (Gilbert, 2005, p. 33).

involve geometrical or phenomenological accounts, but also are defined by the social relations enacted in them, this lived space cannot be enunciated in the way Soja articulates Thirdspace. Social relations are not conceived heterogeneously, and second space is uniformised under a single perspective. Moreover, Nowherians' spatial practices do not construct real-and-imagined space, since their practices do not involve stepping out of the self and opposition is removed. The inhabitants of utopia are unable to reclaim the utopian vision created for them, appearing 'at times to constitute on the level of human activity what Morris's "force of badges" and "banded-workshops" represent in the sphere of mechanical operations: entities indispensable to the smooth ideological functioning of his novel' (Dowling, 1996, p. 72). Nowhere's citizens, art and spaces are homogenised, but only on closer inspection. Although apparently diverse, structural differences among citizens are erased, and they are unable to perform acts of spatial resistance. Although apparently the product of free will and desire, art possesses a positive aesthetic function and obeys what Morris considers the ideal form of art. Finally, although apparently granting free mobility, spaces possess forcefields of the practices and representations that are allowed within them. Geoghegan asserts that in this respect, 'Morris depicts a society in which sensitivity to personal memories is matched by a sensitivity to aspects of the past. This sensitivity has its blind spots, however. Morris builds into his fantasy his own selective appreciation of the past, and universalizes his strong likes and dislikes' (Geoghegan, 1992, p. 87). Thus, Geoghegan states, 'Morris is clearly appreciative of the past, but it is *his* past!' (Geoghegan, 1992, p. 87). There is no space but *his* space, no art but *his* art. The intersection of space, history and society in Morris's rendering of utopian art is a regressionist, identitary one in which, much like Jameson's cognitive mapping, the subject reclaims his or her own subjective vision of an idealised form of aesthetic sensibility and spatiality that corroborates his or her own vision of the world. The aesthetic function of art and art in space is one that seeks to integrate Guest – and Morris – back into what Morris perceives to be a lost holistic narrative. Recalling the discussion on recuperation achieved by the reclaiming of an 'archive of the feet' at the beginning of this section, Morris's emphasis on medieval art forms and derivative spaces of art can be articulated in terms of a modern spatial narrative that dispenses with history, although apparently embedded in historical medievalism. Art, its space and the space of utopia are eternalised and organised according to a single perspective that orders history according to memory.

The last examples of the museums, factories and slums point nevertheless to a different direction than LB did: they are not presented as abstract space, as a phenomenological sense of place is regularly favoured. Social relations are presented vertically rather than horizontally, and some spaces of art are presented as lived spaces with malleable borders and, sometimes, as even unbounded. However, these qualities lack a dynamic articulation and reveal the very incongruities of Morris's own views on the utopian function of art and his actual employment of those principles. Dowling speaks of a 'paradox of aesthetic democracy' (Dowling, 1996, p. XII).[131] Partly elaborating on and partly disagreeing with Dowling, I argue that this 'paradox' is not due to Morris's preservation of institutions that separate art from life, but that art, to be democratic, must necessarily resist univocal, homogeneous or one-dimensional discourses that try to fix art under a given form.

Spaces of art in NFN, we may conclude, serve two main functions: negative and positive. The preservation of pre-existing spaces such as the British Museum (and other unnamed museums) or the slums in which artistic practices take place – as a festival – serve as hermeneutic exercises in which the connection between real and imagined spaces is made. Although immutable by themselves, as abstract entities, they nevertheless do not obey the abstract function for which they were originally created: they are alive, social and relational, and not just in stark contrast to the rest of the spaces, but in their historical articulation. The spaces that are properly those of utopia – being built as a result of utopia's establishment – have only a positive aesthetic function, similar to the case in LB. Morris's utopia favours prescriptive, moralist art whose form is not always evolving but recreates the space of art in medieval times as an eternal monad. Art in NFN thus acquires a static character whose idealisation, despite being discordant with Victorian taste, is reduced to an ideological representation of a prescriptive aestheticism.

When framed within the modern/postmodern spatiality debate, the first are more properly postmodern (although not yet fully integrating its critical heterogenous character), and the second are modern spaces since, although radically different from the form of Morris's own real space, they preserve their function and ideological implications. The conclusion I derive from this exercise is that NFN, while still inserted

[131] As, Dowling argues, 'every gesture in the direction of social redemption is immediately undermined by an urgent awareness that art, if it is to survive in the modern age, must be isolated or protected from the hideousness of mass society' (Dowling, 1996, p. XII).

in a modern discourse, cannot be fully articulated in the tradition of utopia as such. Authors such as Miguel Abensour and Tony Pinkney also argue for a similar perspective, favouring a reading of NFN beyond a utopian blueprint and as centrally concerned with what Abensour names 'the education of desire' – what I call the negative function of art. Regarding heuristic function, Laurence Davis refers to the openness to real space in the construction of a community-based utopia and art. These authors highlight the heuristic, anti-perfectionist character of Morris's utopia; others, however, point to how his notions of space are regressionist and even reactionary. The same applies to his considerations on the role and form of art, that may be considered coercive also in the over-valorisation of medieval forms over all others. In the prescriptive reading of NFN, we can point to the perspectives of Dowling, who highlights that Morris's attempt to denounce the Cockney-like character of Bellamy's utopia results in the production of a 'Cockney paradise of his own' (Dowling, 1996, p. 72). She refers to the 'disappearance of fine or intellectual art within the blandly static experience of Nowhere' and claims that the merging of artistic creation with 'the uniform sensuous experience' effaces 'the crucial principles of resistance and cognition necessary to both art and human development as they are constituted even in utopia' (Dowling, 1996, p. 71). By putting this lack into evidence, Dowling argues that aesthetic homogenisation results in 'precisely the fulfilment of the radical Enlightenment sensualism that *Blackwood's Magazine* had long ago identified and denounced in the "Cockney school"' (Dowling, 1996, p. 72).

My own view synthesises the previous two. Based on the close reading done so far on the role of art and its spaces, NFN is prescriptive and positive regarding the placement of art *in* utopia, but heuristic and negative as a utopian text in itself. Morris's work reveals the diverse aesthetic discourses that shape his account of art and its spatialisation: first, art is not wholly autonomous but is embedded in a discourse seeking to preserve art as a cultural relic that still perceives it as merely aesthetic object, whose meanings, despite being articulated as product of an ideological stance, are lost once a preferable aesthetic form is expressed. Second, art is a social fact, but only as far as it functions as a signifier of communal work – having a positive function in utopia – or as a negative reflection of the conditions of life under industrialism.

The juxtaposition of Victorian art and spaces produces important aesthetic meanings for the text itself as work of art. Guest, awaking from his dream of utopia, reflects that 'if others can see it as I have seen it, then it may be called a vision rather than

a dream' (Morris, 2004c, p. 228). With this sentence, Morris extends – explicitly this time – the text to the real world and real space, hoping that the interplay between imaginary and real space acts as an emancipatory, transformative utopian desire that destabilises the status quo. The articulation implies a negative function in the text itself. 'Clearly, for Morris, the utopian dream can be politically effective through being re-told in the form of a fable' (Lee, 1995, p. 73), permitting both Guest and the reader real political action. Bellamy's text, by contrast, although seeking to inspire people to embrace equality and solidarity, excludes negative function from the text by, among other things, not allowing West out of the utopian society, which serves as relief, thus 'breaking any symbolic suggestion that this vision of an alternative order can be brought back to transform the visitor's own society' (Lee, 1995, p. 73).

Vincent Geoghegan, comparing Bellamy and Morris, convincingly argues that Bellamy's utopian text is 'much more typical of late nineteenth-century socialism' (Geoghegan, 1992, p. 87), and, I argue, of modernism altogether. While Geoghegan attributes this difference to the authors' distinct attitudes on history and memory, I would argue that this distinction is largely dependent on their attitudes and depiction of artistic practice and spatiality. Bearing this in mind, although still deeply embedded in modern aesthetics and spatiality revealing the reactionary, identitary and nostalgic counterpart of modernism, whose emphasis is idealist and phenomenological, rather than material or geometrical (in comparison to LB), Morris utopia surpasses some of the shortcomings of Bellamy's depiction as it establishes an articulation between modern and postmodern perspectives, on the one hand, and between traditional and critical utopia, on the other hand.

2.2. From Anarres to Triton and Back again: The Utopia as (Space) Ship in the Critical Utopias of Ursula K. Le Guin and Samuel R. Delany

> *the boat is a floating piece of space, a place without a place, that exists by itself, that is closed in on itself and at the same time is given over to the infinity of the sea and that, from port to port, from tack to tack, from brothel to brothel, it goes as far as the colonies in search of the most precious treasures they conceal in their gardens, you will understand why the boat has not only been for our civilization, from the sixteenth century until the present, the great instrument of economic development (I have not been speaking of that today), but has been simultaneously the greatest reserve of the imagination. The ship is the heterotopia par excellence. In civilizations without boats, dreams dry up, espionage takes the place of adventure, and the police take the place of pirates.* (Foucault, 1986, p. 336)

We are first introduced to the utopian society of Anarres in TD*,* and we are confronted with a wall. Drastically different from the apparently perfect pictures portrayed by Morris and Bellamy of a seemingly beautiful, open, unbounded and free utopia, the first space-idea we encounter is bounded, representing a limit and closure that serves as both a physical and mental trope. The wall[132] symbolises spatial fixity, a binary between inside and outside, within and without, Same and Other.

> There was a wall. It did not look important. It was built of uncut rocks roughly mortared. An adult could look right over it, and even a child could climb it. Where it crossed the roadway, instead of having a gate it degenerated into mere geometry, a line, an idea of boundary. But the idea was real. It was important. For seven generations there had been nothing in the world more important than that wall.
> Like all walls it was ambiguous, two-faced. What was inside it and what was outside it depended upon which side of it you were on. (Le Guin, 2011 (1974), p. 1)

While Le Guin warns the reader in the book's subtitle that this is an 'ambiguous utopia', the imposition of the wall still represents a remarkably dissonant place from the common-sense space of the traditional utopia. What the space of the wall does – especially as it becomes a main spatial and imaginary motif throughout the entirety of the text – is prepare us for a utopia in which not everything is perfect and not everything is sameness. In TD, although the wall separates and establishes a limit, it also opens the possibilities of difference and relationality. As Massey articulates through her concept of 'progressive sense of space', space that is sameness must necessarily be articulated in opposition to something that is not space or that is another space (i.e., Otherness). The recognition of binaries permits interaction between them and a border that can be transgressed and through which different perspectives can relate to each other. Comparably, viewed from

[132] In 'The Gap in the Wall: Partnership, Physics, and Politics in *The Dispossessed'* Everett L. Hamner argues for the symbology of the wall contending that whereas some of the wall are immutable, some others act as facilitators of a dialectic between opposites meant to be deconstructed and unified.

inside, Anarres' wall 'enclosed the universe, leaving Anarres outside, free' (Le Guin, 2011 (1974), p. 2); however, 'looked at from the other side, the wall enclosed Anarres. The whole planet was inside it, a great prison camp, cut off from other worlds and other men, in quarantine' (Le Guin, 2011 (1974), p. 2).

The idea of transgression as revolution is thus fundamental for the comprehension of Le Guin's critical utopia. The recognition of binaries involves, simultaneously, their articulation for utopian realisation – revolution and the constant pursuit of freedom being the main organising principle of Anarres, a society 'developed by a million followers of the revolutionary Odo, a woman whose writings form the theoretical basis for the movement and the society . . .. Odo's theory is a variety of anarchism: the principle of individual freedom and initiative is its essence' (Moylan, 1980, p. 239).

The principles of transformative revolution via the personal expression of freedom, despite being the foundation of Anarres, become of paramount importance when applied to the citizens of utopia, who are to enact this principle as praxis rather than as institution – the very striving for utopia being what is utopian about the Anarres society. As Moylan explains in 'Beyond Negation: The Critical Utopias of Ursula K. Le Guin and Samuel R. Delany':

> As Le Guin presents the superstructure of Anarresti society - its moral, legal, cultural systems - she ties them to the economy; but, given her idealist approach, she bases the social conscience and social system much more on the *concept* of individual initiative and freedom than on the economic-material system (Moylan, 1980, p. 240)

While traditional utopia degenerates into dogma – as happens in Anarres once it permits the Odonian revolution to be reduced to a mere ideologeme or mouthpiece, a phenomenon that fuels the narrative – the recognition of articulation through transgression is perceived as the only possible way to grant true utopian human freedom, which is necessarily co-implicative with the recognition of difference. This recognition is pervasive throughout the entire novel, which depicts the journey of Shevek from Anarres to Urras (the dystopian counterpart of Anarres), from obedience to rebellion, from sameness to otherness. The destructive/reconstructive mode is recognised as fundamental for a utopia that does not homogenise but that is critical of itself.

Moylan distinguishes three levels in the utopian narrative that shift from the traditional to the critical utopia: the iconic, the discrete and the generic. The iconic is 'the way in which the alternative society is presented', the discrete is 'the way in which the protagonist is presented', and the generic is 'the way the text becomes self-aware and

self-critical' (Moylan, 2014, p. 43). The symbolism of the wall is remarkable in pinpointing these changes as it polarises rather than uniformises, opening possibilities for radical subjectivity and reflecting on the very ideologeme of the utopian text that, as wall in itself, seeks to transgress its traditional formality. The wall asks for its own recognition and, in the eyes of Shevek, its destruction – 'not a simple handshake over a mended fence but the smashing of boundaries that *divide and isolate*' (Moylan, 2014, p. 88) – as part of the utopian reconstruction demanded of its citizens. The question of homogenisation is thus overcome from the beginning, as the hero – or anti-hero – becomes the means through which difference is enacted and ideals contested. The traditional role of the visitor is reversed, and our 'eyes' through utopia, become agent and citizen of the utopia being presented. Contrary to the traditional shift from an original society to a utopian society, 'the visitor in some of the novels – *The Dispossessed: An Ambiguous Utopia* especially – reverses directions and goes from utopia to explore and learn from the original society; or in the case of Triton the visitor is a non-utopian misfit trying to live in utopia' (Moylan, 2014, p. 44). In TD, through Shevek, a citizen of utopia, we discover utopia's flaws, as it degenerates into dogma, a 'compromise and ossification of revolution' (Moylan, 2014, p. 91), revolution that constituted the original promise of utopia as a permanent and critical practice of itself.

This radical subjectivity is thus not only informer of the text, but of society altogether, as 'the liberty of the individual is joined in dialectical tension with the needs of the society: a non-antagonistic contradiction that provides Anarres with its fundamental human energy' (Moylan, 1980, p. 240). Although perceived through the perspective of Shevek, Le Guin's critical utopia is plural in its subjectivity: Space is not perceived from a purely abstract or mental standpoint, but is thought about and interacted with, being constituted by the many discourses and practices of the utopian citizenry, including Shevek. The assumed subjectivity of the text, rather than enclosing the text and its spaces in the univocal experiences and judgements of its perceiver, articulates these spaces in terms of openness to multiple perspectives that constitute the iconic form of utopia. In its refusal of a static compromise, through artistic affiliation or form, the literary practice of the utopian text is radicalised in its negation of the present – for both Shevek's original society[133] (Anarres) and Le Guin's. The power of Le Guin's utopian vision thus

---

[133] Davis says on the use of contrast between Urras and Anarres employed by Le Guin: 'In this creative dialectic of utopia and existing reality, the Anarresti utopia provides the hope that is the catalyst for

resides not only in the systematic exposition of how an anarchist society would organise itself on the iconic level, but also in the embodiment of Odonian principles through the (critical) spatial practices of social relations and everyday life – especially when we consider the role of art as emancipatory revolutionary praxis. By focusing on the 'personal journey from passivity to agency' (Moylan, 2014, p. XV) as social practice, and by mediating between individual awareness and agency, on the one hand, and the political process 'needed to take radical change forward' (Moylan, 2014, p. XV), on the other hand, Le Guin – like other authors[134] within the subgenre of the critical utopia – exposes subjectivity as a revolutionary form of alterity. This factor is in turn reflected in the function of art and the construction of spaces of art – which are part of the iconic register of the novel. Peter Fitting in particular, Moylan points out, comprehends the critical utopia's focus on the relationship between the *politics of everyday life* and revolutionary transformation, contending that the critical utopia offers the reader 'the look and feel and shape and experiences of what an alternative might and could actually be, a thought experiment or form of "social dreaming"' (Fitting, cited in Moylan, 2014, p. XVI). Spaces of art appear recurrently as markers or as settings, and they enact the dynamic energies between the subject and society, from bottom-up critical action to social transformation. Indeed, according to Moylan, the social system of the critical utopia is not imposed but produced, so much so that the 'literary form of utopia as method – a thought experiment, if you will, of how utopianism can work – [is] one which has . . . archaeological, architectural, and ontological elements' (Moylan, 2014, p. XIX).

Comparing Le Guin's utopia with that of Morris – and of Oscar Wilde – Davis notes that 'unlike Morris, Le Guin acknowledges a prominent and enduring place in her utopian vision for a socially disruptive form of individual assertiveness' (Davis, 2009, p. 237). This subversive form of individual freedom is at the core of the dynamic, critical character of Le Guin's own utopian vision, constituting the means for artistic production as truly free critical expression to flourish and constitute itself dialectically, critically and spatially.

---

revolution on Urras, while the continuing reality of oppression and injustice on Urras reminds the Anarresti of why they must be eternally vigilant in testing, protecting, and renewing their anarchism. Each, in other words, gives the other what it lacks in isolation: the reason to go on changing' (Davis, The Dynamic and Revolutionary Utopia of Ursula K. Le Guin, 2005, p. 9).

[134] In *Female Man*, for example, Joanna Russ depicts not 'the utopian plan' but 'the ambience' (Moylan, 2014, p. 54) of utopia, being the importance shifted from iconic to the discrete. Whileaway, the utopian society portrayed, 'is not the answer, but rather the vision that provokes change' (Moylan, 2014, p. 54).

This dynamic is supported by the role art plays as a trigger for critical thinking for Shevek, who, through the influence of his friends Bedap, Salas and Tirin – the last two being, respectively, a music composer and a playwright – initiates his own revolutionary journey. Anarres abounds in artistic education, workshops, concert halls and other less systematised spaces of art – 'the arts are practiced by everyone and integrated into the everyday life of the people: the popular forms are poetry, storytelling, dance, song, pottery, weaving, and sculpture. Musical concerts and theater are the highest arts and attract large audiences whenever performed' (Moylan, 1980, p. 241). However, utopian stagnation imposes a constraint on critical artistic practices. Such constraints apply whether these practices are enacted in rebellion or as differential acts – or even acts of resistance, as in the case of Tirin. However, let us first consider those spaces of art that are part of the superstructure proper.

In the descriptions of both Northsetting and Abbenay, the question of centralisation and decentralisation motivates how power organises itself – Mitis, Shevek's mentor, warns Shevek before the latter's departure to Abbenay (Anarres' capital) that 'power inheres in a center' (Le Guin, 2011 (1974), p. 74) – although the configuration of towns remains more or less the same, except for scale. Hence, there is no proper organisation of the arts, despite the existence of Music and Theatre Syndicates, but even those are essentially decentralised, and the arts are mainly part of everyday life. Similar to NFN, people 'make, give and wear jewelry; pottery, sculpture, weaving, and other crafts are part of daily use; poetry, dance, song and storytelling are popular cultural forms participated in by all; the musical concert and drama are the most highly regarded of the arts' (Moylan, 2014, pp. 94-95). Comparable to Nowhere, in Anarres, 'work is no longer a curse but, instead, a form of play integrally associated with sociability, festivity, and joyful artistic creation' (Davis, 2009, p. 264). Furthermore, craftsmanship is expressed with joy and pride, although plainly (as scarcity and refusal of 'properetarian' thinking result in a plain landscape and architecture) through the decorative. In his own analysis of the text, Davis notes that:

> In the textile district briefly described in chapter four, for example, the centre of each square is planted with poles strung from top to bottom with banners and pennants 'proudly proclaiming' the local dyers art in all its varied colours. Further on, Shevek notices a wiremaker s shopfront 'cheerfully and ornately' decorated with pat terns of vines worked in painted wire (Davis, 2009, p. 236)

As evidenced by Shevek, Anarresti pride and pleasure in the production of arts and crafts are the result of an education that, based on the principles of revolution as continuous

creation, provides everyone with rich artistic schooling – whether in music, painting, theatre or other domains. Shevek remarks, after recognising the pleasures of attending music concerts, that he had always 'thought of music as something you do rather than something you hear'. Indeed, we are told 'as a child he had always sung, or played one instrument or another, in local choirs and ensembles; he had enjoyed it very much, but had not had much talent' (Le Guin, 2011 (1974), p. 205). Nevertheless, learning centres were:

> prepared for the practice of art: training in singing, metrics, dance, the use of brush, chisel, knife, lathe, and so on. It was all pragmatic: the children learned to see, speak, hear, move, handle. No distinction was drawn between the arts and the crafts; art was not considered as having a place in life, but as being a basic technique of life, like speech. Thus architecture had developed, early and freely, a consistent style, pure and plain, subtle in proportion. Painting and sculpture served largely as elements of architecture and town planning. As for the arts of words, poetry and storytelling tended to be ephemeral, to be linked with song and dancing; only the theater stood wholly alone, and only the theater was ever called "the Art"—a thing complete in itself. There were many regional and traveling troupes of actors and dancers, repertory companies, very often with playwright attached. (Le Guin, 2011 (1974), pp. 205-206)

Contrary to NFN,[135] aesthetic incorporation into everyday life and critiques of consumer capitalist society are not achieved by stark negative reflection, but dialectically, through the association of positions. According to Douglas Spencer, 'challenging this binary logic, some of the novel's characters relate intimately to objects without succumbing to their powers of alienation; on the contrary, their subjectivity engages with the social through the world of objects as an extension of their individual agency' (Spencer, 2005, p. 106). By opening to the construction of the mediation and kinetic articulation of space, which enables mobility between positions (e.g., spatial, social, historical, identitary, or cultural), the space created by Le Guin becomes assumedly postmodern.

Thus, similar to the functions of ancient Greek theatre – whose allegorical or metaphorical representations are thought to have allowed for the critical articulation of concepts and application to political and social life – the arts in Anarres, especially music

---

[135] In 'The Alien Comes Home: Getting Past the Twin Planets of Possession and Austerity in Le Guin's *The Dispossessed*', David Spencer articulates the critique of consumer capitalism expressed in *The Dispossessed* enacted by the contrast between Anarres and Urras with the ones expressed by the project Utopic and Superstudio: 'Whereas Utopie and Superstudio responded to the excesses of consumer capitalism by equating renunciation with salvation and freedom, Le Guin (like William Morris before her) recognizes the related limitations of both austerity and opulence. She also gestures to a possibility that Reynolds claims Marcuse overlooks, namely that art might provide a context for the rehabilitation of the object, liberating it from its commodified form.' (Davis, 2005, p. XIII) so much so, thus, possess liberating effects both as to the original society of the author and of the protagonist.

and theatre,[136] have an important didactic function, Simon Strow argues. They offer 'not the limited opportunities of a specific critique or thought experiment, but something much more valuable: the experience and the demonstration of applicable critical method' (Strow, 2005, pp. 37-38).

In parallel, Le Guin articulates artistic practice with the critique of traditional utopias' 'tyranny of the majority'.[137] Bedap critically exposes this aspect, despite having 'no government, no laws, all right . . . ideas were never controlled by laws and governments, even on Urras' (Le Guin, 2011 (1974), p. 215). Thus, even in dystopian societies, 'you can't crush ideas by suppressing them. You can only crush them by ignoring them. By refusing to think – refusing to change' (Le Guin, 2011 (1974), p. 216). The tyranny and peril of a perfect utopian blueprint are those of 'public opinion! That's the power structure he is part of and knows how to use. The unadmitted, inadmissible government that rules the Odonian society by stifling the individual mind' (Le Guin, 2011 (1974), p. 216). Although not having a minority government, Anarres has 'government by the majority', who have allowed 'cooperation [to] become obedience' and individual and social consciousness to be 'controlled by bureaucrats' (Le Guin, 2011 (1974), p. 218).

Le Guin, however, safeguards her utopian vision by being self-reflexive on the conditions of artistic practice as social function and social fact. The anarchist balance between the individual and society, Davis argues, is thus maintained such that it 'simultaneously protects the autonomy of art and firmly rejects the assumption that it must be something precious and elitist' (Davis, 2009, p. 232). This balance recognises how the production and consumption of art may be assumed to represent a social and spatial fact, one to be lived with and not to hide from, while still defending it from co-option. This balance is maintained once art is not merely perceived as an aesthetic object that requires a specific pleasurable, aesthetic form – and response – but also constituted critically.

In Chapter 2, we learn about Shevek's childhood and education as he returns to Northsetting. Tirin writes and performs a play during a party for Shevek at the 'Northsetting Regional Institute of the Noble and Material Sciences'. The play is about

---

[136] In the book, theatre is said to stand 'wholly alone, and only the theater was ever called 'the Art'—a thing complete in itself.' (Le Guin, 2011 (1974), p. 205)
[137] In *On Liberty*, John Stuart Mill argues that power is not only exercised top-down, by the institutions, governments and monarchs, but from the rule of the majority that constraints individual freedom. Thus, this constraint may take the form of 'compulsion and control, whether the means used be physical force in the form of legal penalties, or the moral coercion of public opinion' (Mill, 1999, p. 51).

an Urrasti (the original society, in contrast to which Anarres establishes itself as a utopian possibility) mendicant, who values all his experience in terms of his possessions:

> There were skits and entertainments, rehearsed and impromptu. Tirin got himself up in a collection of rags from the recycle bin and wandered among them as the Poor Urrasti, the Beggarman—one of the Iotic words everybody had learned in history. "Give me money," he whined, shaking his hand under their noses. "Money! Money! Why don't you give me any money? You haven't got any? Liars! Filthy properetarians! Profiteers! Look at all that food, how did you get it if you haven't any money?" He then offered himself for sale. "Bay me, bay me, for just a little money," he wheedled.
> "It isn't bay, it's buy," Rovab corrected him.
> "Bay me, buy me, who cares, look, what a beautiful body, don't you want it?" Tirin crooned, wagging his slender hips and batting his eyes. He was at last publicly executed with a fish knife and reappeared in normal clothing. There were skillful harp players and singers among them, and there was plenty of music and dancing, but more talk. (Le Guin, 2011 (1974), p. 76)

The space created by the play is somewhat ambiguous, although we know that its abstract location is the Institute, the home of these characters, who have always lived within a larger community of people, rather than within a family. Despite taking place at the Institute, the space produced by the work of art cannot be said to be an institution, as it is not part of the ideological apparatus of the larger society. Rather, the space of art is created through the spatial performance of both Tirin and the spectator, who is asked to participate in the establishment of such a space. The space of art reveals itself as a fluid, unbounded entity, as it lacks a barrier between itself and other spaces or people, who become part of the space where practice happens. It is a proper postmodern space because it lacks boundaries; engages in a practice of 'thirdring-as-Othering'; is heterogenous; and calls social relations and spatial practices to be part of its multiple, plural discourse.

Following Shevek's departure, Tirin writes another play, which raises questions about the simplistic dichotomies between life on Urras and life on Anarres. Years later, Shevek learns through Bedap and then Tirin himself that after this episode, Tirin was denied a place at the Institute following complaints about the play – again, the tyranny of the majority – which later led to Tirin being admitted to a mental asylum. The space of art, here, assumes a mental trope, just as with the wall. This space of art is nevertheless critical and relational, despite being denied by the orthodoxies and dogmatism of institutional thinking. The space is dynamic, as it permits change, disruption and a 'thirdring-as-*Othering*.'

Later in the novel, Shevek meets a composer named Salas, who, like Tirin, has been 'punished' for his artistic unorthodoxy and thus excluded by the Music Syndicate for not being sufficiently 'harmonious':

> But the Music syndics don't like my compositions. And nobody much else does, yet I can't be a syndicate all by myself, can I? . . .
> You see, I don't write the way I was trained to write at the conservatory. I write dysfunctional music." He smiled more sweetly than ever. "They want chorales. I hate chorales. They want wide-harmony pieces like Sessur wrote. I hate Sessur's music. I'm writing a piece of chamber music. Thought I might call it *The Simultaneity Principle.* Five instruments each playing an independent cyclic theme; no melodic causality; the forward process entirely in the relationship of the parts. It makes a lovely harmony. But they don't hear it. (Le Guin, 2011 (1974), pp. 227-228)

The Music Syndicate is representative of the modern art space and institution: it is a psychological bounded place (a wall) with a definite set of spatial practices, static in its maintenance of an aesthetic orthodoxy and horizontal in its preservation of a view of history that has turned into dogma and that is univocal, identitary and functional. The Syndicate's (positive) function is thus the maintenance of utopian dogmatism. Salas's artistic practice, on the other hand, by refusing to be assimilated by institutional positiveness, creates a critical spatiality for artistic practice.

When Shevek is first confronted with Salas' and Bedap's testimonies, he refuses to see how Anarres' revolutionary principle has become a 'functionalist orthodoxy' (Spencer, 2005, p. 106) that inhibits the critical practice of artistic production and its institutional parameters. Thus, he asserts – and one cannot help but wonder if this remark is, in any measure, directed to Morris's dogmatic aesthetic, 'I think Tir's a born artist. Not a craftsman; a creator. An inventor-destroyer, the kind who's got to turn everything upside down and inside out. A satirist, a man who praises through rage' (Le Guin, 2011 (1974), p. 428).[138]

Cognisant of the institutionalisation taking place in Anarres, the space created by the artistic practices of people such as Tirin and Salas allows for an articulation between first and second space and the construction of Thirdspace, which is, after all, the space of the critical utopia itself. Being utopia performed as a process, the space of art sets in motion the process of 'critical spatial practice' in the sense envisioned by Rendell. Unlike Rendell's explanation of critical spatial practice as derived from self-reflexive movements of art in space – being site-specificity self-aware in this case – it is unclear whether Le Guin – through Tirin and Salas –consciously upholds such an artistic practice. What is evidenced explicitly, however, is the institutional critique of the avant-garde

[138] The apparent critique to craftsmanship and the distinction between fine art and craft has no elitist overtones to it as both artistic practices are integrated with the utopian ideals of community, individuality and equality. Rather, it serves to distinguish critical from noncritical artistic practices, being art, in Le Guin's utopia, truly social in the terms argued for in the first chapter of the present study.

movements that were demanding, by the time Le Guin was writing TD, the reformation of the modern museum and art gallery. Such movements are always capable of being assimilated, and it is precisely to counter this assimilation that the prefix 'critical' – applied to both artistic practice and utopia – writes itself against in Le Guin's utopian vision. In Anarres, not all art spaces are postmodern, but it is in the dialogues between these art spaces and modern art spaces that differences and dialogue may occur. In the same way as Urras serves as a point of comparison that activates the revolutionary principle that founded Anarres in the first place, the critical spatial practices of art serve to activate the utopian principle. It is in the enactment of the plural micro-structures of society that Le Guin explores the tension and ambiguity between 'utopian ideals and dystopian denials, of rebellion and cooptation, of synchronic unity and diachronic movement toward a better world' (Moylan, 2014, p. 90). Art is recognised, and its critical and hermeneutic potential is what ultimately propels characters such as Shevek, Takver and Bedap to act to maintain the principle of utopia as a continuous and alive critical movement by preserving it at the level of individual and creative revolution and expression of freedom. Much like critical spatial (artistic) practice, radical subjectivity is enacted within the spatial, social and historical paradigm by actively reflecting and transforming society's values.

Similarly, in TOT, an artistic performance propels the inner journey of Bron, a self-estranged unhappy 'misfit in utopia' (Moylan, 2014, p. 154), who is born in a dystopian world (represented by Mars) and for whom the idea of difference shakes his own identitary[139] convictions. Bron's attitude towards the free and liberal utopia of Triton filters the experience of and life in utopia through a negative lens, 'as Bron misunderstands, misuses, and fails to adjust to life on Triton' (Moylan, 2014, p. 154). Delany thus chooses to focus on radically different individuals, either in relation to the society in which they live or in relation to our own: Bron is a homophobic misfit, Lawrence is an antisocial alcoholic homosexual, Sam is a criminal, the Spike is a revolutionary artist, and some other minor characters with neurological disabilities are introduced. Delany does not only show that heterogeneity is encouraged but also – as the

[139] Bron's resistance to this sexually freed society and negation of simplistic binaries have much to do with that fact that Bron – much like a modern man – derives his being-in-the-world from rigid identitary boundaries that, in his case, are related to his sexuality and the maintenance of genre and sexual identity boundaries. See Wendy Gay Pearson's 'Born to be Bron: Destiny and Destinerrance in Samuel R. Delany's Trouble on Triton'.

diversity of these individuals' characters demonstrates, especially the Spike and Sam – highlights the kind of 'creative potential that the utopian society can nurture' (Moylan, 2014, p. 171). Thus, the society's macro-structures try to guarantee freedom and the preservation of self-determination and emancipation within society, including both structures and instructions not only on how to conform to this utopian possibility, but also on how to not conform and to either contest it or destroy oneself both physically and psychologically.

'If Le Guin's is a utopia of the intellect, Samuel Delany's *Triton* is a utopia of the streets' (Moylan, 1980, p. 243), as the refunctioning of utopia is attained in the dynamic opposition between Triton and Mars (Bron's homeland), as well as through the book's approach to the licensed and unlicensed sectors. Delany offers a view of utopia 'from the underside, from urban streets rather than university towers, from the margins of even the distant utopian center' (Moylan, 2014, p. 163). As we first step into Triton, we are confronted with a deeply heterogeneous space, starkly different from both traditional utopias and Le Guin's space. Triton is as dissimilar from them as it is similar to a globalised large city of today, with its spaces of flows, visual saturation and crowdedness. It is still recognisably utopian, however: it is dynamic, plural and relational, with different forces playing a role in the making of its spaces and practices. The u-l, or the 'unlicensed sector' – a space that is, according to the perspective of Bron, constructed so as to be associated with a contemporary ghetto – is a place where marginal practices are permitted and incorporated as a healthy spatial practice, the enforcement of homogeneity resulting in the opposite effect. The u-l[140] is described in the following terms:

> At founding, each Outer Satellite city had set aside a city sector well no law officially held – since, as the Mars sociologist who first advocated it had pointed out, most cities develop, of necessity, such a neighborhood anyway. These sectors fulfilled a complex range of functions in the cities' Psychological, political, and economic ecology. Problems a few conservative, Earth-bound thinkers feared must come, didn't: the interface between official law and official lawlessness produced some remarkably stable *un*official laws throughout the no-law sector. . .. Today it was something of a truism: "most places in the unlicensed sector are statistically safer than the rest of the city." to which the truistic response was: "But not *all*."
> Still, there was a definite and different feel to the u-l streets. Those who chose to live there – and many did – did so because, presumably, they liked that feel. (Delany, 1996 (1976), p. 8)

[140] Moylan makes a connection between the deliberate use of artistic space in the text with the language and artistic vision of the text itself, whose product is a plot that 'provides a 'spine' around which the multiple images of decadent worlds and utopian moons, science-fiction critiques and dystopian descriptions are clustered and controlled as the 'spine' of a film narrative controls the visual and aural elements gathered around it. Film and the modern psychological novel, then, are proper analogues for the organization of *Triton*' (Moylan, 1980, p. 248).

Bron's own view of the unlicensed sector, however, is still cautious, and the opinions and prejudices he has of that space in the book's first pages reflect his reluctance and biases towards what he considers a marginal space. These representations of space are, however, frustrated once Bron meets the Spike in the u-l, which becomes a space for a street performance of micro-theatre:

> In the small square, a refuse can blazed, flaking light over the dark-haired girl's guitar; she turned, strumming slowly. The music (the acrobat preceding them did a final flip and, staggering and laughing, stood) quickened.
> Some man started singing.
> Bron looked for him and saw the poster – mural rather – across the back wall:
> A winged beast with near-naked rider rose through thrashing branches, the rider's expression ecstatic, flexed arms bound in bronze. . ..
> A dozen people stood near the fire. One woman, seated on a crate, suckled a baby: in the warm draft from the burning can, her chiffon lifted and fell. (Delany, 1996 (1976), pp. 14-15)

The space of the u-l is as much transgressed as it is assimilated into the play, as are the practices of Bron, turning the artistic place into a lived space where relations are enacted. As in Tirin's case, boundaries are blurred, and institutional space is denied. In contrast to Tirin's play, however, this play is filled by the context, which is assumed to be part of the piece itself. The spatial form of the Spike's play is at times confusing, but like Tirin's play, it is deeply political and social: the space asks to be contested and put into perspective as part of the artistic creation. The opposition, on the one hand, and reconciliation, on the other hand, between the space of art and the space of the city, combined with the ambiguity regarding the identification of the performers and spectators, serve to convey a message of artistic and creative (spatial critical) practice as a powerful indicator of the relationships between society's macro- and micro-structures and the union 'of the artistic and political vanguard' (Moylan, 2014, p. 178), both of which are highly estimated in the form of desired activism. According to Moylan, Delany is suggesting that the post-industrial society needs not the terrorist or dystopian denial, but political and artistic work in the construction of a better and Not-Yet realised world. While the macro-structure of society is responsible for the preservation of the utopian society, it does not exercise ideological, spatial or social control over the micro-structures of society, nor does it control how people express themselves creatively and intimately. In fact, the government of Triton endorses creative and critical practices because they are constitutive of the life of a utopia that is constantly referring back to itself for change and continual utopian demand. Moylan states:

> The arts on Triton are abundant and endowed by the government and the university. Video is available in both public channels and private, special interest ones. The ice opera is a popular

> cultural form that is a combination of science fiction and television sitcoms and dramas. And, of course, in the microtheater and epics of The Spike, the dramatist with whom Bron Helstrom becomes romantically involved, the reader sees one aspect of avant garde art-an aspect that traces its origins back to the Happenings and street theater of the 1960s (Moylan, 1980, pp. 246-247)

The Spike thus represents a vanguard – heavily influenced by the avant-garde of Delany's own cultural historical backdrop – and her art demands the active involvement of the citizens as a 'creative part of the post-revolutionary ideological state apparatus' (Moylan, 2014, pp. 177-178). This aspect reinforces critical creative thinking, which is perceived as a constitutional basis for personal and communal growth. Moreover, by consciously performing her plays, in different places – her performances are 'seldom confined in a formal theatrical space' (Delany, 1996 (1976), p. 43), – The Spike – and, as a consequence of her endorsement by the 'Government Art Endowment' (Delany, 1996 (1976), p. 17), the Government – is conscious of the critical and emancipatory role of place, especially in its connection to art. The spaces created by her performance are thus relational and unbounded, meant for the free dwelling and participation of spectators, who are encouraged to engage in the artistic place of the performance and partake in the construction of that space. By opening space to the meanings and practices of its dweller-spectators, these art spaces become true 4D entities in which culture is asked to produce and be produced by the contrasting and heterogeneous dimensions of the city space, its history and its diverse forms of social relations. The space of art is not simply there to be taken and perceived as a whole entity in itself but is being made at the same time as it is being perceived – the use of drugs and the artist's gesture of gratefulness to Bron are testimony to this.

Thus, although critical and sometimes even disruptive of the surrounding space, the spaces of art of these utopias are not heterotopias in the sense put forward by Foucault because they do not constitute spaces that are different or concurrent with the meanings of utopia. Nevertheless, these spaces are part of the constitution of utopia, even though Delany chose 'An Ambiguous Heterotopia' as the subtitle to his book, due to not being 'so interested in utopian consolation or obvious conflicts as . . . he is in the disturbing, disordered – indeed, ambiguous and uncertain – image of a utopian society emerging slowly out of the old Worlds' (Moylan, 1980, p. 244). The reason for the argument is that while Foucault's concept involves a closure or form of boundedness whose relation to the exterior is merely negative – as it stresses, by contrast, spaces that are other – the spaces of utopia in Anarres and Triton are relational because they seek to communicate and

articulate the binaries that they themselves would be part of if they were heterotopias, rather than to reinforce them. Their critical spatial (artistic) practices are imagined as processes of utopia due to the addition of the prefix 'critical', itself a processual space. Hence, these critical utopian practices seek to perform as social monads whose constitution is not merely destructive but also – and more importantly – constructive of a true alternative centred on participation rather than negation of different discourses. Undoubtedly, both TD and TOT possess institutional spaces of art – not in the traditional forms of the modern museum or white cube, but in terms of their psychological boundedness, abstract constitution and positiveness. These aspects serve to confirm the utopian dogma and are constituted in much the same way as spaces of art in the traditional utopia; however, they remain relational, as they are affected by the critical ideologeme of the utopian text or society and the other postmodern spaces of art that demand to also become part of the process of utopian transformation. Moylan articulates this movement in the following terms:

> Aware of the historical tendency of the utopian genre to limit the imagination to one particular ideal and also aware of the restriction of the utopian impulse to marketing mechanisms, the authors of the critical utopias assumed the risky task of reviving the emancipatory utopian imagination while simultaneously destroying the traditional utopia and yet preserving it in a transformed and liberated form that was critical both of utopian writing itself and of the prevailing social formation (Moylan, 2014, pp. 41-42)

Mindful of the limitations of the utopias that preceded them and placed within a cultural background that was not only multiple and fluid but also marked by fear of the totalising ideals of the modern utopia – 'here, of course, is echoed the historic failure to achieve perfection, a false goal in the first place' (Moylan, 2014, p. 43) – these new forms of literary utopia portray societies as having ambiguities, 'faults, inconsistencies, problems, and even denials of the utopian impulse in the form of the persistence of exploitation and domination in the better place' (Moylan, 2014, p. 43). In the book's Appendix A, Delany makes explicit his critique of the traditional utopia's belief in a perfect system. This belief rests on binary oppositions between 'good' and 'evil', which, according to Delany, reveal nothing more than temperaments or preferences, which nevertheless impose the modern idea that there is a truth referent to be derived from this opposition. Delany's and Le Guin's utopian exercises instead try to surpass simple binaries and frame themselves within a deconstructive postmodern attitude that therefore reveals 'a multi-flex vision of both the possibilities and dangers of [the] emerging societies' no longer defined by 'simplistic condemnation or praise' (Moylan, 2014, p. 152).

The utopian novel[141] tended to valorise setting over plot and character and therefore social ideals over the spatial stories enacted in everyday life, so much so that 'it no longer allowed the radical imagination to look beyond its present [and] the sense of possible change in social system denied' (Moylan, 2014, p. 44). The critical utopia, however, reverses the structural depiction of its alternative society's primacy, rather articulating it in terms of the critical practices (plot) of the characters. 'Where utopia as system can only be passively wished for, utopia as struggle can be taken in a willed effort to transform the social system' (Moylan, 2014, pp. 48-49). This transformation is integrated in the text itself via the depiction of transformative actions, such as artistic practice enacted in space and towards (utopian) space.

Hence, the critical utopia conveys, through the dynamic between its micro-structures of artistic practice and its subject, a form of resistance to institutional dogmatism and is instead better understood in terms of these relational practices. 'Le Guin's utopia, by contrast, upholds the value of difference. Like Samuel Delany's Triton, it is a heterodox rather than an orthodox book—in part because (again like Triton) it is not written from a singular ideological perspective, but even more importantly because of the ambiguous location of its utopian horizon' (Davis, Introduction, 2005, p. XIX). Rather than being fixed under an established form, Le Guin's critical artistic practice and utopian drive are defined as a method, with the actual mobility and dynamism of the method the source of a variety of discourses that participate in utopian change. Once the process is annulled – as in the traditional utopia – dialogues are interrupted between society and the individual (who becomes one with the community), between space and history (which must be eternalised and thus must become inoperative concepts) and between same and other (whose existence is denied as conflict and difference are abandoned and replaced by the homogenised human experience required for maintaining a perceived blueprint that sees itself as a finished object). The space of art in the critical utopia is thus crucial in establishing utopia's function as a method and as enacted spatially through thirdring-as-Othering.

Artistic practice is thus the product and producer of liminality and relationality, in the midst of which the thinking subject meets the community. This relationship is biconditional and hence co-implicative: the reference of criticality permitted by artistic

[141] See Fredric Jameson's *The Political Unconscious.*

practice is, counteractively, permitted by a utopian imagination that sees in its very act of creation the dynamism necessary for the articulation of the concepts of utopia and art. As Sousa Dias – and Bloch, from a different perspective – states that the very possibilities of art and utopia are ontologically simultaneous and that one's condition of happenstance thus implies the other, so this synthesis is better understood under the function of the critical that does not seek itself as stasis but as a continual method. Artistic practice in utopia is thus simultaneously positive, negative and critical: it is utopia, reflects back utopia as an unfinished product and reveals its own utopian condition via emancipatory praxis. There is thus an active and pedagogical potential in the relationality of spatial critical (artistic) practice in utopia and the critical utopia as textual reality. They both demand – like the wall or, perhaps, Richard Serra's *Tilted Arc* – that one is confronted with their undeniable reality to inspire responsibility for 'what is to be done, and how it is to be done' (Moylan, 2014, p. XIV) regarding utopia itself as a process of transformation and not as a 'fixed blueprint' (Moylan, 2014, p. XIV) – and, as a consequence, the utopian function of art as process rather than as ideal form.

Conclusion

> *The globe shrinks for those who own it; for the displaced and the dispossessed, the migrant or refugee, no distance is more awesome than the few feet across borders and frontiers.* (Bhabha, 1992, p. 88)

> *By midday, with the tie, The Undiscovered Island, finally set to sea, searching for itself.* (Saramago, 2007, p. 39)[142]

If we accept the trialectics established by authors such as Lefebvre and Soja and follow their conclusions onto the work of authors such as Rendell, Kwon, or Osborne – that art practices produce and are product of (social) space dialectically – then it becomes of valuable interest to analyse the way their spatiality is constitutive of the production of space in utopia (especially when bearing in mind they possess utopian functions by themselves). Massey's concept of 'progressive sense of place' – called elsewhere '4D spatiality' –, which demands not only the cooperation of history, space and society in proposing a radical alternative to traditional binaries but also the engagement and articulation of these to cultural and artistic forms, provides us a theoretical backdrop for the theorisation of the relations being made in the present study, in a constellation-like analysis.

The hypothesis finally takes shape: the spatial turn has implied, besides its immediate consequences, a shift in aesthetic sensibilities[143] that is accompanied by a transformation of the utopian genre. The new postmodern aesthetic and spatial sensibility has permitted to notice a shift both in the status of space and the artwork (that is now perceived spatially, historically and socially). Similarly, the micro-topologies of the utopian text and their relation to the artwork's form and function has been transformed, implicating a metamorphosis on the formal structure of the utopian text itself. In other words, the movement from modern to postmodern spatial and aesthetic sensibilities has represented, simultaneously, a change in the utopian function of art and its space both in the imagined space of the text and in the real geospace in which authors live. This study's emphasis on a postmodern analysis – as both a deconstructive and constructive dialectical

---

[142] Original text: 'Pela hora do meio-dia, com a maré, A Ilha Desconhecida fez-se enfim ao mar, à procura de si mesma'.

[143] Much like is suggested by Jameson that, as has been exposed in the first part of the present study, relates the spatial turn to a transformation in aesthetic sensibility from modernism to postmodernism.

tool – reflects this new attitude and articulates, critically, objects in networks of relations rather than through antagonistic binaries.

It was proven how the shift from modernism to postmodernism, via the spatial turn, the institutional critique and the consequent reformulation of aestheticism, has meant a shift from relations between macro- and micro- structures within the utopian text, from traditional to critical utopia. By employing spatial methods into art spaces' analysis and applying it as analytical method[144] in the close reading of the established *traditional* utopias of Bellamy and Morris and the *critical* utopias of Le Guin and Delany, we were permitted to conclude that these texts incorporate art in utopia through varying utopian functions. Considering both Osborne's theorisation of contemporary art as synthesis of aestheticism and conceptualism in space, and Sousa Dias' and Bloch's argument of the ontological bi-necessity of art and utopia, this study has proven how the conceptual and the aesthetic express different modes of utopian functions in art, whose forms can be extracted from their spatial enactment in/as modern and postmodern space. These distinctions can, in turn, be articulated in terms of the role art occupies in utopia – namely, the positive, the negative and the critical. Synchronically, these functions enable us to understand in which ways the discrete and generic textual levels affect and are affected by the iconic register, deepening the investigation made by Moylan.

Bellamy's and Morris's utopias were distinguished, via this method, in terms of function but not of form. However, both were distinguished equally in terms of form and function from the critical utopia. While the traditional utopia can be said proper to modern utopian art in both form and function, the latter (largely because of their historical, social and cultural context), the critical utopias under analysis reveal a postmodern aesthetic sensibility, in both a destructive and reconstructive manner.

Louis Marin argues in *Utopics: Spatial Play* there is an order of 'figurability' in the utopian text that takes the form of the spatial Other, 'the negative of contemporary social, historical reality' that assumes the role of 'the absent term, as such, of the figure that refers to it' (Marin, 1984, p. 196). These spatial figures are, as Tally[145] would argue, inspired by real geospace and inverted in the text. Bearing this in mind, the space of utopian discourse produces real-and-imagined spaces as they both try to integrate and

---

[144] That allowed the distinction between modern and postmodern spaces of art as well as the operative concepts of 'thirdring-as-Othering', critical spatial practices and progressive sense of place

[145] See *The Routledge Handbook to Literature and Space* and *Spatiality*.

transcend first and second space, if we consider the role of the author – and of ourselves – as mediating figures. Still, once the modes, forms and functions of the micro-topologies of artistic practice in Morris' and Bellamy's traditional utopias are analysed, it becomes evident that this inversion is not of the type Marin defended. In fact, it has been proven heretofore that these utopias' spaces of art accommodate, in their structures, a modern narrative, continuous to the spatial and artistic modes of their own time. Although the aesthetic and spatial form of the real is contested, its discourses are not. Inside the text, the modern logic is preserved as homogeneous, bounded, horizontal, eternal, functional and univocal form, with an absolute view imposed upon difference.

There is beauty in Nowhere's space, Dowling agrees, a powerful sense of craftsmanship and architectural splendour – 'there are pleasing bridges and houses as well as charming friezes and mosaics in the public spaces' (Dowling, 1996, p. 70) – however, as Dowling explains, 'the fine arts have been curiously displaced . . . 'both drama and music are neglected, while sculpture and painting are relatively insignificant' (Dowling, 1996, p. 70); and literature has almost ceased to be produced as the Nowherians not only do not cultivate the habit of reading[146] but no longer endeavour on the act of writing besides fairy-tale writing. This lack, Dowling contends, is 'symptomatic . . . of a larger tension or pattern of inconsistencies operating within the work, combining to impart a dystopian dimension to Morris's socialist paradise' (Dowling, 1996, p. 70). I would not, however, call this absence an inconsistency but rather a necessary consequence of the traditional utopian form. Maybe this absence points to the authors' own recognition of an incompatibility between art as utopia – or transformative desire – and art in the traditional utopian form.

Safeguarding my own perspective from 'standard rejoinder to reach a critique of Morris's Nowhere' that, Dowling adverts, 'usually counter[s] that any such putatively dystopian elements represent instead the critics' own bourgeois misrecognition of the condition of art in a socialist utopia' (Dowling 70) and from imparting the present study with my own ideological biases, I wish to disclaim that the conclusions here exposed do not aim to condemn the traditional utopia or its positive function of art – critiquing it as reifying or commodifying art. Instead, the goal is to reveal the blockages of the utopian text as blueprint in the articulation of non-modern spaces of art. These spaces imply, in

[146] As Ellen's grandfather so vehemently makes apparent.

turn, a limitation of subjective, heterogeneous practices and thus the articulation of art as a truly social, critical and dynamic object. Consequently, artistic practice, although present in the text, assumes a positive function and only functions at the level of the iconic register – giving it credibility instead of livelihood.

The uniformisation of artistic practice under a sole function, Noami Jacobs contends, results from the long history of utopian thought. Traditional utopia was 'quantifiable, material, and inorganic, its superiority could be seen, in the symmetry and clarity with which it imitated an elegantly balanced and stable divine creation' (Jacobs, 1989, p. 109) – tendency that can be traced back to the Greek ideals of order and balance, Lewis Mumford suggests in 'Utopia, the City and the Machine'. Although such 'physical and visual stability and balance' made the traditional utopia an 'object of contemplation of great intellectual and aesthetic beauty' (Jacobs, 1989, p. 109), it also reduced utopia to static abstraction, whose commitment to the functions of art were passive – as becomes evident in LB. Morris, on the other hand, subverts this ordered tendency – he is explicitly critical of both Bellamy and the Greek tradition – and subverts mapped symmetry. Spaces of art – as all spaces in Nowhere – are decentralised, their organisation organic, and the hopes of mapping thwarted by a constellation-like distribution. This distribution is mainly due to Morris's own attempts to deconstruct what he perceived to be the aristocratic, elitist forms of institutional art space of his own time.

Nevertheless, NFN, despite the growing expansiveness on utopian function of art and of space, is still inserted in the tradition of the traditional utopia. The sense of permanence, immutability and perfection is conveyed by the stativity of the form and function of its spaces of art. In utopias such as Morris's and Bellamy's 'the temporality of the social process, the dialectics of social change . . . are excluded, while social stability is assured by a fixed spatial form' (Harvey, 2000, p. 160). Artistic practice, although present and recognised as container of utopia possibilities, is neutralised under a 'fixed spatial form' that denaturalises the very creative impulse and abstracts artistic practice as an eternal, formal quality. Morris's utopian discourse strives to disrupt 'historical reality through . . . figurative representation . . . hop[ing] to express historical reality by deadening and shaping it into a closed system of ideas aimed at presenting a justified and legitimated representation of it' (Marin, 1984, p. 195). However, by disregarding the implicit modern unidimensionality of spaces and art, Morris ends up just reversing their neutralisation rather than critically integrating art and space. Morris's case would, still,

benefit from a deeper analysis that sought to establish further correlations between his transgression of the traditional utopia's art space and contextualisation in the historical and artistic transition period he lived – possibly justifying the distinctions made between LB and NFN.

Modernism, as a 'culture of temporal abstraction, centred on that restless logic of negation that makes up the temporal dialectic of the new' (Osborne, 2001, p. 183), mediates difference in terms of this negation – linked to artwork's autonomy – and temporal discourse. Because of this superimposition of a form of utopian reasoning and a grand narrative that must be assessed indiscriminately, these modern utopias have been described by authors such as Harvey and Lyotard 'as forms of 'terroristic meta-narrative', whereby dominant discourse act to squash individuality and restrict society to narrow, forced growth' (Ward, 2006, p. 46). In the traditional utopia, to forced eternalisation. Traditional utopias' emphasis on perfection makes both 'history and narrative . . . structurally obsolete' (Riquet, 2017, p. 218) while re-enacting the implicit forms of real space. It can thus be argued (Cf. Riquet 2017) that the island space is the archetypical space of the traditional utopia, which is reproduced even when historical time is specified (as in Edward Bellamy's LB) and utopia is placed somewhere in the future. This future, however, admits no future to itself, no continuation for utopian society, only permanence. Temporality, spatiality, sociality and culture are turned into picture. The island, even when it does not take the form of a piece of land surrounded by water on all sides, stands as the traditional utopian space par excellence. Defence of the island space is similar to the defence of the local, which can be shown either by bounded or reactionary spatial attitudes – as is the case of Morris – or by identitary, ideological attitudes – as is the case of Bellamy. Local attitudes in utopia thus pose a threat to themselves as utopian spaces as they 'often 'devolve into a kind of primordialism that fixes and romanticizes social relation and identity.' Moreover, investment in local forms of identity can 'hinder recognition of shared problems and the formation of more effective political alliances' (Caroll, 2017, p. 164),[147] homogenising social and spatial problems and identities.

Hardt's and Negri's approach, Siobhan Caroll reiterates, 'rather than trying to defend historical place . . . argue for 'the concrete invention of the first new place in non-

[147] Of course, local spatiality's capacity for 'more effective political alliances' may enable it to constitute powerful forms of bottom-up initiatives that places the citizen at the core of its concerns but in order for this articulation to be done, they must not be identitary or reactionary, but relational and open to other spatialities and discourses.

place – new sites of identity situated within the twenty-first century flows' (Caroll, 2017, p. 164). It allows identitary plurality to be enacted in space as process. Similarly, critical utopias reject bounded, local, identitary-based notions of space which are often reactionary. Critical utopias provide, instead, critical spatial artistic practices that serve as conscious manifestation against traditional utopia's spatiality. Spaces of art in the form of institutional space is of this sort: they preserve the artwork and its space as an eternal monad apparently defending from the outside world. Critical utopias and critical (artistic) spatial practices, by contrast, ally the local with the global, being progressive and processual. Art spaces can be noticed clearly in the generic, iconic and discrete levels in TD and TOT in which traditional utopian dogmatism is contested by postmodern critical attitudes within utopia itself. These utopias, Moylan argued, have as a central concern 'the awareness of the limitations of the utopian tradition so that these texts *reject utopia as blueprint* while preserving it as dream (Moylan, 2014, p. 10)' focusing 'on the continuing presence of difference and imperfection within utopian society itself and thus render more recognizable and dynamic alternatives' (Moylan, 2014, p. 11). Critical utopias seek to invert the static character of the traditional utopia, transforming the island into a ship, in a movement recalling José Saramago's 'The Tale of the Undiscovered Island' in which the quest for the island transforms the search vehicle (the ship) into an island itself. Literary critical utopias' space is dynamic, its artistic critical spatial practices serve as paddles, and artistic utopia sets out to discover and build itself a continual utopian self-improvement.

In *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*, Roland Robertson argues for this relational character of artistic practices and spaces as necessarily transformative under globalisation which, 'as a concept, refers both to the compression of the world and classification of the world as a whole' (Robertson, 1992, p. 8). Framed in this context, artistic practices both demand and produce dialogues between notions of original and global communities and social space, a 'thirdspace of enunciation' or a 'in-between space' – as Bhabba puts it. This notion, Anna Maria Guash argues, is founded 'on the premise that all aesthetic intervention in the concept of 'place' and 'subject' provides new bases for rethinking the issues of knowledge, agency and political commitment in a globalized world' (Guasch, 2014, n.p.). Comparably, to Massey places are forever changing and cannot be taken as 'fixed environments but as processes, 'spatio-temporal events'. Consequently, Massey maintains 'that a "global sense of place" entails grasping

place in terms of its relations with what lies beyond it, as a "particular constellation of social relations, meeting and weaving together at a particular locus"' (Alexander, 2017, p. 41). Thus, artistic practices must serve as 'source of new forms of reflexivity that, following Rob Wilson, provoke an "aesthetic of openness toward otherness"' (Guasch, 2014, n.p.). New processes of spatialisation and artistic practice thus become co-productive of new forms of critical engagement and dialogue whose relational character allows them greater fluidity and margin for improvement and empowerment – since it relates to the Other and not just to the Self. In this process resides the truly critical, dynamic and utopian function of postmodern spaces of art. Not only are they now aware of one another but produce new discourses, multiple and plural identities, and are inclusive and heterogeneous. So, they are both utopian and resistant movements against 'the economic structures of the art world producing not a commodity but a process' (Scarfone, 2007, p. 209). This process is, according to Kwon, generative, alternative and non-traditional, producing inclusive spaces[148] of 'repressed ethnic history, [of] a political cause, [of] a disenfranchised social group' (Kwon, 2002, p. 30). The art space becomes a utopian project in the enactment of practice and difference, enclosing a possibility, a potency *a la* Aristotle. This type of art space is produced by the artwork instead of the art institution. It considers art both as autonomous and as a social fact. This space is cognisant of its relation to city, as Osborne makes clear. Its futurity is grounded retrospectively and not for its own sake. By occurring socially and spatially, the 'aesthetic refuses to remain 'indifferent' in art spaces . . . The aesthetic as such [can] not be annihilated, or absolutely removed from art, but rather . . . increasingly strategically incorporated or 'contained' through the ongoing negation of various of its specific modes and the instrumental refunctioning of others (Osborne, 2018, p. 195). Contrary to what happened to modern spaces of art, the postmodern space of art's relation to time is not of detachment but 'of dissatisfaction with the inability to fulfil experience' (Maleuvre, 1999, p. 79). Art is tied to its historical, spatial and social context without being subsumed by it. Remaining free and autonomous it is only by recognising its own contextuality that the artwork presents itself as truly critical and utopian, saving history, space and social relations from entropy;

[148] Kwon uses the term sites throughout her analysis referring to the artistic practice of site-specificity, which links the artwork to a given location. When she refers to sites, nonetheless, she seems to be using it in the same way 'place' is being employed in the present study. However, when she refers to nomadic spatial practices and heterogeneous, processual production of space – as is the case here –, her use of the term 'site' seems more attuned to the conceptualisation of 'space' put forward in the first section of the present study.

the failure to do so relegates it to pure background or 'mere ornamental documentation' (Dowling, 1996, p. 70).

Bearing this in mind, in Le Guin's TD and Delany's TOT artistic practices and spatialities are regarded as processual since they undermine dogmatisation. In TD, institutionalisation of the artistic practice although recognised, acts as inciter of change and recuperation of the utopian ideal. This utopia is, in turn, not taken as static spatial form but as a processual, creative, dialectic one. Art refuses to be prescriptive in function (be it aesthetic or conceptual) and, instead, by epitomising the critical spatial practice here theorised, incorporates both functions in its sociospatial action.

'These works' Philip Wegner argues, 'are very much the products of the global political, social, and cultural ferment of the late 1960s and 1970s, and, as a consequence, a whole series of concerns – ecology, the environment, race, gender, and sexuality – are given a prominence that had not been evident earlier in the genre's long history' (Wegner, Utopia, 2005, p. 91). They reflect, in this regard, the new global consciousness of space and a new consciousness of the utopian functions of art (both in the context of social practice and of its theorisation in space as social practice). Largely sedimented in counter-culture movements – critical utopia was embroiled in 'the reflective period of the early 1970s [which] was marked by a renewed concern for theory and history as well as the development of an opposition/radical culture' (Moylan, 1980, p. 237) –, these texts reveal both their artistic preoccupations towards institutionalisation and the power geometries that are embedded in them. As such, the space of art in utopia serves both as a negative and critical topos for emancipatory action to take place. Art spaces empower the utopian narrative and its citizens as they demand (the impossible) reality of multiplicity, simultaneity, difference and dynamism. By contrast, the modern art space is comprehended as antithetical to the new needs of political, social and cultural life.

Moreover, TOT and TD 'echo literature's importance and offer necessary shifts away from traditional valuation of the arts and humanities as crucial to critical thinking alone, demanding readers to comprehend the value of creative expression […] that we need to help us think galactically' (Stallings, 2015, p. 227), that is, thinking critically while recognising that all of our thoughts and experiences are sedimented in how we 'understand time and space, life and death, being and feeling' (Stallings, 2015, p. 227). Thus, while in traditional utopias the separation between political life, science and art is largely due to the modern positivist (and, with equal prejudice, idealist) tendency to

overarching generalisation and eternalisation (which 'has dictated the split between art and science and between art and reality' (Stallings, 2015, p. 225)), the merging of utopia and science fiction in the critical utopia challenge these splits. As 'systematic devaluation of creativity and artistic expression in a society under capitalism can influence order and system of values' (Stallings, 2015, p. 226), so the traditional utopia's devaluation of artistic space and practice undermines the possibility of critical thought and subjectivity. The move against the arts and the control over spatial fix under regulated institutions impose not only specific ways of viewing the world but also external value to individual experience and artistic sensibility. By undermining globalising systems of values, which impose a spatial order to the mobilisation of difference and creative expression, critical utopias undermine institutional spaces of art, both recognising the value of spatialisation over social relations and the utopian possibilities of critical artistic practice that act within society as radical process of change.

Thus, the utopian role of art must not be exercised in canonical, idealist form in postmodernism – the disenchantment witnessed towards utopia in the post-war years proves just that –, but in a critical, dynamic way. Traditional or modern utopian-orientated art 'tends to reify art and turn it into a device exactly measuring its dissociation from social relevance (O'Doherty, 1986, p. 82). It secludes itself from society by being detached from it. The utopias of the 1970s, aware of this new spatial and artistic demands, reflect a new attitude toward society, art and utopia – or, perhaps, utopianism –, perceiving it from an everyday life and everyday subject standpoint. They make utopia a function of desire and of imagination. Artistic practice as a social fact enrols in a similar endeavour. For establishing a new spatial and inclusive dialogue, as proposed by Soja and Massey in the first chapter, the space of art must be capable of plurality and relationality in this matter:

> in precisely the unhinging of stable categories and subject position, in the interdisciplinary and intermediary, in the conflictual and dividing, in the fragmented and permissive – in different spaces of experience, as it were. We should begin to think of this contradictory and non-unitary notion of a public sphere, and of the art institution as the embodiment of this sphere. (Sheikh, 2006, p. 194)

The emphasis put on the critical function of artistic practice in the critical utopia provides a reflective alternative to identitary and regressionist attitudes towards both space and art endorsed by modernism whose aestheticism and spatiality is of an ethical order and

constructed as 'or' sentences (i.e., through the construction of moral binaries of 'good' *or* 'evil': good utopia *or* bad old society, good art *or* bad art, good space *or* bad space, good citizen *or* bad citizen). The central question, Stallings argues, citing Sylvia Wynter, 'remains unresolved' in this system of antagonistic dichotomies: '*which* meaning, for *what* group, and from *which* perspective – celebrant or dissident?' (as cited in Stallings, 2015, p. 227).

This last conclusion could open the debate of modern and postmodern spatial artistic practice onto further investigation of its impact on cultural, racial, feminist, sexual and other studies. This could be done through the articulation of imaginary and real spatial practices with cultural forms of artistic expression in utopia – the analysis of Joanna Russ's *Female Man* could prove useful in such an inquiry.

Consequently, the conclusions made so far are bound by theoretical limits as, for example, regarding the articulation of issues of subjectivity, history and memory or the relations between art spaces and the political affiliations of the text itself. (Strong arguments could be made regarding capitalist production in Bellamy's LB, in contrast to the more Marxist approach of Morris and the anarcho-Marxist approaches of both Le Guin and Delany). Moreover, a further sample of utopias, in a larger time span – including utopias prior to the nineteenth century and posterior to the twentieth –, would surely display further variation on artistic practices and functions in the literary utopia. This quantitative limitation, however, leaves research space open, as the present study strength lies on its methodological proposal. This limitation is also a consequence of one of the chief obstacles found in the elaboration of the present study, namely, the shortage of literature devoted to the subject of the role of art and its space in the literary utopia. Although there is a vast amount of studies devoted to the utopian function of art, the function both of space in utopia and of space in art, the articulation between art in utopia has been hitherto greatly neglected. The reason for this neglect lies, I believe, in the fact that many authors writing within the utopian tradition have lacked, themselves, a critical articulation between utopia's macro-structures and the role of art as an organic part of life in utopia. The absence of critical articulations – although further research would have to be done in matters of reception, raise and decline of genres or even a quantitative analysis mapping the functions argued for in the present study – has significantly contributed to the decline in utopian thought and optimism during a large part of the twentieth century. Utopia was then an idealised modern state, not a place to live. The critical utopia, more

attuned to these limitations brought about by history and cultural conditions, has recuperated utopia as critical artistic space.

The present study thus sought to showcase this recuperation by trying to offer new dynamics through which to consider utopia, framing it both historically and spatially and making it relevant for contemporary preoccupations and issues. Through these articulations, I expect to have proven that utopia and utopian art have remained an important social method and function for the deconstruction of identitary and regressionist forms of artistic, spatial and, consequently, of cultural discourses. In this respect, the study of art spaces and their theorisation within postmodern discourses, feminism, colonialism or race studies, knit to the field of utopian studies may, moreover, produce new paths for interdisciplinarity, cooperation and solidarity. Thus, the present study did not only open the discourses between aesthetics, architecture, geography, cultural and literary studies but, by stressing the utopian dimension as critical method to deconstruct and reconstruct bounds through relationality and alterity, enabled more inclusive and cooperative practices that see in space and in art a form of utopian discourse that unhinges static notions of fixed boundaries and reveals the potentialities of hospitality and democracy underneath. A democracy that is not homogenising or segregating but one that is cognisant of the array of discourses – the sustainable, the feminist, the queer, the democratic, the youth, the refugee, and so on – that constitute democracy and sees, in the interface between artistic, spatial and utopian practices, a communication medium between these discourses. Utopia must thus value dialogue that is suited to the new global conditions instead of promoting regressionist, reactionary or identity discourses, with fear of processual change. It must regard globalisation as the occasion for the promotion of diversity, alterity, internationality, learning, and so on. The new utopia can, finally, be constructed as critical spatial artistic practice. The search for new utopian islands has changed in the space of flows of our contemporary world and, just like in Saramago's short story, the island must turn to ship, and the ship to island, in a synchronic rather than diachronic movement, rooted but floating, permanently seeking itself as a utopia of dialogues and processes and constantly reimagining its own conditions in a sea whose horizon is always moving, always nowhere.

Bibliographic References

Primary Bibliography

Bellamy, E. (1986 (1888)). Looking Backward, 2000-1887. London: Penguin Books.

Delany, S. R. (1996 (1976)). Trouble on Triton: An Ambiguous Heterotopia. Hanover: Wesleyan.

Le Guin, U. K. (2011 (1974)). The Dispossessed: An Ambiguous Utopia. New York: Harper Voyager.

Morris, W. (2004c). News from Nowhere, or an Epoch of Rest. In W. Morris, News from Nowhere and Other Writings (pp. 41-230). London: Penguin Books.

Critical Bibliography

Abensour, M. (1999). William Morris: The Politics of Romance. In M. Blechman, *Revolutionary Romanticism: A Drunken Boat Antology* (pp. 125-161). San Fransisco: City Lights Books.

Adorno, T. (1997). *Aesthetic Theory.* (G. Adorno, R. Tiedemann, Eds., & R. Hullot-Kentor, Trans.) London; New York: Continuum.

Adorno, T. (2004). *Negative Dialectics.* (E. Ashton, Trans.) London and New York: Routledge.

Agnew, J. (2011). Space and Place. In J. A. Agnew, & D. N. Livingstone (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Geographical Knowldge* (pp. 316-330). Los Angeles; London; New Delhi; Singapore; Washington DC: SAGE.

Agnew, J., & Duncan, J. S. (2011). *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Human Geography.* Malden; Oxford; West Sussex: Willey-Blackwell.

Agnew, J., & Livingstone, D. N. (2011). Introduction. In J. Agnew, & D. N. Livingstone, *The Sage Handbook to Geographical Knowledge* (pp. 1-18). London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi; Singapore: Sage Publications.

Alexander, N. (2017). Senses of Place. In R. T. (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Literature and Space* (pp. 39-49). London and New York: Routledge.

Almeida, B. P. (2000). Uma utopia para a estética. *Ler: Livros e Leitores*(48), 76-77.

Altschuler, G. C. (1989). [Review] Looking Backward, 1988-1888: Essays on Edward Bellamy. *The Journal of American History, 76*(3), 952.

Antonsich, M. (2011). Grounding theories of place and globalisation. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie, 102*(3), 331-345.

Arnot, R. P. (1934). *William Morris: A Vindication.* London: Martin Laurence Limited.

Ashcroft, B. (2007). Critical utopias. *Textual Practice, 21*(3), 411-431.

Ashcroft, B. (2012). "Introduction: Spaces of Utopia". *Spaces of Utopia: An Electronic Journal, 2nd series*(1), 1-17.

Atkinson, D., Jackson, P., Sibley, D., & Washbourne, N. (Eds.). (2005). *Cultural Geography: A Critical Dictionary of Key Concepts.* London; New York: I.B.Tauris.

Bachelard, G. (1969). *The Poetics of Space.* (M. Jolas, Trans.) Boston: Beacon Press.

Bal, M., & Inge, B. (1994). *The Point of Theory: Practices of Cultural Analysis.* New York: Continuum.

Balthrope, R. (2006). Bellamy's Looking Backward 2000–1887, Globalism, and Race. *Contemporary Justice Review, 9*(3), 303–315.

Barata, A. M. (2004). *Arquitectura e Design na Ensaística de William Morris e Walter Gropius.* Porto: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto.

Bauman, Z. (1976). *Socialism: The Active Utopia.* New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers.

Bauman, Z. (2013). *Liquid Modernity.* Cambridge: John Wiley & Sons.

Bhabha, H. K. (1992). Double Visions. *Artforum*, 82-90.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture.* London: Routledge.

Bishop, C. (2012). *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship.* London and New York: Verso.

Blanco, J. R. (2013). *Reclaim The Streets! From Local to Global Party Protest.* Retrieved from Third Text: Critical Perspectives on Contemporary Art and Culture: http://thirdtext.org/reclaim-the-streets

Blanco, J. R. (2018). *Artistic Utopias of Revolt: Claremont Road, Reclaim the Streets, the City of Sol.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bloch, E. (1988). *The Utopian Function of Art and Literature; Selected Essays.* (J. Zipes, & F. Mecklenburg, Trans.) Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Bloch, E. (1995). *The Principle of Hope.* (N. Plaice, S. Plaice, & P. Knight, Trans.) Cambridge; Massachussets: The MIT Press.

Bloch, E. (2000). *The Spirit of Utopia.* (A. A. Nassar, Trans.) California: Stanford University Press.

Boichot, F., & Barthélémy, C. (2014). Entre mouvement et ancrages: les spatialités d'artistes mobiles. *Belgeo, 3*, 1-15.

Bolaños, P. A. (June 2007). The Critical Role of Art: Adorno between Utopia and Dystopia. *KRITIKĒ*, 25-31.

Bradburry, R. (2013). *Fahrenheit 451.* London: Harper Collins Publishers.

Britannica. (n.d.). Castrum (Roman Town). Retrieved from www.brittanica.com

Cannadine, D., & Reeder, D. (Eds.). (1982). *Exploring the urban past: Essays in urban history by H. J. DYOS.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Caroll, S. (2017). Atopia/Non-Place. In R. Tally, *The Routledge Handbook of Literature and Space* (pp. 159-167). New York and London: Routledge (Taylor and Francis Group).

Casey, E. S. (1997). *The Fate of Place: A philosophical history.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Castree, N. (2004). Differential geographies: place, indigenous rights and 'local'. *Political Geography, 23*, 133-167.

Certeau, M. d. (2002 (2ª ed.)). *The Practice of Everyday Life.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cohen, P. (Director). (1989). *The Architecture of Doom* [Motion Picture].

Curry, M. (1998). *Digital Places: Living with Geographic Information Technologies.* New York: Routledge.

Czigányik, Z. (2017). Introduction – Utopianism: Literary and Political. In Z. Czigányik, *Introduction – Utopianism: Literary and Political* (pp. 1-17). Budapest; New York: Central European University Press.

Czigányik, Z. (Ed.). (2017). *Utopian Horizons: Ideology, Politics, Literature.* Budapest; New York: Central European University Press.

Daniels, S. (2011). Art Studio. In J. Agnew, & D. N. Livingstone, *The Sage Handbook to Geographical Knowledge* (pp. 137-148). London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi; Singapore: Sage Publications.

Davies, S., Higgins, K. M., Hopkins, R., Stecker, R., & Cooper, D. E. (2009). *A Companion to Aesthetics (Second Edition).* Singapore: Willey-Blackwell.

Davis, L. (2005). Introduction. In L. D. (ed.), *The New Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's The Dispossessed* (pp. ix-xxvii). Oxford: Lexington Books.

Davis, L. (2005). The Dynamic and Revolutionary Utopia of Ursula K. Le Guin. In L. Davis (Ed.), *The new utopian politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's The Dispossessed* (pp. 3-36). Oxford: Lexington Books.

Davis, L. (2009). Morris, Wilde, and Le Guin on Art, Work, and Utopia. *Utopian Studies, 20*(2), 213-248.

Deutsche, R. (1988). Uneven Development: Public Art in New York City. *October, 47*, 3-52.

Deutsche, R. (1992). Tilted Arc and the Uses of Public Spaces. *DesignBook Review, 23*, 22-27.

Deutsche, R. (1996). *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics.* Cambridge; London: The MIT Press.

Dewey, J. (1980). *Art as Experience.* New York: Perigee.

Dias, S. (2000). A utopia íntima da arte. *Ler: Livros e Leitores*(48), 75.

Doll, M. (2010). The Topoi of Utopia: A Topology of Political Tensions. *Tension/Spannung*, 203-226.

Dowling, L. C. (1996). *The Vulgarization of Art: The Victorians and Aesthetic Democracy.* Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press.

Escobar, A. (2001). Culture sits in places: reflections on globalism and subaltern. *Political Geography, 20*, 139-174.

Foucault, M. (1986). Of Other Spaces. *Drialectics*, 22-27.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (2003). *Birth of the Clinic: An archaeology of medical perception* . London and New York: Routlege.

Friedland, R., & Boden, D. (1994). Nowhere: An Introduction to Space, Time and Modernity. In R. Friedland, & D. B. (ed.), *Nowhere: Space, Time and Modernity* (pp. 1-45). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Geoghegan, V. (1992). The Utopian Past: Memory and History in Edward Bellamy's Looking Backward and William Morris's News from Nowhere. *Utopian Studies, 3*(2), 75-90.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Gilbert, N. (2005). The Landscape of Resistance in Morris's 'News from Nowhere'. *JWMS, 16*(23), 22-37.

Grbin, M. (2015). Foucault and Place. *Социолошки преглед, XLIX*(3), 205-312.

Green, S., Harvey, P., & Knox, H. (2005). Scales of place and networks: an ethnography of the imperative to connect through information and communications technologies. *Current Anthropology*, 805–826.

Gregory, D., Johnston, R., Pratt, G., J.Watts, M., & Whatmore, S. (Eds.). (2009). *The Dictionary of Human Geography.* West Sussex: Willey-Blackwell.

Groys, B. (1994). The Struggle against the Museum; or, The Display of Art in Totalitarian Space. In D. Sherman, & I. R. (eds), *Museum Cultures: Histories, Discourses, Practices* (pp. 144-162). London: Routledge.

Groys, B. (2008). The Topology of Contemporary Art. In T. Smith, O. Enwezor, & N. Condee, *Antinomies of Art and Culture: Modernity, Postmodernity, Contemporeneity* (pp. 71-82). Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Guasch, A. M. (2014). *Globalization and Contemporary Art.* Retrieved Julho 15, 2019, from Third Text: Critical Perspectives on Contemporary Art and Culture: http://www.thirdtext.org/globalization-and-contemporary-art

Gutek, G. (1964). An Analysis of Formal Education in Edward Bellamy's Looking Backward. *History of Education Quarterly, 4*(4), 251-263.

Habermas, J. (1987). *The Theory of Communicative Action - Lifeworld and System: A Critic of Functionalist Reason.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Harvey, D. (1990). *The condition of postmodernity: an enquiry into the origins of cultural change.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Harvey, D. (2000). *Spaces of Hope.* Edingburgh: Edingburgh University Press.

Harvey, D. (2001). Globalization and the 'Spatial Fix'. *Geographische revue*, 23-30.

Hawkins, H. (2011). Dialogues and Doings: Sketching the relationships between geography and art. *Geography Compass*, 464-478.

Hegel, G. W. (1979). *Phenomenology of Spirit.* (A. V. Miller, & J. N. Findlay, Trans.) New York: Oxford University Press.

Heidegger, M. (1973). Art and Space. *Man and World, 6*(1), 3-8.

Heidegger, M. (2002). The Origin of the Work of Art. In M. Heidegger, J. Young, & K. Haynes (Eds.), *Off the Beaten Track* (pp. 1-56). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hill, S. N. (2011). Museums. In J. Agnew, & D. N. Livingstone, *The Sage Handbook of Geographical Knowledge* (pp. 64-79). London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi; Singapore: Sage Publications.

Holiday, H. (1894). The Artistic Aspects of Bellamy's 'Looking Backward'. *The Decorator and Furnisher, 14*(5), 175-176.

Hubbard, P., & Kitchin, R. (2011). *Key Thinkers on Space and Place (2nd edition).* Los Angeles; London; New Delhi; Singapore; Washington DC: SAGE.

Huxley, A. (2019). *Brave New World.* London: Vintage Classics.

Jacobs, N. (1989). Beyond Stasis and Symmetry: Lessing, Le Guin and the Remodeling of Utopia. *Utopia Studies*(2), 109-117.

Jameson, F. (1981). *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act. Ithaca: Cornell.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism.* London: Verso.

Kant, I. (2007). *Critique of Judgement.* (J. C. Nicholas Walker, Trans.) Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Keith, M., & Pile, S. (1993). *Place and the Politics of Identity.* London: Routledge.

Kelvin, N. (1996). Morris, the 1890s, and the Problematic Autonomy of Art. *Victorian Poetry, 4*(3), 425–436.

Kruger, R. (Summer 2007). Art in the Fourth Dimension: Giving Form to Form – The Abstract Paintings of Piet Mondrian. *Spaces of Utopia: An Electronic Journal*(5), 23-35.

Kwon, M. (2002). *One Place After Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity.* Cambridge; London: The MIT Press.

Lagopolous, A. P. (1992). Postmodernism, Geography , and the Social Semiotics of Space. *Department of Urban and Regional Planning*, 255-278.

Lee, J. A. (1995). *Utopia as Critical Practice in the Transformation of William Morris.* Ontario: University of Victoria.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space.* Oxford; Cambridge: Blackwell.

León, B. B. (2017). Urban theory in postmodern cities: Amnesiac spaces and ephemeral aesthetics. *Revista de Estudios Urbanos y Ciencias Sociales, 7*(1), 57-65.

Levitas, R. (1989). Marxism, Romanticism and Utopia: Ernst Bloch and William Morris. *Radical Philosophy, 51*, 27-36.

Levitas, R. (2007). The Archive of the Feet: Memory, Place and Utopia. In T. Moylan, & M. J. (eds.), *Exploring the Utopian Impulse: Essays on Utopian Thought and Practice* (pp. 19-42). Bern: Peter Lang.

Levitas, R. (2007). The Imaginary Reconstitution of Society: Utopia as Method. In T. Moylan, & R. Baccollini, *Utopia Method Vision: The Use Value of Social Dreaming* (pp. 64-84). Bern: Peter Lang.

Levitas, R. (2010). *The Concept of Utopia.* Bern: Peter Lang.

Levitas, R. (2013). *Utopia as Method: The Utopian Reconstitution of Society.* Bristol, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.

Lewis, R. C. (1987). News from Nowhere: Arcadia or Utopia? *JWMS*, 15-25.

Livingstone, D. (2003). *Putting Science in its Place: Geographies of Scientific Knowledge.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Lungu, A. (2008). Marx, Postmodernism, and Spatial Confifigurations in Jameson and Lefebvre. *Comparative Literature and Culture, 10*(1). Retrieved from <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol10/iss1/2>

Lynskey, D. (December 2012). Pussy Riot: activists, not pin-ups. *The Guardian*.

Maier, H. O. (2013). Soja's Thirdspace, Foucault's Heterotopia and de Certeau's Practice: Time-Space and Social Geography in Emergent Christianity. *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung, 38*(3), 76-92.

Maleuvre, D. (1999). *Museum Memories: History, Technology, Art.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Mannheim, K. (1979). *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge.* London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Marin, L. (1984). *Utopics: Spatial Play.* New Jersey: MacMillan.

Massey, D. (1985). *Spatial divisions of labor: social structures and the geography of production.* Basingstoke: MacMillan.

Massey, D. (1991). A Global Sense of Place. *Marxism Today*, 24-29.

Massey, D. (1994). *Space, place, and gender.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Massey, D. (1999). *Power-Geometries and the Politics of Space-Time.* Heidelberg: Hettner Lecture, Institute of Geography, University of Heidelberg.

Massey, D. (2005). *For Space.* Los Angeles; London; New Delhi; Singapore; Washington DC: Sage.

Massey, D. (February 1, 2013). Doreen Massey on Space. (N. Warburton, Interviewer)

Mattick, P. (2009). Museums. In S. Davies, K. M. Higgins, R. Hopkins, R. Stecker, & D. E. (eds), *A Companion to Aesthetics* (pp. 431-435). Wiley-Blackwell.

McEvilley, T. (1986). Introduction. In B. O'Doherty, *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space* (pp. 7-13). Santa Monica, San Francisco: The Lapis Press.

Me and the cop: Pussy Riot releases new protest song. (July 2018). *DW: News and current affairs from Germany and around the world*. Retrieved from https://www.dw.com/en/me-and-the-cop-pussy-riot-releases-new-protest-song/a-44704951

Michaels, S. (August 2012). An art revolution in St Petersburg. *The Guardian*.

Mill, J. S. (1999). *On Liberty.* Ontario: Broadview Literary Texts.

Miller, E. C. (2008). William Morris, Print Culture, and the Politics of Aestheticism. *Modernism/modernity, 15*(3), 477-502.

Mitchell, D. (2000). *Cultural geography: a critical introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Mohanty, A. (2012). Differential Spaces in a Globalised Era. *Economic and Political Weekly, 47*(1), 119-120.

Molina, G., & Guinard, P. (2017). Arts in Cities - Cities in Arts. *Articulo - Journal of Urban Research*. Retrieved from https://journals.openedition.org/articulo/3435

Moretti, F. (2005). *Graphs, Maps and Trees: Abstract Models for a Literary History.* London and New York: Verso.

Morris, W. (1993). Introduction: The Radical Aesthetics of William Morris. In G. Zabel, & G. Zabel (Ed.), *Art and Society: Lectures and Essays by William Morris* (pp. 1-7). Boston: George's Hill.

Morris, W. (2004a). Gothic Architecture. In W. Morris, *News from Nowhere and Other Writings* (pp. 329-351). London: Penguin Books.

Morris, W. (2004b). 'Looking Backward': a review of Looking Backward by Edward Bellamy. In W. Morris, *News from Nowhere and Other Writings* (pp. 351-358). London: Penguin Books.

Morris, W. (2004d). Some Hints on Pattern-designing. In W. Morris, *News from Nowhere and Other Writings* (pp. 255-284). London: Penguin Books.

Morris, W. (2004e). The Lesser Arts. In W. Morris, *News from Nowhere and Other Writings* (pp. 231-254). London: Penguin Books.

Morris, W. (2004f). Useful Work versus Useless Toil. In W. Morris, *News from Nowhere and Other Writings* (pp. 285-306). London: Penguin Books.

Moylan, T. (1980). Beyond Negation: The Critical Utopias of Ursula K. Le Guin and Samuel R. Delany. *Extrapolations, 21*(3), 236-253.

Moylan, T. (2014). *Demand the Impossible: Science Fiction and the Utopian Imagination.* New York: Peter Lang.

Mullin, J. R. (2000). Edward Bellamy's Ambivalence: Can Utopia Be Urban? *Utopian Studies, 11*(1), 51-65.

Mullin, J. R., & Payne, K. (1997, August). Thoughts on Edward Bellamy as City Planner: The Ordered Art of Geometry. *Planning History Studies: Journal of the Society of American City and Regional Planning Historians, 34*, n.p.

Mumford, L. (1946 [1938]). *The Culture of Cities.* London: Secker & Warburg.

Mumford, L. (1966). Utopia, the City and the Machine. In F. E. Manuel (Ed.), *Utopias and Utopian Thoughts* (pp. 3-24). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Naylor, S., & Hill, J. (2011). Museums. In J. Agnew, & D. N. (ed), *The SAGE Handbook of Geographical Knowledge* (pp. 64-76). London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi; Singapore: SAGE Publications.

Oconnor, S. (2004). *The Cambridge Companion to Postmodernism.* New York: Cambridge University Press .

O'Doherty, B. (1986). *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space.* Santa Monica, San Francisco: The Lapis Press.

O'Doherty, B. (2007). *Studio and Cube: the relationship between where art is and where art is displayed.* New York: Buell Center / FORuM Project.

Orwell, G. (2008). *1984.* London: Penguin Books.

Osborne, P. (2001). Non-places and Art Spaces. *The Journal of Architecture, 6*, 183-194 .

Osborne, P. (2013). Art Spaces. In P. Osborne, *Anywhere or Not at All: Philosophy of Contemporary Art* (pp. 117-150). London; New York: Verso.

Osborne, P. (2018). *The Postconceptual Condition: Critical Essays.* London; Brooklyn: Verso.

Parker, M. (1993). Space, 1984-91. In M. Parker, *Seamus Heaney: The Making of the poet* (pp. 211-222). Hampshire: MacMillan Press Ltd.

Pearson, W. G. (2009). Born to be Bron: Destiny and Desinterrance in Samuel R. Delany's Truble on Triton. *Science Fictin Studies, 36*(3), 461-477.

Peters, K. (2006). The contemporary landscape in art. *Middle States Geographer, 39*, 117-125.

Piatti, B., Bär, H. R., Reuschel, A.-K., Hurni, L., & Cartwright, W. (2009). Mapping Literature: Towards a Geography of Fiction. In W. Cartwright, G. Gartner, & A. L. (eds.), *Cartography and Art* (pp. 175-192). Berlin: Springer.

Pietro, E. (2011). Geocriticism, Geopoetics, Geophilosophy and Beyond. In R. Tally, *Geocritical Explorations: Space, Place, and Mapping in Literary and Cultural Studies* (pp. 13-28). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pinkney, T. (2008). News from Nowhere, modernism, postmodernism. *Canadian Aesthetics Journal = Revue Canadienne d'Esthétique, 15*.

Pinkney, T. (Autumn 1991). Postmodern Space and Morris's Utopia. *News from Nowhere: Journal of Cultural Materialism, Special Issue on Utopias and Utopianism, 9*, 28-49.

Portolano, M. (2012). The Rhetorical Function of Utopia: An Exploration of the Concept of Utopia in Rhetorical Theory. *Utopian Studies, 23*(1), 113-141.

Rancière, J. (2011). *The Emancipated Spectator.* London: Verso.

Ray, G. (2009). Toward a Critical Art Theory. In G. Raunig, & G. R. (eds), *Art and Contemporary Critical Practice* (pp. 79-94). London: MayFly.

Rendell, J. (2006). *Art and Architecture: A Place Between.* London: IB Tauris.

Rendell, J. (2008). Space, Place, Site in Critical Spatial Practice. In C. C. (eds), *The Practice of Public Art* (pp. 33-56). London: Routledge.

Rendell, J. (2009). *Critical Artistic Practices.* Retrieved 08 02, 2019

Reynolds, A. (2005). Ursula K. Le Guin, Herbert Marcuse, and the of Utopia in the Postmodern. In L. D. (ed.), *The New Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's The Dispossessed* (pp. 75-94). Oxford: Lexington Books.

Riot, P. (2018). Track About Good Cop.

Riquet, J. (2017). Island Spatialities. In R. T. (ed.), *The Routledge Companion of Literature and Space* (pp. 214-230). London and New York: Routledge.

Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture.* London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Russ, J. (2000 (1973)). *The Female Man.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Said, E. (1976). *Place and Placelessness.* London: Pion Limited.

Sandler, I. (2018 (1996)). *Art of the Postmodern Era: From the Late 1960s to the Eary 1990s.* New York and London: Routledge.

Saramago, J. (2007). *O Conto da Ilha Desconhecida.* Caminho.

Sargent, L. T. (2010). *Utopianism: A Very Short Introduction.* Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Scarfone, A. (2007). *[Review] "One Place After Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity by Miwon Kwon".*

Schleuning, N. (2013). *Artpolitik: Social Anarchist Aesthetic in an Age of Fragmentation.* Wivenhoe / New York / Port Watson : Minor Compositions.

Sheikh, S. (2006). Public Spheres and the Function of the Progressive Art Institutions. In V. Muller, & N. S. (eds), *Under Construction – Perspectives on Institutional Practice* (pp. 192-194). Köln: Verlag der Buchhandlung Walther König.

Sheikh, S. (2009). Notes on Institutional Critique . In G. Raunig, & G. R. (eds), *Art and Contemporary Critical Practice: Reinventing Institutional Critique* (pp. 29-33). London: MayFly.

Sheikh, S. (2009). Positively White Cube Revisited. *e-flux*.

Sheppard, E. (2002). The Spaces and Times of Globalization: Place, Scale, Networks, and Positionality. *Economic Geography, 78*(3), 307-330.

Skordoulis, C. D., & Arvanitis, E. (2008). Space Conceptualisation in the Context of Postmodernity: Theorizing Spatial Representation. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, 3*(6), 105-113.

Soja, E. (1971). *The Political Organization of Space.* Washington D.C.: Northwestern University.

Soja, E. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journey to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places.* Cambridge; Oxford: Blackwell.

Soja, E. (1999). *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertation of Space in Critical Social Theory.* London: Verso.

Soja, E. (2004). *Postmetropolis: critical studies of cities and regions.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Soja, E. (2009). Taking Space Personally. In B. Warf, & S. Arias, *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 11-35). London; New York.

Spencer, D. (2005). The Alien Comes Home: Getting Past the Twin Planets of Possession and Austerity in Le Guin’s The Dispossessed. In L. D. (ed.), *The New Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin’s The Dispossessed* (pp. 95-110). Oxford: Lexington Books.

Stallings, L. H. (2015). 'Think Galactic. Or Your World is Lost': The Boundaries of Art and Science and Samuel Delany's Poetics. *African American Review, 48*(3), 225-238.

Strow, S. (2005). Worlds Apart: Ursula K. Le Guin and the Possibility of Method. In L. D. (ed.), *The New Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's The Dispossessed* (pp. 37-54). Oxford: Lexignton Books.

Tally, R. (2013). *Spatiality.* London; New York: Routlege (Taylor and Francis Group).

Tally, R. (2017). Introduction: The Reassertion of Space in Literaty Studies. In R. T. (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Literature and Space* (pp. 1-21). New York and London: Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group.

Tally, R. (2017). *The Routledge Handbook of Literature and Space.* New York and London: Routlege (Taylor and Francis Group).

Thacker, A. (2003). Theorizing Space and Place in Modernism. In A. Thacker, *Moving Through Modernity: Space and Geography in Modernism* (pp. 13-45). Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Thacker, A. (2017). Critical Literary Geography. In R. Tally, *The Routledge Handbook of Literarure and Space* (pp. 28-38). New York and London: Routlege (Taylor and Francis Group).

Tichi, C. (1986). Introduction. In E. Bellamy, *Looking Backward, 2000-1887* (pp. 7-28). London: Penguin Books.

Tilman, R. (1985). The Utopian Vision of Edward Bellamy and Thorstein Veblen. *Journal of Economic Issues, 19*(4).

Tolkien, J. (2001). *Tree and Leaf.* New York: HarperCollins.

Tuan, Y.-F. (1977). *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience.* Minneapolis; London: University of Minnesota Press.

Tuan, Y.-F. (1997). Sense of place: What does it mean to be human? *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy, 18*(1), 47-58.

Vieira, F. (2004). O Utopismo e a Crise da Contemporaneidade: Velhas Receitas para Novos Caminhos. In F. Vieira, & M. L. Castilho, *Estilhaços de Sonhos: Espaços de Utopia* (pp. 32-47). Vila Nova de Famalicão: quasi.

Vieira, F. (2006). A verdade do socialismo segundo William Morris. In A. L. Amaral, & G. C. (eds.), *Estudos em Homenagem a Margarida Losa* (pp. 459-467). Porto: Universidade do Porto. Faculdade de Letras.

Vint, S. (2013). Mapping the Current Critical Landscape. In N. Hubble, & A. M. (eds.), *The Science Fiction Handbook* (pp. 238-254). London and New York: Bloomsbury.

Wagar, W. W. (1988). Bellamy, Wells,a dn the Positive Utopia. In D. Patai, *Looking Backward, 1988-1888: Essays on Edward Bellamy* (pp. 106-124). Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Ward, M. (2006). Designing a Critical Utopia: Facts, Futures and Fictions. *Scroope: Cambridge Architectural Journal, 18*, 44-53.

Warf, B. (2006). *Encyclopedia of Human Geography.* Thousand Oaks; London; New Delhi: SAGE Puplications.

Warf, B., & Arias, S. (2009). Introduction: the reinsertion of space into the social sciences and humanities. In B. Warf, & S. Arias, *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perpesctives* (pp. 1-10). London and New York: Routledge.

Wegner, P. E. (2005). Utopia. In D. Seed (Ed.), *A Companion to Science Fiction* (pp. 79-94). Malden and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Wegner, P. E. (2007). Here or Nowhere: Utopia, Modernity, and Totality. In T. Moylan, & R. Baccolini, *Utopia Method Vision: The Use Value of Social Dreaming* (pp. 113-130). Bern: Peter Lang.

West-Pavlov, R. (2017). From the spatial turn to the spacetime-vitalist turn: Mahjoub's Navigation of a Rainmaker and Owuor's Dust. In R. Tally, *The Routledge*

Handbook of Literature and Space (pp. 291-302). New York and London: Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group.

Westphal, B. (2011). *Geocriticism: Real and Fictional Spaces.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Williams, R. (1985 (1893)). *London Rookeries and Colliers' Slums.* Garland Publications.

Wilmer, C. (2004). Introduction. In W. Morris, *News from Nowhere and Other Writings* (pp. ix-xlii). London: Penguin Books.

Wilson, R. J. (1977). Experience and Utopia: The Making of Edward Bellamy's 'Looking Backward'. *Journal of American Studies, 11*(1), 45-60.

Wimmer, K. (Director). (2002). *Equilibrium* [Motion Picture].

Wright, E. O. (2010). *Envisioning Real Utopias.* London: Verso.

Yount, M., & (eds.), J. D. (1993). *Foucault and the Critique of Institutions.* Pennsylvania State University Press.

Zabel, G. (1990). Ernst Bloch and the Utopian Dimension in Music. *The Musical Times, 131*(1764), 82-84.

Annexes

Annexe A

Perceived Space	Conceived Space	Lived Space
Spatial Practice	Representations of Space	Spaces of Representations
Physical Space	Mental Space	Social Space
Surfaces	Transparency	Active Experience
Materialism	Idealism	Imaginative
Visual	Geometric	Symbolic

Table 2. Presentation of Lefebvre's Unitary Theory of Space, taken from 'Spatial Conceptualization in the Context of Postmodernity: Theorizing Spatial Representations' (108)

Annexe B

category	explication/definition
setting	where the action takes place (i.e. a house, a village)
zone of action	several settings combined (i.e. a whole city, a region)
projected space	characters are not present there, but are dreaming of, remembering, longing for a specific place
marker	a place which is mentioned, but not part of the categories above; markers indicate the geographical range and horizon of a fictional space
route	along which characters are moving: by foot, by train, on horseback etc.

Table 3. 'Spatial elements of a fictional text' (Piati et al. 180), taken from 'Mapping Literature: Towards a Geography of Fiction'