

Fujio Mizuoka ■

SUBSUMPTION OF SPACE INTO SOCIETY AND ALTERNATIVE SPATIAL STRATEGY

I Introduction

Critical geography emerged in the Anglophone world in the late 1960s out of radical political ferment in university campuses, and it has now developed into global intellectual currency among academic geography. This critical approach had existed in many parts of the world earlier than this, however. In Germany, for example, a critical tradition in geography emerged in the pre-WWII period out of the communist movement. Wittfogel (1929), then member of the Communist Party of Germany (KPD), criticised geopolitics from a Marxist perspective and attempted to build a materialist theory based on it. Christaller, the founder of central place theory, was also a socialist and a communist party member in post-WWII West Germany (Hottes, 1983). After the war, Marxism became the authoritative ideology in the German Democratic Republic (DDR), where Schmidt-Renner (1961) attempted to reconstruct economic geography through Marxist economics and philosophy. The heritage of Marxist geography has been also profound in other parts of Europe, especially in France, Italy and Spain.

In Japan, the works of both Wittfogel and Schmidt-Renner were translated into Japanese and spurred the development of critical economic geography (Mizuoka et al., 2005). Wittfogel's work was translated by Kawanishi with the title of *Critique of Geography*, and the work of Schmidt-Renner was translated by geographers associated with the Japan Association of Economic Geographers (JAEG). Founded in 1954, JAEG is one of the first critical geography institutions that led to quite creative theoretical developments, such as Ueno's critical chorography.

Unfortunately, these critical geography movements waned without being able to attract a global audience and influence conventional geographers. These critical geography projects were suffocated by means of various academic manoeuvres. In Germany, after a brief flowering of critical geography in the 1970s, academic jobs were denied to younger critical geographers inspired by Anglophone critical geographers. In Japan, the

JAEG and the younger generation of critical geographers shifted their position towards more a conservative line. This came about through the influence commanded by Yada, the guru who converted his political affiliation from communism to neo-liberalist state (Mizuoka, 2006).

Critical geography has come back again in these countries only recently, through the efforts of new generations of geographers exposed to recent developments in the Anglophone world in conjunction with those who had once been engaged in the movements for critical geography independently of Anglophone critical geography.

This paper invites readers to understand the critical geography that came about in Japan in this process of its resurrection.

II Subsumption: The Key Concept for a Critical Analysis of Space

When pursuit of causal relationships became the norm for science, geography shifted from description to explanation of spatial differentiation by deploying various independent factors. The first factor picked out was the physical environment. But once it was understood that the same physical environment does not necessarily entail the same configuration of space, geographers turned to distance across a homogenous plane, with limited elements of economy like consumption, supply centres or raw material extraction that are assumed to be spatially concentrated. The Germans Johann Heinrich von Thünen, Alfred Weber and Walter Christaller contributed substantially to this approach.

Among them, Christaller was one of the earliest geographers with socialist political affiliations. True to his beliefs, he assumed in building his hexagonal urban hierarchy model a planned economy aiming for spatial egalitarianism – i.e. no matter where one lives, everyone should have equal access to the same basket of commodities (Christaller, 1968edn). A similar territorial integration is possible even under a market economy, yet the density of central places tends to be sparser, which forces people living in the isotropic demand plane to travel longer distances to obtain the same basket of consumption goods.

Thus, social organisation reflects spatial configuration. Hegemonic power organises the configuration of space to make it consistent with their social, economic and political objectives. Space thus produced is, however, not just an image of a social relation projected onto screen of the earth. As it is a physical object, space constitutes an active moment, which can be in conflict with hegemonic social power.

The existence of this socio-spatial dialectics has found consensus among critical geographers across the globe (Soja, 1980). The question here is to elaborate the dialectics further to explain these spatial processes and strategies with which hegemonic power exercises and enhances its power, through cooptation and/or coercion. In capitalism, space indeed forms an indispensable regulatory element to contain class struggle and economic crisis.

In contrast, social scientists at large have been taking a much different approach. The concepts they have arrived at abstract from many elements, including space, and treat

them as unnecessary in analysing society. Modern social science has thus typically become aspatial, where economy and society are assumed to develop as if on the tip of a pin. Critical and Marxist social science is no exception.

It is thus necessary to put the elements having been thrown away stepwise back into abstract concepts to enrich theory. In Marxian economics, this process is called *ascent*, where value is transformed into surplus value and capital through the incorporation of labour power, and value and surplus-value are transformed into production price and average profit through the incorporation of competition among many capitalists.

Space is one of the elements to be incorporated into the body of Marxist theory at a later stage in the process of ascent. As globalisation and its related issues have gained ever more significance, the aspatial nature of existing social sciences has also become more problematic.

A makeshift solution to cover up this conceptual lacuna was to turn sideways what was once treated as vertical social structure so as to stretch it across space horizontally. This is what is implied in the dependency theory. Frank put the contradiction of capital-labour and 'core-satellite' relations homologous to one another: the capitalists or the core expropriates the economic surplus that the labour or the satellite produces, respectively (Frank, 1969, 6-9). He claims that the core-satellite structure is nested in various scales, e.g. national, regional, local and sectoral, yet the simplistic homology where the horizontal spatial relation is interpreted by the vertical structure of capitalism turned sideways remains the same.

However, the dialectics between society and space is more complex. In fact, the whole history of critical geography has been a series of attempts to resolve this knotty question.

In discovering this dialectical relation, Marx's concept of 'subsumption (*Subsumtion*)' offers a profound insight (Marx, 1969 edn, 44-60). Marx adopted this concept to analyse the incorporation of pre-capitalist labour process into the capitalist mode of production. His argument goes as follows:

As the capitalist mode of production emerges, the capitalists must bring technology that had been practiced outside capitalism into their capitalist production processes. The technology, embodied in the labourers who had spent years or even decades to become skilful artisans, puts them in a strong position in the capital-labour relation. The artisans hired as labourers complain of hard work, longer work-days, etc. and resort to class struggle when their demands are not met. Whereas the capitalists run into difficulty in capital accumulation as the number of labourers cannot be readily augmented because training takes years. This is the stage of *formal subsumption* of labour, or the dominant class is yet to incorporate the system outside its own society to make it conform to the dominant society.

In order to transcend (*aufheben*) this contradiction, the capitalist class transforms the physical system of production to induce deskilling through the introduction of the factory

system using automated machines operated by unskilled labour. This new technology works well to contain class struggle and to enhance capital accumulation, since the capitalists can easily replace militant labour with fresh, unskilled ones, and they can freely engage in expanded reproduction thanks to abundant supply of unskilled labour. This is the process of *real subsumption* of labour into capitalism.

The concept of subsumption can be expanded to the incorporation of every physical substance into society: ecosystem, human body, such physical landscape features as river or mountain and *space*, just to name a few. Capitalist society thus ‘produces’ the nature after its own image.

III Pristine Space and Its Formal Subsumption into Society

In the beginning of the subsumption of space into society, humans face pristine space inherited from the big bang of the universe, i.e. space without any alternation made by humans. Pristine space has two attributes: absolute and relative. *Absolute space* has the property of unlimited expanse, isotropic contiguity and a propensity to connect anything that exists within it. Two substances or groups placed in a common absolute space are subject to the process of homogenisation that spontaneously takes place between them. Every social and physical substance stands equally before pristine absolute space: everyone is free to enter, settle or leave; and if there is something that is different, the process of homogenisation will take care of it. Thus, the property of pristine absolute space is something like the mantra of the French Revolution: *liberté, égalité, fraternité*.

To a social group and especially those in a dominant social position, the situation is different. When absolute space is formally subsumed, this propensity generates unexpected and anarchistic spatial interaction and homogenisation which interferes with the independence of social agency. As long as this anarchistic interaction proceeds, it is not possible for the dominant social group to exercise its absolute power, since the subjugated under it can always liberate themselves from its domination by spatially escaping from the hierarchical political structure.

Relative space, on the other hand, has the property of distance, positionality and the propensity to separate anything that exists across space. The property of distance stands in the way of social interaction with the distance-decay effect, while the property of positionality is essential for any intended social interaction to take place, for without specifying place using some spatial coordinate system, no person can meet with one another. Yet, these places are all unique relative to one another. All in all, the properties of relative space are diagonally opposite to those of absolute space in that they tend to be oriented towards fragmentation and individualising agency and social groups.

When relative space is formally subsumed, this propensity generates unexpected and anarchistic spatial separation, which interferes with actions among agents and inhibits social integration. This makes it very difficult for the dominant social group to extend its power to remote, peripheral areas. Pristine space formally subsumed thus comes into

contradiction with existing society in two fronts and destroys the integrity of a social group. When society is formed through hierarchy and dominated by a particular class, the power of the ruling class to dominate is undermined. It then becomes the task of the ruling class to transcend this contradiction by getting rid of this property of space through the process of real subsumption.

IV Real Subsumption of Absolute Space: Bounding and Territories

The process of the real subsumption of space has often been called '*la production de l'espace*' (Lefebvre, 1974), since it involves purposeful modification of the pristine properties of space. It comes as two different lines, corresponding to two attributes of space: bounding and spatial integration.

For absolute space, the uncontrolled and anarchistic development of spatial interaction has to be annihilated (*vernichten*) in order to restore the integrity of agency or of a social group and to maintain the domination of a particular social group or class. In a market system, each agent is expected to interact with each other only through market relations, thus each agent must be sealed off from any possibility of non-market interactions. This is the spatial process of *bounding*, or boundary delineation as the obstacle to anarchistic spatial interactions in an attempt to transcend the contradiction present in formal subsumption. Once a boundary is set up, and an exclusive patch of space, called a *territory*, is carved out of an unlimited expanse of pristine absolute space, spatial interactions are put under control. Anarchistic spatial interaction is now contained within the single, circumscribed territory, aiding the process of homogenization.

The bounding is not stable unless some measure is taken to fend off trespassing attempts. The most generic yet powerful form is to use physical force against those who attempt to trespass a bounded territory. Thus, armed forces are built up to defend the state or an individual takes up arms to fight against strangers entering his or her own house. Else, a mutual sense of peace and friendship with the neighbour is nurtured as a preventive diplomacy against a war of aggression against them. As for the territories created at a scale lower than state level, e.g. privately owned plots of land in cities, it is more common that state power protects territorial integrity, using the legal system of registering ownership of the territory (private land) with the government registry, and of making trespassing of private territory (land) an action punishable through the penal code.

Territoriality is thus made sustainable and made into stable 'container' (Taylor, 1994) for the exclusive use of a social group, mode of production, macro-economy, as well as a dominant political power. The most powerful territory in our society is still the state constituted under the principle of the Peace of Westfalia. The sites to set up a labour process and process of labour reproduction are also significant, as they serve the most basic bodily or productive needs. Marx (1972 edn, 195) called this type of space *Wirkungsraum*.

However, the boundary that surrounds the *Wirkungsraum* has only a limited power to halt interactions across boundaries. This is because groups have an inherent propensity to

interact with others situated out of its own 'container'. The anarchistic nature of spatial interaction cannot be contained with the setting up of a boundary at a single scale alone either because of the various reasons discussed in detail later in this paper (Chapter VIII). Boundaries always come to have both the intended and unintended characteristics of permeability or *porosity*.

V Real Subsumption of Relative Space: Spatial Integration

Distanciation or the distance-decay effect is the main cause of contradiction in the formal subsumption of relative space. The uncontrolled and anarchistic negation of spatial interaction arising from distanciation has to be annihilated to restore agency integrity or domination of a social group over others. This process of real subsumption of relative space, or *spatial integration* (Harvey, 1982), is what Marx termed 'annihilation of space' by means of communication and transportation.

This attempt at restoring contiguity and free spatial interaction across space does not completely materialise, however, but more uneven space is produced, because of the physical constraints inherent in the process of spatial integration. To begin with, the isotropic nature of pristine absolute space cannot be recovered, since, aside from wireless communications, the two-dimensional surface of the earth is integrated with a set of one-dimensional transport lines connected normally through hierarchical nodal points. Even the Internet is constructed physically as the network of one-dimensional optical fibre cables. Secondly, technological development seeking for more efficient and rapid 'annihilation of space' results in a sparser transportation network, since the construction of higher-speed transport lines as the Autobahn or shinkansen costs more per kilometre than conventional transport routes. This uneven space is all the more prevalent under neo-liberalism, as evidenced by airline companies pursuing 'hub and spoke' configurations to achieve operational cost efficiency.

In short, spatial integration does not restore egalitarian space but creates an uneven configuration of space of physical network consisting of hierarchical nodes and transport lines, which tend to exclude from development the areas remote from these nodes or lines.

Centred at the nodal points thus created, activities like commuting, shopping, migration etc. take place to form an action space (*Aktionsraum*) (Maier et al., 1977, 53) rather spontaneously towards its periphery. Unlike *Wirkungsraum*, action space is not exclusive, with its area extending more flexibly and in an anarchistic manner. Its extent is more directly regulated by market mechanisms and the distance-decay effect, as opposed to the bounded territory whose extent is determined largely by path-dependent political power. Action space has no clear boundary as territory, and those who participate in producing the action space do not have absolute power to eject anyone from that space. Thus, action space is more anarchistic and uncontrolled than socially produced territory. Space that illegal immigrants or flora and fauna create all belongs to this category of space.

VI Relational Space – Contiguity and Separation

Since absolute space and relative space are in dialectical separation within a unity of a single substance called space, the space produced as a result of real subsumption is also in dialectical relationship.

With the formal subsumption of space a social group secures *contiguity* within a bounded territory, while real subsumption of space produces space that is integrated and made contagious through means of communication and transportation.

The formal subsumption of relative space provides society with a spontaneous and physical *separation* through the distance-decay effect, while the real subsumption of absolute space provides a space artificially separated and made into a mosaic through bounding.

Upon completion of this first round of real subsumption, an intriguing socio-spatial relation emerges: the dichotomy of pristine space, i.e. absolute and relative spaces, now transforms itself into the new dialectical dichotomy of contiguity and separation. This is *relational space*, which includes two dialectical relations in the subsumption of space: absolute and relative spaces, and pristine and produced spaces.

In this second phase, the process of formal and real subsumption takes place. The set of contiguity and separation in existing relational space accommodates neither the processes of dominant political system nor mode of production. The conflict of formal subsumption interferes with political domination or capital accumulation. Thus, the dominating political power must intervene and reorganise the configuration of the relational space according to its own image.

This process is the *real subsumption of relational space*. It comes as two separate processes, corresponding to its horizontal and vertical orderings: land-use coordination takes care of the horizontal order, and territorial integration does the vertical. Location theories have unconsciously dealt with both of these two processes.

VII Land-Use Co-ordination: The Real Subsumption in Horizontal Ordering

The mosaic of territories separated by the boundaries spreads horizontally over a plane, which constitutes a single spatial *scale*. The outcome of the real subsumption of absolute space does not guarantee that a territory with different contents has any purposeful order under a particular guiding principle of the dominating power exercised across the entire plane. A spatial order must be given to this territorial mosaic under the explicit principle of the dominating power. This is the spatial process of *land-use coordination*.

The sort of location theory offered by von Thünen demonstrates the process typical of land-use coordination in market economy at the scale of a metropolitan area. Here, each user of a territory on the plane chooses land use that maximizes his/her rent (Thünen, 1966 edn), which is determined by transport costs to and from the market, assumed to be

at the centre of the plane. As a result, the intensity of land-use decreases away from the centre of the plane. If the existing configuration of space does not match the ideal pattern of coordinated land-use, the process of land-use change or urban restructuring is to be coordinated by market incentives or state power.

In other modes of production, the process of land-use coordination is largely dictated by a dominating political power. Socialism and feudalism are the modes of production with social relations unique to one another; yet both of them have a common spatial feature: in the cities of both modes of production, the political apparatus typically directs who gets which territory in the city; and each member of society is to follow this assignment.

Land-use coordination is necessary and done at other spatial scales as well. With respect to the scale of the state, post-WWII global governance led by the globally hegemonic Allies, legitimatised by the UN and the Helsinki Accords, is based upon the unconditional fix of the international boundaries drawn as a result of the peace treaties after WWII. The spontaneous and anarchistic delineation of international boundaries was thus put under control. This principle was extended to the scale of governance. When the USSR and Yugoslavia broke up, the boundaries of the newly created countries followed exactly the border lines of former 'republics', or the territorial units of local administration drawn rather arbitrarily by the former socialist government.

Once land-use is thus coordinated, the mosaic of territories no longer comes into contradiction with the dominant society or mode of production, but it facilitates a regulation with space explicitly subsumed.

VIII Territorial Integration: Vertical Ordering of Spatial Scales

Global spatial configuration consists of multiple horizontal layers, each of which is coordinated as explained in the previous section. The layers are stuck vertically over another just like a geological formation. Recently, this point has been empathetically addressed by Brenner, using analogy of French dessert *millefeuille* (Brenner, 2008). Nevertheless, he is not necessarily explicit about the logical nexus between spatial scale and boundary porosity, or conflict between fixed and legitimatised territory in form of *Wirkungsraum* and much malleable and anarchistic action space.

One or more unique spatial scales emerge or are created out of the following political, social or economic factors:

1. *The state* – The states incorporated under Westfalian principle form a scale that is most powerful among all, for the state has legal and physical *Gewalt* that can force people to act in a way that the ruling class feels necessary. Whenever possible, however, a capitalist state tries to regulate it, in order to achieve social integration and capital accumulation. The regulation process includes the control over international boundary and other spatial policies.

2. *The hierarchical system of local governance* – The state creates a system of local governance to regulate the localities more efficiently and effectively. A nested system of local governments with boundaries is imposed by the state to create scales organised hierarchically: national – provincial – municipal – neighbourhood. The territories and boundaries in each scale are legitimate and fixed. Yet, this spatial system cannot limit the extent of action space, as people can freely penetrate the boundary of local governments, which are seldom endowed with the power to control their borders.
3. *Supranational union of states* – Number of states come together and mutually agree to create a union in order to ‘enhance structural competitiveness, to facilitate capital mobility within new continental zones of accumulation’ (Brenner, 2004, 61). Yet, in many cases, geopolitical ambition to expand sphere of influence by the core states is often a hidden agenda behind such move. International boundaries within the union are made more porous, to substantiate the scales composed of these unions. The outer circumference is fixed, for one of the rationales for the union is ‘to provide protective barriers against the pressures of global economic competition’ (Brenner, *ibid*).
4. *The hierarchical spatial system of the multinational corporations* – Under neo-liberalism, the international boundary has become increasingly porous across the globe to permit direct investment of multinationals. They purposefully create a spatially fixed hierarchy of establishments, which is the multi-level corporate hierarchy turned sideways across global space. Each level in the hierarchy has different decision-making powers and different corporate functions. The locations of these establishments often follow the fixed spatial distribution of existing urban agglomerations or ‘industrial clusters’, and multi-scalar action spaces emerge around these establishments.
5. *Differentiated spatial range depending on the kinds of goods, schools or jobs* (Reichweite) – As the central-place theory teaches us, extent of market ranges is different by goods, and so are the commuting ranges of pupils and students. In pure market economy, the urban hierarchy emerges out of the overlapping action spaces of market agents; yet in capitalism, government often intervenes in the process of urban growth to facilitate capital accumulation. In socialism, the system is planned, as in the model built by Christaller; yet it still retains the nature of action space, since the boundary of complementary regions is not controlled by the state authority. When the centres of these action spaces are put together so that they share as many common centres as possible, the vertical hierarchy of central places emerges. The hierarchy of their complementary regions creates a vertically overlapped spatial scales and a hierarchical urban system, which the multinationals take advantage to allocate their establishments across the globe.
6. *Anarchical action spaces of market, humans, creatures and chemical substances* – The market exchanges emerge spontaneously and develop into action spaces called

market area. Distance-decay effect limits their extent physically. Yet state also attempts to limit it by controlling the porosity of boundary with customs and immigration controls. Those subjugated sometimes ignore the boundary, however, as in case of illegal immigrants, smugglers and child traffickers. Animals and plants move around across space, creating action spaces that overlap and intertwine to create an ecosystem. Their action spaces never respect the boundaries that humans create. Chemical substances, when driven by air or water flows, also form their own action space. Since these anarchical developments of action space expands in ignorance of the political authority that controls an international boundary, such expansion spontaneously creates a wider, thus higher spatial scale, which can contest the authority imposing the boundary.

7. *Demands on space* (Flächenanspruch) (Maier, et al. 1977, 100) *by the human body and the production process* – A human must occupy territory as *Wirkungsraum*. This is another kind of exclusive and bounded territory, constituting the lowest scale in the multiscalar configuration of space. Although it is not directly derived out of the Westfalian state, its boundary and exclusiveness are normally protected by the state authority through registry, the penal code and police forces which arrest those who commits trespassing. Landuse coordination force those oppressed, or in market economy, those who cannot afford to the cramped state with minimum amount of space allowing mere existence at their disposal.
8. *The hierarchy created by linguistic affinity and difference* – Shared language greatly enhances social interaction so that languages with closer affinity to one another tend to create higher intensity action spaces. As languages are hierarchically structured, this category of action space likely produces a hierarchy. Such dominating political structure as colonialism and dominance over minorities artificially can produce bilingual people through elementary education, or ban on learning certain languages. A state can thereby manipulate the extent of action space by force to its benefit.
9. *Path-dependent action space determined by the built environment built in the past* – The physical properties of the built environment has elements of spatial contiguity and separation, which in itself canalises the extent of action space. Since the built environment often projects the political and economic regimes or dominating power that led to its construction, the built environments inherited from the past can lead to path-dependent spatial movement at present.

In short, the multiscalar spatial system is the socio-spatial ensemble, created through the articulation of all the above. It internalises social struggles manifested in the conflicts between bounded and exclusive territory and malleable action spaces. The dominating power must contain, through the process of territorial integration, the conflicts between, on the one hand, spontaneous and anarchistic action space as well as corporeally and technologically necessary *Wirkungsraum* and, on the other hand, the hierarchy of governance systems purposefully constructed by states and multinationals for the purpose of

domination. Failure in controlling the ensemble of multiscalar system will result in the return of anarchistic homogenisation process, or the pristine nature of absolute space. Authority at one spatial scale cannot stop this sort of spatial challenge to its dominance. It thus becomes imperative for a dominating power to form a vertically structured political alliance to take care of this problem as a part of their regulatory processes.

IX The Possibility for Counter-Space to Wage Spatialised Struggle

Through the real subsumption of relational space, an entire space seems to have been rigorously structured by the political authority like a prison building made of concrete. Any 'stray spaces' seems to have been sealed off and every subjugated subject is placed into a pre-structured pigeon hole where they are forced to 'know one's place' and to act accordingly.

In a class society, different spatial configurations contradict each another in terms of how space is subsumed. In any class society, struggles against dominant authority must include a positive effort to create an alternative configuration of space. Lefebvre (1974, 48-49) termed the space that authority creates as '*les représentations de l'espace*', and he called alternative spaces created by inhabitants '*les espaces de représentation*'. The strategy here has two fronts, reflecting two stages in the real subsumption of space.

The first front is related to the real subsumption of pristine space. The *les espaces de représentation* can be created by reappropriating the contiguity that the dominant power split and fragmented so as to materialise *liberté, égalité, fraternité* across space, which supports real democracy and freedom in interactions among the grassroots.

For the subsumption of absolute space, struggle must be undertaken to undermine the delineation and territoriality super imposed on it by the dominating political and social power. This can be achieved, initially, by overriding the existing boundary, which allows those subjugated to access to the social relation at higher scale, which can side them and protect from the authority dominating at lower scale. This strategy is sometimes called 'scale bending' (Smith, 2004), for, with this strategy, the subjugated can switch the stages of struggle to a higher order scale, in an attempt to command the lower-order scale and undermine from above the authority which had dominated over them at the previous scale.

For relative space, the restrictions to spatial mobility on those subjugated arising from economic, social or political reasons must be abolished, and egalitarian and homogenous spatial integration must be achieved. In Japan, an academic association advocates for the 'Right to Transport', which includes the provision of more user-friendly, densely and efficiently organised and inexpensive system of public transportation (<http://www009.upp.so-net.ne.jp/kotsuken-gakkai/charter/english.html>).

The second front is in creating *les espaces de représentation* is to defend and create public space of the grassroots in the process of the subsumption of relational space by the political authority. Relational space may not be perfectly subsumed, but 'stray space' often remains.

There are two strategies to tackle, reflecting the nature of subsumption. Within one horizontal plane at a single spatial scale, the strategy is to set up an agora-like public space as a base for democracy. If this is not successful, the strategy must go forward to grab a territory not subject to domination by the authority ruling the entire plane. Such 'stray territory', escaping the authority's surveillance and remaining out of its control, can be used as the base for waging fresh class struggle at higher spatial scales.

In the case of vertical scales, the strategy is to defend exiting stray action space by ignoring existing laws pertaining to reducing boundary porosity or by creating boundaries afresh that are deemed 'anarchistic' from the standpoint of the dominant power. An alternative territorial integration of vertical scales can be built based on it.

With the struggle at these two fronts combined, those subjugated can recapture at least part of the relational space, from which they can then wage new and more effective struggles. A task for the critical geographer is to elaborate a plan for *les espaces de représentation* for those living under capitalist and political domination and encourage its materialisation.

Note: A part of this article was presented at the fifth meeting of the East Asian Regional Conferences in Alternative Geography, held in Seoul, South Korea, on 13-16 December 2008.

X Literature

- Brenner, Neil 2004: *New State Spaces – Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*. Oxford.
- Brenner, Neil (forthcoming): 'A Thousand Leaves: Notes on the Geographies of Uneven Spatial Development'. In: Roger Keil and Rianne Mahon (eds), *The New Political Economy of Scale*. Vancouver.
- Christaller, Walter 1968 (edn): *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland*. Darmstadt.
- Frank, Andre Gunder 1969: *Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America: historical studies of Chile and Brazil*. New York.
- Harvey, David 1982: *Limits to Capital*. Chicago.
- Hottes, Ruth 1983: 'Walter Christaller', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 73(1), 51-54.
- Lefebvre, Henri 1974: *La Production de L'espace*. Paris.
- Marx, Karl 1969 (edn): *Resultate des unmittelbaren Produktionsprozesses* (Archiv sozialistischer Literatur 17). Frankfurt am Main.
- Marx, Karl 1972 (edn): *Das Kapital, Erster Band*. Berlin (DDR).
- Mizuoka, Fujio, Mizuuchi Toshio, Hisatake Tetsuya, Tsutsumi Kenji and Fujita Tetsushi 2005: 'The critical heritage of Japanese geography: its tortured trajectory for eight decades', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 23(3), 453-473.

-
- Mizuoka, Fujio 2006: 'The Demise of a Critical Institution of Economic Geography in Japan'. In: Toshio Mizuuchi (ed), *Critical and Radical Geographies of the Social, the Spatial and the Political*, Osaka, 22-34.
- Maier, Jörg, Karl Ruppert, Reinhard Paesler and Franz Schaffer 1977: *Sozialgeographie*. Braunschweig.
- Schmidt-Renner, Gerhard 1961: *Elementare Theorie der Ökonomischen Geographie*. Berlin (DDR).
- Smith, Neil 2004: 'Scale Bending and the Fate of the National'. In: Eric Sheppard and Robert B. McMaster (eds), *Scale and Geographic Inquiry: Nature, Society, and Method*, Malden, 192-212.
- Soja, Edward W. 1980: 'The Socio-Spatial Dialectic', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 70(2) 207-225.
- Taylor, Peter 1994: 'The State as Container: Territoriality in the Modern World-System', *Progress in Human Geography*, 18(2), 151-162.
- Thünen, Johann Heinrich von 1966 (edn): *Der isolierte Staat in Beziehung auf Landwirtschaft und Nationalökonomie*. Stuttgart.
- Wittfogel, Karl August 1929: 'Geopolitik, Geographischer Materialismus und Marxismus', *Unter dem Banner des Marxismus*, 3(1) 17-51, (4) 484-522, (5) 698-735 .