



Space as Ideological Landscape: A Methodology

Yashveer

Assistant Professor, Smt Aruna Asaf Ali Govt. P.G. College, Kalka

“The geographical imagination is far too pervasive and important a fact of intellectual life to be left alone to geographers.” (David Harvey 1995:161)

I

Of late the dialectic of space and story has invited critical interventions from academic and non-academic circles. Undoubtedly, it is believed that space is the originator of story. But, the question arises: Is story a passive description of the space? Or, does a story have the potential to create a space; by the way it is described? In the present paper, an attempt has been made to explore the interconnection between space, story and ideology. The present study entitled, “Space as Ideological Landscape: A Methodology”, is likely to arouse and foster both a sense of curiosity and debate in academic circles. The first part of the title which goes ‘Space as Ideological Landscape’ tends to explore the meaning and ideological value of space while the second part that reads: ‘A Methodology’ tends to enumerate rambling representations of the volatile space (such as embattled zone of ‘red corridor’¹ in the context of India). The study concentrates on the problematic of representation of space in official, literary and popular discourse, *in toto*.

Space as a theoretical concept is one of the most complex ideas to human understanding². The ground for such ambiguity is the inherent dynamism of space. Space is defined differently across the disciplines –mathematics, physics, architecture, geometry, phenomenology, sociology, human- geography, communication studies and cultural theory. It would not be an exaggeration if we say that space serves as a *window* in understanding of the different cultures. “Space is one of the most obvious of things which is mobilized as a term in a thousand different contexts, but whose potential meanings are all too rarely explicated or addressed” (Doreen Massey 1999: 27). It is a vehicle for evaluating what it means to be interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary, and to bring contrasting lines of thought on board. Space does not exist by itself; it is connected to the action and social relations. The most basic understanding of space in the present context relies upon the meaning of space as a ‘condition of situatedness’.

With the increasing popularity of the terms –‘chronotope’, ‘heterotopia’, ‘cognitive’, ‘mapping’, and ‘literary topography’ the idea of space became seminal in the field of literature. Space is a term used in general sense to signify a physical location or to indicate an open expanse in physical geography, though; it is used specifically by marxist thinkers to acknowledge the socially-constructed nature of surroundings. The Marxist critics such as Henri Lefebvre³, Nigel Thrift, Manuel Castells⁴, Neil Smith, Edward Soja⁵, Michael Foucault, Derek Gregory, Doreen Massey and Fredrick Jameson and also Pierre Bourdieu proposed that space is at once the “field of production and the ultimate goal of infinitum” to borrow the phrase from the latter (Bourdieu 37).

¹ In native Indian context, the size and scale of the space of red corridor is very vast. In geographical terms, the terrain includes central-eastern states of India as a core area. It also consists of large tracts of land from western and northern states such as Maharashtra and Punjab. Ideologically, red corridor is a manifestation of revolutionary thought that spread across the various states of India. Red Corridor is primarily known for naxalite-activities.

² Human geography has used absolute, relative and relational concepts of space. It is fundamentally ambiguous philosophical concept. As Blaut (1961:1-7) inputs, ‘space is a treacherous philosophical word’ and is certainly not a unitary concept. He distinguished *absolute* conceptions of space, in which space is ‘a distinct, physical and eminently real or empirical entity in itself’ and *relative* conceptions of space in which space is ‘merely a relation between events or an aspects of events’, and thus bound to time and process’. The whole purpose of the distinction is –itself of considerable significance to the development of general theorems of spatial organizations, because ‘if geography is to generalize it must be able to replicate cases and it has to use relative space’ (Chapman, 1977). This necessitates what Harvey calls a *relational* view of space, in which space is contained in objects in the sense that an object can be said to exist only insofar as it contains and represents within itself the relationships to other objects. But to Schatzki (1991) such a formulation conflates two ontologies which need to be distinguished: *objective space* and *social space*. Schatzki’s Heideggerian reading remains closer to Marxian interpretation of space –a product of historical and material condition.

³ Henri Lefebvre looks for spaces of representation to challenge the spatial monopoly, majority and dominant ways of life through fostering ‘alternative’ lifestyles. It includes the counter-sites, heterotopias and liminal spaces in its rubric.

⁴ Manuel Castells’ concept ‘space of flows’ refers to the spatial structure which is firmly associated with the information economy. It plays a key role in Arjun Appadurai’s theory of *x-scapes*. For further information see the Manuel Castells’ book *Rise of the Network Society*.

⁵ Socio-spatial dialectic –is a concept put forward by Edward Soja to recognize the social constructivist approach to space. He maintains a conception of space produced through social relationships, which in turn, constitutes those very relationships (Gregory & Urry 1985; Harvey 1989; Lefebvre 1976, 1991; Soja 1989, 1996). For further investigation look into *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Theory* (1989) and *Thirdspace* (1996).



Thus the word ‘space’, ‘place’, ‘mapping’ and ‘place-making’ are used in literal and metaphorical sense to explore the various dimensions and productions of culture.

In this relation, the ‘spatial-turn’ in literary and cultural studies, received critical response in the latter half of the twentieth century particularly 1960s onwards. The critical spatial turn stretched the traditional frontiers of core disciplines such as architecture, geography and urban studies by extending its penetration into fields such as literature, art history, cinema and cultural studies. Notably, these fields were dominated by historicist hegemony of Hegel, Toynbee, Marx and other historians. Typically, historicist thought was obsessed with the temporal stages of development rather than that of spatial imagination. As of now, new way of thinking about space surfaced in the writings of Henri Lefebvre, Michel Foucault, Edward Soja, David Harvey, Doreen Massey and Arjun Appadurai. The proposition to be laid was that space is a ‘social construction’ which happens through discursive practices. Such understanding of space invokes the debates of ‘orientalism’ and helps the reader to develop a critical thinking of various fields of cultural production which often go unnoticed. The Marxist geographers such as Henri Lefebvre and David Harvey⁶ have conceptualized the condition of spatiality in social thought. They have also proposed the model of ‘commodity-production’ and ‘urbanization of space’ where they have analyzed the inflow of immigrants and labor process.

Nonetheless, the space has a symbolic value. It is not for the simplistic reason that everything occurs in space or we inhabit it, but because *where* things happen is critical to understanding *how* and *why* they occur: “Spatial turn is a crucial hinge on which creative artists and social theorists analyze the constitution of society [...] space in social sciences is considered as a product of social action and a product of social structure” (Shiel 1). Despite of variation in the conceptualization of space, critics seem to agree on certain points –metaphysics of space and the discourse that emanates from the spatiality of human life. According to Michel Foucault, the twentieth century began with the “epoch of space” (Foucault 22); an epoch in which space has acquired the status of a text and vice-versa. Foucault has opened a debate on how the approach to space has changed from a traditional geography to socio-cultural anthropology.

Foucault offers a structuralist view of space and spatiality. The heterogeneity of social space is discussed in his writings from the perspective of a philosopher. He has established that contemporary era is an “epoch of simultaneity, epoch of juxtaposition, the epoch of near and far, of side by side, of the dispersed” (Foucault 1). He visualizes space as a network of social relations, speed, technological advancement and classification of humans. In contemporary era, the individuality of a person is eroded while spatiality and sociality is imposed. In other words, space outscores individuals and forms the relations with other sites. The sites may be graded as the public-private space, family social-space and leisure-work space. For him, all these sites often tend to coalesce, intersect and interact. These spaces form a network of relations:

transportation, streets, trains (a train is an ordinary bundle of relations because it is something through which one goes, it is also something by means of which one can go from one point to another, and then it is also something that goes by). One could describe, via its cluster of relations that allows them to be defined, the sites of temporary relaxations, the closed or semi-closed sites of rest –the house, the bedroom, the bed [...] I am interested in certain ones *that have the curious property of being in relation with other sites* (emphasis added), but in such a way as to suspect, neutralize, or invent the set of relations that they happen to designate, mirror or reflect (*Of Other Spaces* 22-23).

For Foucault, heterotopia represents a physical and mental space filled up with sundry elements. A heterotopia, he claims, functions independently of hegemonic conditions. He historically traces the first principle of the condition of heterotopia to primitive societies and labels it “crisis-heterotopias” (24). There are certain secret spaces that are reserved for individuals, who are in relation to the social and cultural environment of the society, obviously out of sight, such as military space and excretion space. The second principle describes ‘heterotopias of deviation’ where individuals are kept for punishment or cure –prisons and mental asylum. The third principle of heterotopia superimposes singular real place to several spaces –cinematicscape. The fourth principle of heterotopia is linked to hetero-chronies of traditional time –museums and library. The fifth principle of a heterotopia refers to formally restricted space or one seeks permission to enter into –workplace and office. The last but not least in importance the principle of heterotopia functions in relation to other spaces. It creates a space of illusion and space of consumption. The space of illusion fabricates another real space, as genuine as original, for example –housing societies.

Within this context, Edward Soja in his book *Postmodern Geographies* (1989) argues that our environment is not just a product of history, but rather –before all else – also a construction of human geography; a social construction of space and the continuous reshaping of geographic landscapes. Fredric Jameson also proposes that “A certain spatial turn has often seemed to offer one or more productive ways of distinguishing postmodernism from modernism proper” (Jameson 1991: 154). In continuation, David Harvey posits: “space as a site of production rather than given” (12). This, in broader context, represented the construction, transformation and the functioning of power structures regulating everyday life. Harvey’s logic marks emphasis on the process of commodity production and labor process. His idea of space is contextualized in the process of urbanization.

⁶ David Harvey used the term structured coherence to indicate the ways in which urban regions assume distinctive characteristics which are the product of local systems of production, local-labour markets and the associated modes of consumption and life-styles. Due to structured-coherence, migration and displacement production of localities is on unprecedented rise.



For Edward Soja, space may be given but spatiality is produced through interaction with the sundry elements. There lies the politics of production of space. The practice of producing spatiality is ideological which forms the nucleus of Soja's thesis. He visualizes space as "a social product (outcome) and a shaping force (medium) in social life" (Soja 11). For him, spatiality is a condition of existence and he analyzed the politics of spatiality: "How relations of power and discipline are inscribed into the apparently innocent spatiality of social life, how geographies become filled with politics and ideology" (Soja 12). This exercise helps in understanding cultural artifacts such as films, music, sports, popular fiction and cultural practice as texts filled with ideologies and governed by the condition of spatiality. Like Henri Lefebvre, Soja observes a tripartite division in spatial analysis analogous to former's spatial triad⁷ but he categorizes it differently: Firstspace, Secondspace and Thirdspace. For him, firstspace offers a rational perspective on materiality of space. Secondspace is just an extension of the former and it is represented through images and symbols. Thirdspace is a synthesis of both the former and the latter. Thirdspace is a signifying practice and it gives social meaning to the landscape:

I define Thirdspace as an –Other way of understanding and acting to change the spatiality of human life, a distinct model of critical spatial awareness that is appropriate to the new scope and significance being brought out in the rebalanced triad of *spatiality-historicity-sociality* (emphasis added) (Soja 57).

II

The concept of space in literature is very fluid and it draws meaning from the context in which it is used. A spatial understanding of a text relies upon the understanding of a *text* as a culture-specific code or a *geography-ideology-literature* interface (emphasis added). It raises questions in relation to narratological aspects of a text. So, the project also draws some insights from the idea of narrative space. Space has a deep correlation with the narrative and dissemination of a narrative affect the space in equal terms, as Homi K Bhabha would establish. Bhabha writes that 'location' or 'situatedness' is never apolitical. The debates on the "politics of location" (Homi K Bhabha 3), "insider and outsider perspective" (Gopal Guru and Sundar Sarukkai 16), "simultaneity, juxtaposition and network of relationship" (Manuel Castells 11), and "son of soil" (Dipankar Gupta 5), and also "production of locality" (Arjun Appadurai 169) are seen central to the explanation of social phenomena. The present study also intends to analyze ideas starting from the central geographic concepts of space, place and scale to ideology, territory and nation-state. It would demonstrate the utility of a spatial perspective through an examination of the ways, in which a particular site is perceived, conceived and lived, and acted upon as a space for political and commercial possibilities.

In this connection, Deleuze, a French philosopher and critic, theorizes that space is structured like a language. His works on space are formative and influential seminal but at the same time abstract and random. It is difficult to position him among traditional thinkers of space. For him, the process of production of meaning is very close to the theory of space. The reason being, meaning does not exist in isolation; it has to be viewed in relation to other semantic units or structure of language. Similarly, the meaning of space exists in relation to other similar entities such as 'place', 'place-making', 'habitus', 'sites', 'location' and 'landscape'. Deleuze and Guattari demonstrate the concept of space as primordial while a practiced space becomes place; when a place becomes a center of cultural production and acquires status of a social structure it is called 'habitus'. The practice of inhabiting places is called 'place-making'. In other words, space owes to metaphysical reality while place is a material reality. The constant interaction between space, place and society leads to formation of social relations: community, society, culture, subculture, migration and immigration are by product of spatial practice. The space for Deleuze and Guattari is a space of identity that works in difference. Thus, a space emerges from the discontinuities of flow within the space and an individual identity emanates out of that encounter. In this context, Arjun Appadurai's has theorized the process of 'global cultural flows' under the impact of ideology, finance, ethnicity, media and technology:

The image, the imagined, the imaginary –these are all terms that direct us to something critical and new in global cultural processes: the imagination as a social practice. No longer mere fantasy (opium for the masses who real work is somewhere else), no longer simple escape (from a world defined principally by more concrete purposes and structures), no longer elite pastime (thus not relevant to the lives of ordinary people), and no longer mere contemplation (irrelevant for new forms of desire and subjectivity), the imagination has become an organized field of social practices, a form of work (in the sense of both labor and culturally organized practice), and a form of negotiation between sites of agency (individuals) and globally defined fields of possibility. This unleashing of the imagination links the play of pastiche (in

⁷ The spatial-trilectics in Lefebvre's writings represents a tripartite division in space vis-à-vis (i) spatial practice –an exercise that points towards the spheres from which a given historical work originates and towards which it is directed to differentiate between local, global, regional and national, (ii) representations of space –are variables to understand the underlying models in many historical exercises. This component surface the tensions between centre and periphery, (iii) spaces of representations –are symbolic which possibly include the use of certain spatial forms and strategies of representation.



some settings) to the terror and coercion of states and their competitors. The imagination is now central to all forms of agency, is itself a social fact, and is the key component of new global order (Appadurai 31).

The occurrence of global cultural flows in spatial terms breaks the code of *one-place-one-culture-one-identity* paradigm (emphasis added). These flows offer a solution to wipe out hierarchies as the process insists on the dismantling of ‘aura’ of the real putting all elements on equal pedestal. This type of transformation does not confine itself to physical borders and subsequently there occurs a sense of ‘border-free’. To the contrary, a sense of borders curtails human lives fixed into ghettos. This subsequent de-territorialization due to global cultural and spatial flows triggers the formation of new spaces across the globe: “a territory precisely when milieu components cease to be directional, becoming dimensional instead, when they cease to be become expressive. There is a territory where the rhythm has expressiveness. What defines the territory is the emergence of matters of expression” (*A Thousand Plateaus* 315).

Deleuze and Guattari explain the phenomena of locality and belonging in connection with ideological marking of space. They distinguish between the nomadic and migrant space. The nomad creates an image of materialistic space and feels attracted towards the commercial prospect of space while the migrant leaves behind the *space of poverty* (emphasis added). It is a scientific fact that all movements and social processes occur in space, just as they occur over a time. In this context, Bakhtin, Russian literary critic, posits the term chronotope to study the philosophy of language and literature. Bakhtin explains the term chronotope⁸ in terms of an impulse of recycling the narrative in a changed time-space setting. Specific chronotopes may correspond to specific genres or represent particular system of thought or ideology. He illustrates through his analysis how different genres in literature with different alignments of time and space recycle a core narrative. For instance, the chronotopic setting of the genre epic is different from that of the genre tragedy or the hero adventure in the genre of picaresque novel. One way to define space is to explore its relation with time. It would define space as something *where* movement happens; and time is *movement* in space.

Time is a concept that has evolved and changed rapidly in social life particularly in the last two centuries vis-à-vis time as a schedule, industrial time, railway time, clock time and “spectacular time” (Guy Debord 59), so the concept of space too has travelled a long journey. Although space has a metaphysical presence, yet it may be produced mechanically. The production of space occurs through social relations and encounters. As Massey puts it, “space is an integral part of social life, both affecting and affected by social actions. Space is one of the axes along which we experience and conceptualize the world.” (Massey 1994: 251). So, space in that sense is a ‘container’ of experience and movement. But at the same time, it also constitutes relationships and networks (including the processes that produce race, ethnicity and identity).

Focusing on the multiple ways that a space may be studied, Henri Lefebvre asserts a ‘spatial-trilectics’. He finds three types of socially produced space: (1) *Perceived*, (2) *Conceived*, and (3) *Lived*. He also calls the *perceived* as spatial practice. It includes the material spaces of everyday life where social production and reproduction occurs. Everyday life in shops, shopping malls, parks, places of worship or congregation and transits. Spatial practice is a tangible form of space. It provides a degree of continuity and cohesion to ‘structures of feeling’. To quote Lefebvre: “It is shot through with power relations, as many aspects of control and contention rest upon the ability to control the spaces of specific activities” (Lefebvre 1991:35).

III

Power is rarely exercised without some ideas or beliefs that justify it; it is sometimes the priestly deceit which emerges in the form of ideology. Machiavelli and Hobbes have already explained the legitimatizing role of religion in distortion of ideas, and the role of ideology in the constitution of society. In the tradition of marxist thought, ideology finds a breakthrough and acquires a central role in the production of meaning. Marx posits that “materialism makes consciousness a reflection of outside reality, while, idealism makes reality the product of consciousness” (Marx 22). In his critical stance, Marx wants to assert that consciousness is not autonomous from men’s forms of existence and it is dependent on material conditions. He explains:

Consciousness can never be anything else than conscious existence and the existence of men is their actual life-process...men, developing their material production and their material intercourse alter, along with this their real existence, their thinking and the products of their thinking. Life is not determined by consciousness but consciousness by

⁸ In the present thesis, red corridor serves as a literary and artistic chronotope where spatial and temporal markers are fused to form a carefully thought-out narrative. A chronotope is both a narrative aspect and cognitive feature of language. In other words, a chronotope underscores the environmental dimension of a literary text as it invokes the image of the concrete physical space in which the discourse takes place. Bakhtin remarks:

[chronotopes] are points in the geography of a community where time and space intersect and fuse. Time takes on flesh and becomes visible for human contemplation; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time and history and the enduring character of a people. [...] Chronotopes thus stand as monuments to the community itself, as symbols of it, as forces operating to shape its members’ images of themselves (qtd. in Basso 1984: 44–45).



life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being determines their consciousness (ibid 47-51).

In Marxist paradigm, consciousness seconds the *being* as against the idealism where being seconds to *consciousness*. At the same time, Marx discards the concept of objective reality which he writes by no means a sacrosanct entity; on the contrary it is a product of historical conditions of men's practice⁹. Practice is not only the transformation of the nature but also the transformation of men themselves; their fashioning and refashioning of themselves. In fact, Marx distinguishes two kinds of practice: (i) labour, or a reproductive practice, (ii) revolutionary practice which aims at transforming social relations. Men's practice produces socio-political conditions which become independent of men's *will* (emphasis added). Consequently, it causes reality as a contradictory reality. According to Marx:

the division of labour inside a nation leads at first to the separation of industrial and commercial from agricultural labour, hence the separation of *country* and *city* (a point also made in Raymond Williams's book *The Country and the City* (1975) and it raises the conflict of interests. As the division of labour develops, new separations and divisions appear: between material and mental labour; among the individuals cooperating inside every branch of production; and so on. (ibid 43).

Therefore, ideology, in the writings of Marx, does not arise either as a pure invention of consciousness which distorts reality or as a result of an objective reality which deceives a passive consciousness but rather it arises from a practice which produces contradictory relations and distorted representations situated in a '*humanized space*' (emphasis added). In other words, place-making is an ideological event. In brief, it unites in one principle consciousness (space) and reality (place). It is a part of superstructure although Marx never uses the concept in exact phraseology instead he refers it to "legal and political superstructure" and to "the forms of social consciousness" (*Preface to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* 181). For Marx, the "political superstructure presents an idea of unity or authority or state" (*The German Ideology* 80). The state, in turn, is the embodiment of the power of dominant class which makes that base work in service of the ruling class.

The cognitive dimension of ideology relies upon the definition of ideology as a system of ideas and beliefs while ideas are subject of scientific operation such as testing and verification, beliefs are not. They simply reveal a "psychological state of acceptance" (Mostafa Rejai 3). Within each belief system, a core belief plays a key role in unifying the entire system (stress on equality in socialist ideology would be an example centrality of a key idea in a belief system). Sometimes, ideology involves the distortion of beliefs or myths. This is one of the central point on which most writers and thinkers would concede. Marx and Engels view ideology as false consciousness, positing that "in all ideology men and their circumstances appear upside down as in a *camera obscura*" (Marx and Engels 14). At the same time, Karl Mannheim also defines ideology as "more or less conscious disguises of the real nature of a situation" (Mannheim 55). Robert Morrison MacIver explains the link between myth and ideology. He writes:

By myths we mean the value-impregnated beliefs and notions that men hold, that they live by or live for. Every society is held together by a myth-system, a complex of dominating thought-forms that determines and sustains all its activities. All social relations, the very texture of human society, are myth-born and myth-sustained...Every civilization, every period, every nation, has its characteristic myth-complex. In it lies the secret of social unities and social continuities, and its changes compose the inner history of every society. Wherever he goes, whatever he encounters, man spins about him his web of myth, as the caterpillar spins its cocoon. Every individual spins his own variant within the greater web of the whole group. The myth mediates between man and nature. From the shelter of his myth he perceives and experiences the world. Inside his myth he is at home in his world (MacIver 4).

Other scholarships, Lasswell and Kaplan refer to ideology as "the political myth functioning to preserve the social structure" (Lasswell and Kaplan 123). Many other examples could be cited to prove the argument that the myth is embedded in ideology both socially and politically and vice-versa. Ideology, then, is a set of ideas, beliefs and assumptions, especially of historical, political, economic and cultural that creates a system. Myths, in fact, serve the purpose of ideology as they communicate a political message in a simplified version and make it unquestionable and sacrosanct. This all is done through linguistic (news, information, education and so on) and non-linguistic (flags, insignia, anthems monuments, temples, mosques, churches, memorials, holidays, ceremonies and so on) symbolism. Symbols provoke emotive response in the audience and thus concretize the beliefs in the form of ideology.

⁹ Marx defines the *practice* in his book *The German Ideology* –practice is a certain kind of activity, yet not all forms of activity are practice. As he puts it, "the first historical act is the production of the means to satisfy human needs, the production of material itself" (Marx 42-48). In other words, practice is labour that aims at reproducing material life. It is not an activity opposed to consciousness but rather a conscious activity otherwise it would be only a blind activity, purely animalistic. Marx's recognizes two kinds of practice: (i) labour, or reproductive practice, (ii) revolutionary practice which aims at transforming social relations although it does not arise arbitrarily out of men's free will. Marx thinks that people have won freedom to the extent that productive forces have so permitted. For further details, please see, *The German Ideology*, Lawrence & Wishart press, 1970, p. 42-50. A similar suggestion, Marx gives, in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, in *Selected Works*: "men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under the circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past" (Marx 96).



On the other hand, affective dimension of ideology remarkably appeals to the audience in an overt manner. Its appeal to emotion gives ideology its force and passion. As Daniel Bell also writes: “The most important, latent, function of ideology is to tap the emotion” (Bell 371). Infamous Babri Masjid demolition on December 6, 1992 in the state of Uttar Pradesh of India where people of Hindu-majority destroyed the old mosque and thereafter surge in saffron party’s political fortune could be cited as an appropriate example of the affective dimension of ideology.

To the contrary, evaluative aspect of the ideology forces its audience to make judgments either by denouncing the existing structures of feeling or by putting forth a set of norms to which social relationship is reconstituted. The former principle takes place through high-sounding morals which are deeply embedded in ideology while the latter relies upon to ascertain the relevance of existing structures in contemporary scenario. Thus, a system of binaries creeps in. One is considered old, rigid, fundamental, and regressive in terms of appeal to standards of morality which is known by the name of right-wing. The other is taken as liberal, humanitarian and progressive –i.e. left-wing. Undoubtedly, all ideologies move towards a presumed ‘good society’, however defined. Some of them leave no room for an alternative relying on a final good, while some of them “insistent on a total transformation of society” (Edward Shills 67). Ultra and liberal ideologies would be a fine example of this view. So, ideology in this sense embraces both political beliefs and political values of a pre-defined territory.

The primary target of ideology is the translation of values into action. The action and program of ideology may maintain either the status quo, or, the transformation. The program of ideology will set forth, implicitly or explicitly, “a hierarchy of values and objectives” (Mostafa Rejai 8). It may even include a statement of priorities specifying immediate, intermediate, and ultimate goals. For instance, in maoist/naxalite ideology, the immediate goal is to “armed struggle”; the intermediate goal is to “establish liberated-zones”; and the ultimate goal is to reinforce the “rights of *Girijans*” by dismantling capitalist system responsible for social injustice (Rahul Pandita 16). Similarly, in the communist ideology, the immediate goal is to overthrow of the bourgeois regime; the intermediate goal is economic reconstruction; and the ultimate goal is to form a classless society. Finally, an ideology, it must have a ‘mass-base’ or support of social groups. It needs a simplified political message to be circulated through some channels of circulation on- ground or off-ground. In this relation, Bell has remarked:

A social movement can rouse people (or mobilize mass action) when it can do three things: simplify ideas, establish a claim to truth, and in the union of the two, demand a commitment to action. Thus not only does ideology transform ideas, it transforms people (and culture) as well (Bell 372).

So, organization is essential for the existence and propagation of an ideology. It is the link between action and belief. However, organization does not grow overnight. It takes time to evolve in space. Thus, an ideoscape occurs. The ‘red corridor’ on the map of India represents –a looming ideological landscape in the south-eastern and central part of India. The present thesis explores the link between ideology, space and place. In this work, the space of red corridor will serve as an ideological text. Indeed, the very word ‘space’ can itself be seen as ideological to the extent that it naturalizes the power relations.

It is truism that physical geography has served the purpose of dominant groups in world civilization for a long time although in a covert manner unexposed until late twentieth century. Space may have a metaphysical presence but the recent research in the field of cultural production has testified and established ‘space’ as a material reality –the product of social relations. It is this socially-constructivist accounts of space that have become the subject and object of our analysis. The politics of production of space causes uneven development articulating politics of inclusion and exclusion. This is because there are multiple stakeholders in the ideological representations of the space of red corridor. Within this context, Lefebvre posits:

Space is not a scientific object removed from ideology and politics; it has always been political and strategic. If space has an air of neutrality and indifference with regard to its contents and thus seems to be ‘purely’ formal, the epitome of rational abstraction, it is precisely because it has been occupied and used, and has already been the focus of the past processes whose traces are not always evident on the landscape. Space has been shaped and molded from historical and natural elements, but this has been a political process. Space is *political* and *ideological*. It is a product of literally filled with *ideologies* (emphasis added) (Lefebvre 31).

IV

The present research has concentrated on the theoretical and methodological aspect of ‘space as ideological landscape’ through a brief illustration of the space of ‘red corridor’ on the map of India. Over the years, the ‘red corridor’ has also acquired marked political and ideological underpinnings. The spatial construction of ‘red corridor’ seems a handiwork of not only the insiders (the people who actually live in the location), but also of the outsiders (the people who either are from the location or share an identity or a profit agenda with the location one way or the other). As narratives, both fictional (imaginative literature) and non-fictional (reports and data) begin to appear about the particular demography of ‘red corridor’, a nuanced discourse of the representation of the ideological space creeps in. While the politically marginalized left has its own vested interest in keeping alive the threat of the



red; the state projects the naxal-threat as the greatest internal security threat to the nation to make up for its governance-deficit. The corporate giants, who scramble for many rights in the mineral belt of India, have their own agenda of profitability. Official reports pronounce 'red corridor' as a law and order problem. While there are the other sections of society, say, literary elite who think that the emergence of 'red corridor' is a consequence of the absence of good governance and state's betrayal of its constitutional role. Another view holds that the problem is a socio-economic or development-related one, and naxalism is a backlash due to unequal distribution of costs and benefits.

The representations of 'red corridor' are many and each representation has its own ideological slant. Within this context, the visualization of 'red corridor' is patently ideological in all its manifestations and it is imagined as –(i) forest and mineral-rich landscape of India, (ii) tribal (notified and denotified) area of India, (iii) naxal-infected area of India. Here, one would find that all these three mappings are hardly distinct and actually merge within i.e., the space of 'red corridor'.

Works Cited and Consulted

- Agnew, John A. *Place and Politics*. Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1987. Print.
- Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. Trans. B. Brewster. London: New Left Books, 1971. Print.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1991. Print.
- Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997. Print.
- Bell, Daniel. *The End of Ideology*. New York: Free Press, 1960. Print.
- Castells, Manuel. *The Urban Question: A Marxist Approach*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. London: Edward Arnold, 1977. Print.
- Certeau, Michel De. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Trans. Stevan Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984. Print.
- Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978. Print.
- Cosgrove, D. *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1998. Print.
- Cresswell, Tim. *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996. Print.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Robert Hurley. Minnesota: Minnesota University Press, 1977. Print.
- . *A Thousand Plateaus*. London: Continuum, 1981. Print.
- Dungdung, Gladson. *Whose Country is it Anyway? : Untold Stories of the Indigenous Peoples of India*. Kolkata: Adivaani, 2013. Print.
- Emmott, Catherine. *Narrative Comprehension: A Discourse Perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College de France*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976. Print.
- . *Heterotopia and the City: Public Space in Post-Civil Society*. New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.
- Ganti, Tejaswani. *Producing Bollywood: Inside the Contemporary Hindi Film Industry*. New Delhi: Orient Black Swan, 2012. Print.
- Giri, B.P. and Prafulla C Kar, eds. *Thinking Territory: Some Reflections*. New Delhi: Pencraft International, 2009. Print.
- Gregory, D and Urry J. (eds.). *Social Relations and Spatial Structures*. London: Macmillan, 1985. Print.
- Gupta, Dipanker. *Culture, Space and the Nation-state: From Sentiment to Structure*. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2000. Print.
- Hall, Stuart. *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage, 1997. Print.
- Hands, Joss. *@ is for Activism: Dissent, Resistance and Rebellion in a Digital Culture*. New York: Pluto Press, 2011. Print.
- Harvey, David. *Explanation in Geography*. London: Edward Arnold, 1969. Print.
- . *The Urban Experience*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1989. Print.
- . *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1990. Print.
- Hubbard, Phil, Rob Kitchen, et (eds.). *Thinking Geographically: Space, Theory and Contemporary Human Geography*. London: Continuum, 2002. Print.
- Kern, Stephen. *The Culture of Time and Space 1880-1918*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983. Print.
- Kumar, Akshaya. *Poetry, Politics and Culture: Essays on Indian Texts and Contexts*. London, New Delhi: Routledge, 2009. Print.
- Lal, Vinay and Ashis Nandy. *Fingerprinting Popular Culture*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2006. Print.
- Larrain, Jorge. *The Concept of Ideology*. New Delhi: B.I. Publication, 1979. Print.
- Sack, R. D. *Conceptions of Space in Social Thought*. London: Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1980. Print.
- Lasswell, Harold and Abraham Kaplan. *Power and Society: A Framework for Political Inquiry*. London: Yale University Press, 1951. Print.
- Lefebvre H. *The Production of Space*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1991. Print.
- MacIver, Morrison Robert. *The Web of Government*. New York: Free Press, 1965. Print.
- Mannheim, Karl. *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge and Kagan Paul, 1954. Print.
- Marx, Karl and Fredrich Engels. *The German Ideology*. New York: International Publishers, 1947. Print.
- Massey, Doreen. *Space, Place and Gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994. Print.
- May, Jon and Nigel Thrift (eds.). *Timespace: Geographies of Temporality*. London: Routledge, 2001. Print.



- Oommen, T. K. *Development Discourse: Issues and Concerns*. New Delhi: Regency Publication, 2004. Print.
- Soja, Edward. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. New York: Verso, 1989. Print.
- . *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real and Imagined Places*. Malden: Blackwell, 1996. Print.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Space and Place: Perspectives on Experience*. London: University of Minnesota Press, 1977. Print.
- . *Topophilia*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1974. Print.
- . *Space and Place: Humanistic Perspective*. London: Edward Arnold, 1975. Print.
- Yadav, Kumkum. *Tribals in Indian Narratives*. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 2003. Print.