**Making Space, Taking Place**

The tensions between space and place can be located alongside the tensions between the universal and the particular, which forms the crux of the debate between Marx and Heidegger. While, Marx believes in the unification of all the working classes of the world into a single revolution that is not rooted in a single place, Heidegger traces the source of our being to our dwelling, which forms the roots of an irreducible and incommunicable human experience. The search for roots must be placed in the specific context of modernity, wherein the yearn for the *authentic* emerges from the feeling of being perpetually displaced However, this state of dislocation does not make the question of *location* obsolete, but in fact, makes it terribly relevant. Tuan (1977) argues that a rooted community may build monuments, but only an uprooted one creates museums, thereby posing the evoking of the sense of the past as deliberate and conscious. This takes us back to our previous class discussion regarding the absolutist and relativistic notions of space. While Marx represents the modernist sense of absolutist space wherein he aspires for the unity of place-less selves through a shared experience of capitalist exploitation, Heidegger represents the postmodern sense of relativistic space wherein the experience of self is inseparable from the spatially defined, place-bound experiences of dwelling. Bringing together the two extremes, Lefebvre (1991) argues that places are constructed and expressed as material artifacts, thereby locating the idea of place at the intersection of experience, perception and imagination.

In opposition to Heidegger’s notion of spaces producing certain experiences through dwelling, Lefebvre inverses this proposition to argue that space is itself shaped by experience through various spatial practices. For instance, Bourdieu’s study of the Kabyle house provides an interesting framework for locating various forms of gendered spatial experiences. The Kabyle man enters the lit part of the house only to occupy it momentarily and leave again, while the woman enters the lit part in order to further enter the dark part of the house, which is a space reserved for cattle, raw food and sexual activities. Furthermore, space needs to be understood in relation to other spaces as well, through the processes of distanciation, appropriation, domination and production of space. One of the aspects of relational understanding of space is that of scale, which has been explored by Neil Smith (1984). The scale marks the difference not so much between spaces as between different kinds of spaces. The Homeless Vehicle, designed by Krzysztof Wodiczko, articulates the construction of the scale of a given community. It functions on the aesthetic level as a device of irony regarding the social absurdity of widespread homelessness, while simultaneously being deliberately practical (the practicality can also be seen as a form of resistance to the impractical). Herein, the vehicle is an expression of spatial exclusion, while also being located firmly in the context of Tompkins Square Parks in the post-riot period.

In terms of relating space and place, it is also interesting to look at the space and place produced in cinema by ethnographic filmmakers. For instance, Gardner’s *Forest of Bliss* (1986)produces a sense of continuous space with very little regard to the actual place, that is, Benaras. He turns space into an aesthetic device, and turns time into a metaphor, as he investigates the experience of death in the holy city of Benaras. However, his reliance on the unifying properties of the story of life and death discourages him to provide any form of context to the film, thereby suspending the space from its political geography and topography. Parry (1998) further argues, *“Space seems to get strangely compressed by the style of the camera work and editing, giving the impression that the whole city floats in a sea of corpses”,* therefore indicating why it is problematic to look at space in the absence of place. This opens up the binary between political-economic aspects of place and culturalist understanding of space, thereby provoking more questions in terms of reimagining the relationship between space, place and time – is there a space beyond a place? Is there a place beyond a space? Is place located within space? Is place located within space?