



David Harvey and Bob Jessop on Spatio-Temporal Fixes¹

*

Erol Subaşı²

ORCID: 0000-0001-5710-9988

Abstract

David Harvey, one of the most preeminent Marxist theoreticians of the contemporary world revolutionized our thinking about the capitalist production of space while Bob Jessop, another leading Marxist theoretician, transformed Marxist state theory. While the two converge on many points in their analysis of the capitalist mode of production, they diverge on some methodological and theoretical arguments about how to analyze the concept of spatio-temporal fixes. While Harvey follows Capital and Grundrisse to adopt a value-theoretical approach that focuses on the circulation of capital, Jessop follows Poulantzas and the Regulation School to call for a more socio-political orientation towards capitalist social formations. Whereas Harvey concentrates on the inner contradictions and crises tendencies of capitalism and capital circulations in the creation of spatio-temporal fixes, Jessop pays more attention to political power relations and the state as modes of the extra-economic principles of societalization in producing spatio-temporal fixes. The present study, recognizing Harvey's crucial contributions to the field, but following Jessop, argues for a more socio-politicized concept of spatio-temporal fixes. It recommends linking it with state power and socio-political power relations through the complex articulations of the economic, political, and ideological determinations of social totality.

Keywords: *David Harvey, Bob Jessop, spatio-temporal fixes, capitalist production of spacetime , political sociology.*

¹ An earlier version of this study was presented at 4th International Congress on Urban Studies, October, 16-18 2019, Ankara.

² Asts. Prof., Recep Tayyip Erdogan University, E-mail: erol.subasi@erdogan.edu.tr



David Harvey ve Bob Jessop'ta Uzam-Zamansal Sabitler

*

Erol Subaşı³

ORCID: 0000-0001-5710-9988

Öz

Çağdaş dünyanın önde gelen Marksist teorisyenlerinden olan David Harvey, kapitalizmin mekan üretimi konusundaki düşüncelerimizde devrim yarattı. Bir başka önde gelen Marksist teorisyen olan Bob Jessop Marksist devlet kuramını dönüştürdü. Bu ikili, her ne kadar kapitalist üretim tarzı analizinde pek çok noktada yaklaşımlar da uzam-zamansal sabitler kavramının nasıl analiz edileceğine dair bir dizi metodolojik ve teorik argümanda birbirlerinden ayrılırlar. Harvey, *Kapital'i ve Grundrisse'yi* izleyerek sermayenin dolaşımına odaklanan değer-teorik bir yaklaşım benimserken; Jessop *Nicos Poulantzas'ı ve Düzenleme Okulu'nu* izleyerek kapitalist toplumsal formasyonlarla ilgili olarak daha sosyo-politik bir yönelim çağrısında bulundu. Harvey, uzam-zamansal sabitlerin yaratılmasında kapitalizmin ve sermaye dolaşımının içsel çelişkilerine ve kriz eğilimlerine odaklanırken Jessop uzam-zamansal sabitlerin üretilmesinde ekonomi-dışı toplumsallaştırma kiplikleri olarak devlete ve siyasal iktidar ilişkilerine daha fazla önem vermektedir. Bu çalışma Harvey'nin bu alana yaptığı çok önemli katkıları tanımakla birlikte Jessop'ı izleyerek sosyo-politikleşmiş bir uzam-zamansal sabit kavramını savunmaktadır. Çalışma, kavramı toplumsal bütünlüğün, ekonomik, politik ve ideolojik belirlenimlerinin karmaşık eklenmesi yolu ile devlet erki ve sosyo-politik iktidar ilişkilerine bağlamayı önermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: David Harvey, Bob Jessop, uzam-zamansal sabitler, uzam zamanın kapitalist üretimi, siyaset sosyolojisi.

³ Dr. Öğr. Üyesi., Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi, E-mail: erol.subasi@erdogan.edu.tr

Introduction

Social theory, since Comte's evolutionary stages of humanity, has seemed to attribute a special place to the concept of time and history. According to David Harvey (1989, p. 205), social theory, has mostly privileged time over space from Weber to Marx. Along these lines, Foucault (1980, p. 70) asked: "Did it start with Bergson, or before? Space was treated as the dead, the fixed, the undialectical, the immobile. Time, on the contrary, was richness, fecundity, life, dialectic." In a similar vein, other commentators stress the neglect of space in the imagination of critical social theory: "no hegemonic shift has yet occurred to allow the critical eye -or the critical I- to see spatiality with the same acute depth of vision that comes with a focus on *durée*" (Soja, 1989, p. 11).

Only during the 1970s and 1980s, did interest in space and the spatial features of social reality begin to gain ground. Two key figures in the reappropriation of space in social theory were Lefebvre and Foucault (Soja, 2009, p. 18). One can thus argue that the spatial turn has French origins. Jameson (1992, p. 154) suggests this "spatial turn" can be conceived as a phenomenon to separate modernism and postmodernism in that the spatial is strongly associated with postmodernism. The interdisciplinarity of spatial emphasis ranges from geography to architecture and urban studies, and from literature to art. In addition, there has been a shift in the understanding of space, from something neutral, empty, and given to something politicized, filled with relations, and socially constructed.

As globalization is considered mainly a spatial phenomenon, studies on globalization bring space back into the debate. Even globalization is considered "the ascendancy of the spatial over the temporal" (Dirlik, 2000, p. 6). Today, as McLuhan and Powers (1989) once famously described it, the world is becoming a "global village", with concepts of spatialization, spatial imaginary, space, location, globe, and scale more popular than ever. As Foucault (1986, p. 22) once prophesized, "the present epoch will perhaps be above all the epoch of space."

Marxism too has experienced its spatial turn in Marxist theory. Marxism, being called historical materialism, gives unparalleled importance to history. The impact of Hegel as a philosopher of history on Marx was crucial (see Avineri, 1967). Karl Popper (1964, p. 3) accused Marxism of a sort of historicism by committing the "crime" of claiming discovery of the laws of history. Thus,

the concept of history has always been privileged in Marxist theory. Marx himself “gave priority to time over space” (Harvey, 1985, p. xiii). Hence, it is common to accuse Marxism of ignoring space and geography compared to its great interest in time and history. Similarly, it also has been suggested that Marxism has one-sidedly focused on historically-specific contingent process, while lacking a “geographical sensibility” (Smith, 2008, p. 2–3).

This absence has motivated some Marxist theoreticians to incorporate place and geography into Marxist theory. Probably the most influential are Henri Lefebvre and David Harvey. Both, have strived to recreate space and geography as constitutive categories of social formations. As Giddens (1981, p. 30) argues, time-space relations are “constitutive features of social systems.” Similarly, Harvey (1985, p. xiv) claims that “historical materialism has to be upgraded, therefore, to historical-geographical materialism.”

To this end, Harvey has developed many conceptual apparatuses to explain the temporality and spatiality of the capitalist mode of production. One such concept, spatio-temporal fixes refers to the reorganization of the temporal and spatial characteristics of capital flow. Another Marxist theoretician, Bob Jessop, who is also dissatisfied with the lack of a coherent Marxist analysis of spatial politics, has also adopted the concept of spatio-temporal fixes. However, his interpretation differs from Harvey’s. While Harvey espoused a value-theoretical approach to the concept, Jessop argues for a more socio-politicized version.

This study discusses David Harvey’s concept of spatio-temporal fixes and its critique by Bob Jessop. The main argument is that despite its major theoretical value, the concept suffers from a value-theoretical approach that underplays the role of socio-political process in fabricating spatio-temporal fixes. Therefore, the development of a more socio-politicized version of the concept is necessary. The first section deals with Harvey’s methodology. The second, introduces the concept of spatial-fixes. The third, presents the conceptualization of time-space compression. The fourth, discusses the concept of spatio-temporal fix. The final section presents the main points of Jessop’s criticism.

David Harvey: Theoretician of Space

David Harvey is one of the world’s most prominent Marxist scholars. As a Marxist geographer, he has contributed immensely to Marxist theory over the last 50 years in a similar direction as Henry Lefebvre did in the 1960s. In doing

so, he has incorporated both space and geography, the production of space, and urban studies in general.

Harvey's methodology privileges dialectics and the approach of internal relations as the Marx's own approach. Marx analyzed capitalism through dialectics. Dialectics, coming from the Ancient Greek via Hegel's mediation and reinterpretation, refers to change, flow, dynamism, negation, process, and contradictions. Marx appropriated the Hegelian version of the dialectic and applied it as a philosophical/conceptual tool to understanding the flow of capital. Mainly through reading *Das Kapital*, Harvey adopted the method of dialectics to understand the movements of modern capital. He constantly highlights that capital is in a constant flux and is inherently contradictory.

Another important insight in Harvey's method is the philosophy of internal relations, popularized by Bertell Ollman in *Alienation* and *Dance of the Dialectics*. According to Ollman (1971, 1993), Marx worked with the philosophy of internal relations, which is the view that things are the mere appearances of relations. In other words, things are nothing but the materializations of relations that are intrinsically connected to each other. He claims that this approach is compatible with Marx's (1982, p. 932) famous dictum that "capital is not a thing but a social relation between persons which is mediated through things." Internal relationality also echoes with the Hegelian concept of totality, because moments, stages, and even things are interconnected and constitute a whole. Similarly, a relationist theoretician, Bhaskar (1998, p. 31) also argues that the subject-matter of social enquiry (and sociology) should be relations: relations "between capitalist and worker, MP and constituent, student and teacher, husband and wife." One might therefore place Harvey into this relational camp.

Harvey's method is also heavily influenced by Marx's political economy approach. Accordingly, his intellectual project mainly revolves around *Das Kapital*, with occasional insights from *Grundrisse*. It might be called a *Das Kapital*-centered approach. One could also claim that Harvey's approach is characterized by its lack of attention to Marx's other significant books, such as *The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850* and the *18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, which are one of the first political sociology books. In Harvey's account, the independent variable is capital and its numerous courses of action. He is primarily occupied with the circulation, valorization, devalorization and revalorization of capital by the spatial and temporal reorganizations of social reality.

Spatial Fixes

Harvey introduces the concept of spatial fix developed along a Hegelian-Marxist conception of colonization. Hegel (1991) in *Outlines of Philosophy of Right*, states that capitalism is inherently contradictory. On the one hand, it creates unprecedented wealth for some. On the other hand, it produces poverty for many with no solution whatsoever. Although, there is an overproduction problem in bourgeois civil society, it fails to prevent poverty. This “inner dialectic of society”, which leads capital to seek other consumers, is the root of colonization to provide new markets and spaces for industrial activity (Hegel, 1991, p. 266–269). Hence, capitalism is destined to expand into colonies, and other new spatial areas.

Partly following Hegel, Harvey argues that individual capitalists invest in technology, because of the class struggle and the pressure of competition. This, in turn, results in overaccumulation. Even though the excess of capital can survive in the forms of commodity, money, productive capacity, and surplus labor power, this process inevitably leads to the devaluation of capital, ultimately causing a crisis. The answer to this crisis is the export of capital for production for it is to be re-valORIZED. In other words, the remedy is the *spatial fix*. For instance, America was a spatial fix for European capitalists, especially the British. However, it is only a temporary solution, since the crisis tendencies are embedded in the logic of capital. In the long term, the inner dialectics of capitalism creates devaluation of capital again, but this time in the spatial-fix. Hence, capital is perpetually searching for new spatial-fixes. Harvey notes that Marx deliberately avoids incorporating questions of foreign trade and of geographical expansion into his theory presented in *Das Kapital* because this would significantly complicate the analysis. Marx’s limited aim was to reveal capitalism’s inner dialectic. The mission to insert politics, especially the politics of imperialism, into the inquiry was undertaken by the next generation of Marxist theoreticians and practitioners such as Bukharin, Lenin, and LuxembourG. Their views concerning imperialism helped fashion a spatial imagination and establish new theoretical links between capitalist exploitation and the spatial fix (Harvey, 1981, p. 7–10).

Time-Space Compression

Harvey went on to introduce or (more exactly) vary, the concepts he uses. One of the most important that he has introduced is *time-space compression*.

The term itself corresponds to the condensation, contraction, or collision of space with time. Harvey first uses the concept to describe the acceleration of time that occurred in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Harvey (1989, p. 240) defines the term as “processes that so revolutionize the objective qualities of space and time that we are forced to alter, sometimes in quite radical ways, how we represent the world to ourselves.” This resonates with the Marx’s (1993, p. 539) claim of the “annihilation of space with time.” In this, Marx highlights the importance of the spatiality of the circulation of capital and also how capital must reduce distances and shorten the time required for the circulation of money-commodity-money. This is thus one of many paradoxes of capital. First, it must expand its market into new spaces. Second, it must accelerate the rhythm of capital’s motion. Consequently, capitalism has so accelerated the rhythm of life that spatial barriers seem to have disappeared while simultaneously creating the feeling that the world has collapsed on individuals. To use McLuhan’s (1989) famous expression, the world has become a “global village” in which not just telecommunication technologies but also economic, social, political and ideological relations have been standardized.

Harvey turns to the case of Europe for examples concerning time-space compression. The Enlightenment Project have radically altered conceptions of time and space. Europe’s feudal world was based on autonomy, meaning that every feudal unit had its own spatial limits vis-à-vis other feudal forces. This resulted in a limited conception of time and space. The renaissance drastically changed temporal and spatial experiences. Geographical discoveries uncovered new continents and transformed the perception of space. According to Harvey, with these discoveries, geographical and cartographic knowledge became profitable and respectable as a crucial mechanism for dominating space. Specifically, geography became privileged knowledge serving colonialism and the accumulation of capital (Harvey, 1989, p. 242–244).

Spatio-Temporal Fix

Having developed the concepts of spatial fix, and time-space compression, Harvey continued to refine his conceptual apparatus. One additional concept is *spatio-temporal fix*, which refers to a relatively simple phenomenon that arises from the dual conditions of surpluses. The first is surplus labor in the form of unemployment; the second is surplus capital in the form of unsold

commodities or inactive productive capacity. These forms of surpluses can be absorbed in three ways: First, the temporal aspect of capital is reordered by turning it into a long-term investment primarily social spending on education or research. Second, surplus capital can be displaced into new spatial areas in search of new markets, resources, and labor-power. Third, they can be amalgamated. In short, spatio-temporal fixes signify a restructuring of the temporal and spatial qualities of capital circulation (Harvey, 2003, p. 108–109).

In Harvey's terms, fix has two meanings. First, it indicates the temporal fixity of the capital. That is, it denotes spatial fixity; a form of spatialization of investments as in the case of healthcare and education, which are both relatively immobile and space-dependent. Second, the spatio-temporal fix is also a metaphor to describe a distinct solution in the form of temporal delay and geographical expansion in response to the recurring crises of capitalism. Geographical expansion entails re-organization, re-ordering, and re-configuration of the division of labor, existing resources, and the prevailing pre-capitalist social and institutional relations. Yet, although capital can be absorbed by new conditions and hence re-valorized for a while, further inaction devalues it once again, so, the whole process must start again. In short, over-accumulated capital must be perpetually in motion (Harvey, 2003, p. 115–116).

This cycle of capital has its own merits and shortcomings when it comes to the giving and receiving countries. Unsold commodities that risk being devalored must find new markets to be sold. These new markets should have the necessary instruments of payment. If not, then they are forced to create new forms of income or given credit or financial support. There are many examples of such actions. The British did this with Argentina in the nineteenth century and Japan did it with the USA in the 1990s. However, excessive financial aid leads to indebtedness, which creates a serious problem for the receiving country. In response, a special organization, the Paris Club was founded to guarantee that debtor countries can repay all their debts. This strategy, based on capital circulation puts the burden of devaluation on the shoulders of receiving countries.

In contrast, export of capital coupled with labor power has different effects. The characteristic example is the colonial transfer of Britain's surplus of labor and capital to the USA, Canada, Australia, and South Africa. Such exports created new centers of capitalist accumulation by constructing a vast infrastructure, including "railroads, highways, ports" (Harvey, 2003, p. 119). Although, it took a long time for these new centers to flourish, they eventually created enough financial resources to buy British goods. Subsequently, these

spatial fixes had to seek new spatial fixes. For instance, Japan, which had benefited a lot from American support after World War II, became a serious financial power in search of financial investments, first in Europe, then the USA, and finally in South Asia and China. During the 1980s South Korea, Taiwan and Singapore followed Japan's path by investing in China as a spatial fix. Since the 1980s both not just South East Asia and South America, including Brazil, Mexico and Chile have provided spatio-temporal fixes for the world's three dominant powers: USA, Japan and the EU.

According to Harvey, the constant creation of new spatio-temporal fixes helps by "switching crises" by directing the flow of capital and its embedded problem of devaluation to new places. Hence, crises became "episodic crises" rather than a crisis of the whole capitalist system itself. One might argue that these spatio-temporal fixes help redistribute the tensions concentrated along the fault lines of capital accumulation by displacing its contradictions elsewhere. Because crises appear in localized forms, it is often argued that local political leaders and/or local structural problems are responsible for these specific crises. This has several implications. First, crises seem accidental rather than systemic. Second, the "Wall street-Treasury-IMF" triad often intervenes in these crises to manipulate them so as to avoid harming finance capital (Harvey, 2003, p. 121-122).

A significant contemporary example of the spatio-temporal fix is China. On the one hand, it absorbs the capital overaccumulation of many countries; on the other hand, this has made it a global power as was the case with the USA in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. China is not only a heaven of cheap labor power but it also has vast numbers of potential consumers. Harvey notes that one of China's specific moves in terms of surplus labor power has been huge infrastructure investments; including dams, subway systems, highways, and railroads. The Summer Olympic games in 2008 also accelerated these investments. However, this wave of huge investments has been supported by borrowing, so if they do not provide a return, then there will be a serious financial crisis (Harvey, 2003, p. 123). Meanwhile, by providing a spatio-temporal fix, China has become an important economic and political power that almost rivals the USA. The recent "tax wars" between Trump's USA and Xi Jinping's China confirms this competition.

Harvey warns us about tensions between various spatio-temporal fixes that each aim to absorb more capital than the others. The weakest link, which cannot compete with other centers of capital accumulation may face financial

crises. This can operationalize the territorial logic of power and lead to potential confrontations in the form of currency, trade, or military wars. Examples in East and South-East Asia, and Russia in 1997-1998 demonstrate such localized crisis of capital devaluation. Harvey suggests that these crises are caused by the dialectic between the political action of state powers and territorial logic and “molecular processes of capital accumulation and the capitalistic logic” (Harvey, 2003, p. 124).

Jessop’s Criticisms of Harvey

Another important contemporary Marxist theoretician is Bob Jessop, who worked extensively on Marxist state theory since the 1980’s and made important contributions to the subject. While Jessop (2006, p. 142) acknowledges the contributions of Harvey to Marxist theory, he criticizes him on “ontological, epistemological, methodological and substantive” points. Jessop salutes Harvey’s contributions, especially his emphasis on space and his immense efforts to incorporate space and geography into historical materialism. However, Jessop does not avoid criticizing Harvey, especially regarding his capital-centered, “value-theoretical” approach.

Jessop’s first criticism is methodological one. While Harvey explains his commitment to Marx’s dialectical method and to his reasoning from abstract-simple to complex-concrete, Jessop believes his theorization is far from complete. Another problem here is Harvey’s use of the philosophy of internal relations. While Jessop acknowledges its heuristic value, he disagrees with employing it as an all-purpose method of enquiry for specific mechanisms and domains. Jessop claims that while Harvey avoids such risks when focusing on the economic moments of social life, he fails to do so when it comes to the “extra-economic aspects” of capital relation when he returns to a “general ontology” of internal relations while ignoring the specific mechanisms explaining the causal links between capital relations and social complexity (Jessop, 2006, p. 142–145).

Second, Jessop criticizes the way in which Harvey uses the concept of “territorial logic of power.” Harvey’s account of territorial logic is clearly overdetermined by capital logic and lacks a defined and theorized concept of power. Furthermore, it is unclear how the two logics are articulated. While the state arises from the territorial logic of political, diplomatic, and military power; the logic of capital derives from the spatiality of capital’s circulation. Jessop (2006, p. 157) claims that Harvey’s recent efforts to insert the territorial logic

of power into the analysis is “underdeveloped” and “pre-theoretical.” Although Harvey has made some remarks about not prioritizing one logic over the other, and keeping the two logics separate yet dialectically related, his analysis ultimately gives analytical primacy to the capitalist logic of power. Jessop’s suggestion to Harvey is to merge his value-theoretical concerns regarding spatial fixes and spatio-temporal fixes with more “concrete-complex state-theoretical” concerns to be able to understand, for example, why globalization is resisted by various territorial powers and nation states (Jessop, 2006, p. 157–160).

Third, Harvey most considers spatial fixes and temporal fixes separately. When he brings them together, they barely interact remaining largely unconnected. While spatial fixes are mostly used to displace and defer the contradictions generated by temporal fixes, it seems that the latter have no such function when it comes to the contradictions fashioned by spatial fixes. Jessop, however, proposes to investigate the various roles played by both spatial and temporal fixes in relocating and postponing the contradictions caused by spatio-temporal fixes. Jessop asserts that the credit mechanism, which Harvey considers part of capital’s temporality, is also a spatial phenomenon directly connected to the exchange difference between nation-states, which itself is a result of spatial barriers (Jessop, 2006, p. 160).

Fourth, Jessop views Harvey’s approach to spatial fixes as one-dimensional in that it concentrates solely on one type of contradiction in capital relation. He mainly focuses only on the de-valorization of productive capital that, is subsequently transformed into long-term infrastructural investments. This emphasis understates other contradictions because capital is also an “object of regulation”(see Jessop, 2002, p. 18–22). This implies that since the capital relation cannot reproduce itself, it depends on non-economic interventions and regulations, which are mostly achieved through political struggles. Another point is that, according to Harvey, spatial fixes are solutions to cyclical crisis of capital relations. However, Jessop (2006, p. 160–161) notes that even the “normal” times of capital movements have their own spatio-temporal contradictions. Thus, one should analyze not only crisis moments but also the normal cycle of capital movement.

Fifth, Harvey’s account of temporal and spatial fixes is predominantly value-theoretical. Although he remains committed to the philosophy of internal relations, his concerns about extra-economic categories only become explicit when he deals with concrete historical examples. Jessop (2006, p. 161)

claims that Harvey misses the fact that economic laws themselves are political. As Jessop remarks, even basic economic categories, such as “commodity, money, exchange, wage, capital”, owe their very existence to the capitalist state and politics. The state itself is thus ontologically involved in forming these categories and giving them a juridico-political shape. This implies that politics are inevitable in any capitalist formation that is politically organized by the modern capitalist state (Poulantzas, 2000) since the economy cannot reproduce itself just by self-reference. Jessop claims that the inability of capital to reproduce itself has three interrelated aspects. First, capital is innately limited by the fictitious character of land, money, and labor-power, and reliant on non-commodified social relations. Second, the capital relation itself suffers from intrinsic “structural contradictions and strategic dilemmas.” Third, it is an open question how these contradictions and dilemmas can be governed or regularized, and to what extent spatial, temporal, and/or spatio-temporal fixes can achieve the circuit of capital and its relation to the broader capitalist social formation (Jessop, 2006, p. 161–162).

At this point, Jessop refers to the Regulation School by evoking the concepts of “accumulation regimes” and “modes of regulation.” This indicates the inadequacy of a purely value-theoretical approach based on the circulation of capital. It also highlights its complex articulations with non-economic and non-commodified social relations. This criticism suggests a new interpretation of spatio-temporal fixes:

A spatio-temporal fix resolves, partially and provisionally at best, the contradictions and dilemmas inherent in capitalism by establishing spatial and temporal boundaries within which a relatively durable pattern of ‘structured coherence’ can be secured and by shifting certain costs of securing this coherence beyond these spatial and temporal boundaries (Jessop, 2006, p. 162).

Such a reading allows the concept of spatio-temporal fix to be applied to various socio-ontological areas such as economic and political (extra-economic), and different scales, such as local, national and international. Harvey’s shortcoming is that he lacks an equally deep and sophisticated analysis of extra-economic moments of social totality. For example, the School of Regulation deals with the social modes of organization of capitalism since capitalism cannot reproduce itself. Jessop’s criticism concentrates on the point that the value-theoretical analysis of capital (circulation) is one dimensional

and needs further width and depth for analyzing the social modes of the regulation of capital(ism) (Jessop, 2006, p. 163).

While Harvey seems to limit spatio-temporal fixes to analyzing the value-theoretical circulation of capital, one might expand their use to the socio-political (re)organization of the capital relation. Jessop (2006, p. 164) therefore suggests inserting “place- based social relations, the built environment, land markets, the rural- urban division of labour, urban hierarchies, locational policies, the territorialization of political power.” The crucial point is that spatio-temporal fixes are both economic and political and they help to dislocate, delay, and resolve the crisis-tendencies. Spatio-temporal fixes are also strategically selective. That is, each specific form of spatio-temporal fix reinforces some social forces while weakening others. For instance, the Keynesian Welfare National State (KWNS) Model involves a particular spatio-temporal fix and various forms of spatial and temporal imaginaries. The longtermness of industrial capital and industrial investments have had a crucial impact on the organization of societalization and class struggles. Furthermore, as feminists often emphasize, the KWNS was based on the view that the male, the father, was the breadwinner while the female, the mother was the housewife. The stability of longtermnesses meant security for the future and the family, which in turn strengthened the males within the family.

Conclusion

Overall, social theory, has privileged time over space. Only recently, due partly to globalization, has interest grown in the theory of space and spatiality of the social complex. Given that history is its primary object of inquiry, Marxism has also been insensitive, at best, to the spatiality of social phenomena. Motivated by the lack of a refined conceptualization of space in social theory in general and Marxism in particular, David Harvey has dedicated himself to the problematic of the capitalist (re)production of space-time.

His contributions to critical geography, Marxism, and urban studies are arguably beyond comparison. Embracing a Marxist political economy approach and relational methodology, Harvey has insisted that capital is a mode of relation having its own inherent contradictions and limits that determine its spatiality and temporality. In Harvey’s account, capital is in an endless cycle of valorization, de-valorization and re-valorization. Thus, his approach is value-theoretical in the sense that it focuses on capital’s cyclical

movements to remain valuable. This suggests crises are caused by de-valorization of capital under certain temporal and spatial conditions. Therefore, to revalorize itself, capital has to modify these temporal and spatial configurations through various means, such as infrastructural investments or financial debts.

Within this perspective, Harvey has developed many concepts such as the spatial fix, time-space compression, and spatio-temporal fix, all of which are directly related to the temporal and spatial restructuring of the movement of capital. While spatial fix refers to colonialism, echoing Hegel's concept of the "inner dialectic" of bourgeois-civil society, time-space compression refers to the acceleration in time's rhythm due to the elimination spatial walls. Another concept that Harvey has developed is the spatio-temporal fix, which is related to surpluses of labor and capital. Unabsorbed surpluses cause de-valorization of capital. Thus, either surplus of labor or capital must be used either to finance long-term investments, such as social assistance, schooling and research, relocated to new spatial areas to find new markets, resources, and labor-power. Therefore, the concept of spatio-temporal fixes describes a particular solution to the continual crisis of capital movement in the form of temporal and spatial reordering.

Bob Jessop, another leading Marxist theoretician, acknowledges Harvey's valuable contributions, especially regarding the spatiality of capitalism. However, he also criticizes his approach. Jessop's first criticism is methodological. Although the philosophy of internal relations and a relational methodology have their own merits, "a general ontology" of internal relations risks ignoring the specific mechanisms and domains, especially regarding the relation between the economic and the non-economic.

Jessop's second criticism concerns the relation between two concepts from Harvey's repertoire: "capital logic" and the "territorial logic of power." Harvey ignores his own advice to avoid prioritizing one logic over the other, given that his focus is disproportionally on capital logic, while the territorial logic of power is mainly absent from his analyses. The lack of a proper conceptualization of politics and state power weakens his approach.

Jessop's third criticism is that Harvey applies temporal and spatial fixes disjointedly, and that he concentrates on the restructuring of spatial fixes due to the contradictions created by temporal fixes rather than the other way around. In contrast, Jessop claims that even the credit mechanism, which seems a purely temporal phenomenon, has a spatial context. One should

therefore operationalize temporal and spatial fixes jointly and pay equal attention to both.

Fourth, Harvey's particular interest is in de-valorization within capital circulation. However, this viewpoint misses the character of capital as an "object of regulation." That is, capital cannot self-valorize; rather its re-valorization is the consequence of struggles between various socio-political powers. Thus, politics is inevitably involved in the movements of capital. Thus rather than a single, and essential logic of capital, there are various, competing socio-political logics on how to regulate the capital movement.

Fifth, Harvey's approach to spatio-temporal fixes is chiefly value-theoretical. According to Jessop, Harvey therefore overlooks the political character of economic categories, such as "commodity, money, exchange, wage, capital." The state is also organically existent in the formation of these categories. Harvey lacks a refined theory of politics and the state. His overemphasis on the logic, dialectics, and inner contradictions of capital downplays the role of politics, class struggles, and the state.

Ultimately, one cannot downplay the importance of Harvey's enormous contributions to social theory just by drawing attention to a balanced analysis that calls for equal weight the extra-economic, mainly socio-political analysis. Clearly, a political sociology of space and time is required to explain the capitalist production of space and time. This paper argues for a *politicized*-but not *politicianist*-approach to spatio-temporal fixes. The suggestion is to focus on socio-political actors in struggles over different spatial and temporal interests and imaginations. This would include politics and the state in the analysis. Spatio-temporal fixes are not the direct results of capital's inherently contradictory movement; rather it is the product of strategically important actors' socio-political struggles. One can apply such an approach to addressing macro political economy issues such as globalization, international and national accumulation strategies, governance of financial or ecological crises or micro political economy issues from gentrification to large scale national infrastructure or construction projects. Such examples can be easily multiplied. That being said, it is impossible to develop such a socio-politically oriented approach without critically engaging with Harvey's theoretical contributions.

Kaynakça/References

Avineri, S. (1967). The Hegelian origins of Marx's political thought. *The Review of Metaphysics*, 33–56.

- Bhaskar, R. (1998). *The possibility of naturalism: a philosophical critique of the contemporary human sciences: Critical Realism—Interventions*. New York: Routledge.
- Dirlik, A. (2000). Globalization as the end and the beginning of history: The contradictory implications of a new paradigm. *Rethinking Marxism*, 12(4), 4–22.
- Foucault, M. (1980). Questions on geography. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews & other writings* (p. 63–77). Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1986). Of other spaces (J. Miskowiec, Trans.). *Diacritics*, 16(1), 22–27.
- Giddens, A. (1981). *A contemporary critique of historical materialism*. University of California Press.
- Harvey, D. (1981). The spatial fix—Hegel, von Thunen, and Marx. *Antipode*, 13(3), 1–12.
- Harvey, D. (1985). *Consciousness and the urban experience*. Basil Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The condition of postmodernity: an enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (2003). *The new imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1991). *Elements of the philosophy of right* (A. W. Wood, Ed.; H. B. Nisbet, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.
- Jameson, F. (1992). *Postmodernism, or, the cultural logic of late capitalism*. Verso.
- Jessop, B. (2002). *The future of the capitalist state*. Polity.
- Jessop, B. (2006). Spatial fixes, temporal fixes and spatio-temporal fixes. In N. Castree and D. Gregory (Eds.), *David Harvey: A critical reader* (p. 142–166). Blackwell Publishing.
- Marx, K. (1982). *Capital: Volume 1: A critique of political economy* (B. Fowkes, Trans.; Reprint Edition). Penguin Classics.
- Marx, K. (1993). *Grundrisse* (M. Nicolaus, Trans.). Penguin Books.
- Mcluhan, M., and Powers, B. R. (1989). *The global village: Transformations in world life and media in the 21st century*. Oxford University Press.
- Ollmann, B. (1971). *Alienation: Marx's conception of man in capitalist society*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ollmann, B. (1993). *Dialectical investigations*. Routledge.
- Popper, K. (1964). *Poverty of historicism*. Harper Torchbooks.
- Poulantzas, N. (2000). *State, power, socialism*. Verso.
- Smith, N. (2008). *Uneven development: Nature, capital and the production of space* (3rd ed.). The University of Georgia Press.
- Soja, E. W. (1989). *Postmodern geographies: The reassertion of space in critical social theory*. Verso.
- Soja, E. W. (2009). Taking space personally. In B. Warf & S. Arias (Eds.), *The spatial turn interdisciplinary perspectives* (p. 11–35). Routledge.