

love: an intention for space

- A love : context
- B love : interplay
- C love : creative energy
- D love : transformative force
- E love : intention

A

|

love : context

"L'amour
accompagne la
modernité."

— Eva Illouz

"Really being in
love means really
wanting to live in a
different world."

— Raoul Vaneigem

Love is a mess. Defined subjectively at every moment, changing from individual to individual and from culture to culture, it glows through its ambiguity and its strength. Even though love has never been fully ignored, its ambiguous nature led, historically, to its consideration for academic inquiry as either "too elusive" (Weis, 2006), or "[...] too emotional for social scientist to take it seriously, [...] a subjective field with unprovable assumptions" (Ackerman, 1995) — a disinclination that do not commonly find its way in the study of other intangible topics. The ambiguity of fear, for instance, which has led to an array of studies on violence and hatred, has steered political projects (Ball, 2016) and influenced our understanding of social relations, (Tudor, 2003) pervading essentially all branches of research. A deep rooted analogy exemplified in Nicole Hochner's demonstration of the political misreading of Machiavelli's work, of whom, she argues, we've ignored the loveful dimension. (Hochner, 2014)

While these reluctances still characterise the situation, a transformative shift is underway and has now affected most of the social and natural sciences. Identified as the *affective turn* by sociologist Patricia Clough in 2007, it outlines the growing and novel enthusiasm given to emotions in the field of social sciences from the end of the 1990s onwards. (Clough, 2007) What was then being avoided, shattered, censored or ridiculed on the grounds of their inclusion of emotion — such as love — is now progressively finding its way towards acceptance as valid academic material. Although most fields of studies have started to deepen their understanding of the notion and began to consider it as relevant study matter, three major conditions in the context of research on love still perdure.

Firstly, while being crucial and deeply valuable, most researches done on the subject have either focussed, according to anthropologist Diane Ackerman, on "[...] what happens when love is deficient, thwarted, warped, or absent rather than love per se [...]" (Ackerman, 1995) or have localised the scope of their investigation to marginalised manifestation of love, such as homosexual and queer love, leaving other facets of love, such as heterosexual love, as, virtually, an academically avoided topic. (Johnson, 2012) Secondly, the tendency of researchers to shred the notion into either fragmenting translations or antique renditions led the academia into endless beating sessions around the bush. (Jónasdóttir, 2015) A portrayal of love's ambiguous nature into translated terms such as desire, romance, care, sexuality, respect, intimacy or the symptomatic greek cry invoking the soothing *eros*, *philia* and *agape* that can still be perceived in the work of Sean Chabot (2008) or Maija Lanas (2014) for example. Ackerman illustrates this diffracting propensity by comparing love to white light and our subjectivity to a prism. The whole gamut of feelings coming from various kinds of situations (friendship, self appreciation, parenting, romantic relations, spirituality, patriotism, etc.), is developed from a *precisely fuzzy* energy, maladroitly bundled up and that "[a]s a society, we are embarrassed by. We treat it as an obscenity". (Ackerman, 1995) And thirdly, the extensive

HOW COULD
A CONCEPT,
EMERGING IN
ACADEMIC
BRANCHES SO
TIGHTLY LINKED
TO SPATIAL
PRACTICES,
BE STILL
CONSIDERED
ANECDOTAL IN
THE DISCIPLINE
AFTER
DECADES OF
DEVELOPMENTS?

void that exists and persists between the cultural understanding of love and its sparse academic literature led its dialectical nature — between an intimate emotion and an abstract philosophical concept — as a still essentially unexplored notion within social and natural sciences. (hooks,2000) (Due, 2013) (Hochner,2014)

While we could compare this still prevalent academic reticence to taboos previously associated to sexuality (Blum, 2005), love, as a subject, is now erupting in academia, exemplifying Foucault's *insurrection of subjugated knowledges*. What has been dubbed the field of "love studies" (Ferguson & Jónasdóttir, 2015) appears to be studying "[...] a whole set of knowledges that have been disqualified as inadequate to their task or insufficiently elaborated: naïve knowledges, located low down on the hierarchy, beneath the required level of cognition or scientificity" (Foucault, 1980) and that it is through "[...] the reemergence of these low-ranking knowledges, these unqualified, even directly disqualified knowledges [...] that criticism performs its work [...]. To emancipate [them] from that subjection [is] to render them [...] capable of opposition and of struggle." (Foucault, 1980) Although that said insurrection has started to pervade many disciplines, most notoriously in the field of politics, sociology and psychology, it is its near absence, in the field of architecture and urban studies, that is the motive behind the current text. *How could a concept, emerging in academic branches so tightly linked to spatial practices, be still considered anecdotal in the discipline after decades of developments?*

While being limited and scattered across disciplines and time, philosopher Anna G. Jónasdóttir categorises the literature on the subject of love as responding to two different modes of approach. On one hand, she indicates that part of the texts exposes it as a site of tensions reflective of more profound forces. Love, in this case, is seen as a metonymical embodiment, a by-product, of deep-rooted social disturbances. A trend exemplified by the *affective turn* of 20th-century social thinkers such as Giddens (*The transformation of Intimacy*), Luhmann (*Love as passion*), Baumann (*Liquid Love*) or Beck (*The Normal Chaos of Love*) and followed by the work of sociologist Eva Illouz (*Why Love hurts, Consuming the romantic Utopia, Cold Intimacies*). It identifies, in various ways, the changing architecture of love and how "[...] [love] contains and condenses the institutions of modernity" (Illouz, 2013) — an angle that could be summarised in Illouz' concise words: "*L'amour accompagne la modernité.*" (*Love accompanies modernity*) (Illouz, 2020; my translation). On the other hand, the second mode of approaching love in literature, according to Jónasdóttir, is in its consideration, not as an epiphenomenon of other social forces, but as an inherently creative, transformative and productive energy that carries in itself the potential to amend contexts positively. An intention that has been described, in the words of many thinkers of many disciplines, (Fromm, 1957) (Alberoni, 1979) (Irigaray, 2004) (Vaneigem, 2010) (Hardt & Negri, 2011) as a missing key in the process of unlocking the dormant potencies for the formulation of positive alternate realities,

"[prompting] to think critically about love in its entire multisensory, lived, embodied, felt and contradictory guises. [...] for developing critically some of the spatial, relational and political dimensions of love." — Morrison, Johnston and Longhurst

an angle epitomised in the resonant situationist phrase: "Really being in love means really wanting to live in a different world". (Vaneigem, 1967)

It is under these two perspectives that the current text exposes the notion of love, like a Möbius strip flipping upon itself: drawing from its relational nature the dialogical creative power of love and its implications for spatial practices. It is *because* love has been described as *the stage of explicitly modern issues* and as a *radical and generative force* within other branches of inquiry that it arises as pertinent to call for its consideration within architecture and urban studies. Love as a theme that geographers were *urging* researchers to consider in 2012, prompting them to "[...] *think critically about love in its entire multisensory, lived, embodied, felt and contradictory guises. [...] for developing critically some of the spatial, relational and political dimensions of love.*" (Morrison, Johnston & Longhurst, 2012)

Why should architecture and urban studies continue to leave aside a notion with such apparently salient relevance? It seems indeed preposterous that the sphere of spatial practices hasn't yet fully embraced a blossoming academic subject that is being described by a growing number of thinkers as (1) a movement (Stark, 2017), inherently creative, intrinsically curious (Deleuze & Guattari, 1972) (2) fundamentally relational (Jackson, 2015), a translating intersubjective agent (Majewska, 2015), a powerful factor in the emancipation of our singularities (Hardt & Negri, 2005) and (3) a transformative force (Badiou, 2013), an imminent political motor for civic life (Hochner, 2014), a help to inform alternate social imaginaries. (Davis & Sarlin, 2011) Triggered by the blatant indifference towards a concept loaded with resonances for the field of spatial studies, we'll attempt, and this is the intention and thesis of the current essay, to lay out and expand the current research tendencies on the subject and seek to portray love as a valid and potent ontology for the field of urban studies and architectural production.

It is worth noting that the collation of the topic of love and architecture is not fully unprecedented. It found precedence in three phenomenological explorations that arise as secluded conceptual islands within the field. Perez-Gomez, in *Built Upon Love* drew a portrait, in a thick and opaque use of language, of his understanding of love as sitting at the intersection of poetics and ethics. He argues, with historical evidence that "true" architecture has been — and will always — stand in the overlaps between "[...] *the architect's wish to design a beautiful world and architecture's imperative to provide a better place for society.*" (Krell, 1997) An interstitial space he identifies as generated by love. David Krell, in an equally impervious articulation, draws on the work of Merleau-Ponty, Heidegger and Bataille to portray an alternate view of Architecture — which he fashions as *Archeticture* — arguing for its possible etymological descent from the Greek verb *tiktein*, meaning "to love" or "to reproduce", and questions the determination that the discipline places towards technology at the expense of its relation to alterity and affects. Finally, Andrea Wheeler carried a thorough analysis of the possible

CONSIDERING
 LOVE IN ITS
 AFFINITY WITH
 SPACE IS THE
 PROCESS OF
 MAKING ROOM
 FOR THE
 CONSTRUCTION
 OF AN
 IMAGINATION
 BUILT UPON ITS
 RELATIONSHIP
 WITH OTHERS:
 A CATHARTIC
 IMAGERY
 THOUGHTFUL OF
 OUR ENMESHED
 REALITIES.

paths to include the thoughts on love and sexual differences of the post-structuralist thinker Luce Irigaray into architectural production. What still stands today as the clearest and most precise endeavour of an introduction of love as a concept into architecture asks how can the field "[...]respond to and initiate modes of living that recognise a feminine subjectivity and hence a radical sexual difference allowing two subjectivities." (Wheeler, 2002)

Given the sparsity of the available literature, the current text will draw upon a wide variety of sources, from various disciplines and periods, from which three modes of approach will be expressed in the consideration of their potency and relevance for architecture and urban studies. Deliberately avoiding its full translation into subspecific terms, we'll undertake to embrace love's ambiguity and strength firstly, in its visualisation as a form of interplay pictured through the work of psychotherapist Donald Winnicott; secondly, through its affective energy as a creative force as outlined by Deleuze and Guattari; and thirdly, as a transformative force, drawing networks from leftist thinkers such as Peter Kropotkin, Raoul Vaneigem, Srečko Horvat, Ann Ferguson, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri. Presenting this curated spectrum of views, on the topic of love, will allow to unfold a broader welcome of the notion in its potential relation to spatial practices. A process through which we will argue that considering love in its affinity with space is the process of *making room* for the *construction of an imagination* built upon its *relationship with others*: a cathartic imagery thoughtful of our enmeshed realities.

B

|

love : interplay

BY WELCOMING
LOVE AS A
DRIVE FOR THE
FORMULATION
OF NEW
IMAGERIES
FOR OUR BUILT
ENVIRONNENT,
WE MIGHT SET
IN MOTION THE
EXPANSION
OF A SPATIAL
LANGUAGE
CONSIDERATE
OF OTHERS
AND THEIR
DIFFERENCES.

"In the beginning is relation." Martin Buber, *I and Thou* (1923)

Keeping cognition and bodily sensations aside, love dwells in human beings through something broader than emotionality, expanding its existence from a passive ideology to an active and interactive verb anchored in the present. Exemplified in the work of Donald Winnicott, a psychoanalyst who dedicated most of his scholarship to developmental psychology, an image of love as *"subtle interplay"* (Winnicott, 1971) — how he phrases it — widens our understanding of the concept on its fundamental relation to alterity.

Deriving his theory on his observance of play in early childhood, Winnicott suggests that our reach to the outward — to the other — builds on a progressive adaptation to the frustration of neediness, and the giving up of our omnipotent attitude. Through that process, and the gradual discardment of narcissism, we develop, in the words of Martha Nussbaum's reading of Winnicott, *"[...]the capacity to be alone in the presence of others, [...]to respond to subtle cues with an appropriate reaction; to imagine what the other intends and feels; [...]a way to explore the world of human possibilities"* (Nussbaum, 2015). In other words, we learn to play. It is in this learned ability to be subjectively ourselves amongst others that Winnicott grounds his understanding of love while arguing that all forms of love are in effect a variation on that notion of *"subtle interplay"*. (Winnicott, 2018) That it is through the dynamic conception of a *"potential space"* that we sustain the negotiation of the tensions of our social relations. A space where *"[...]roles and options can be tried out, [...], an intermediate area, rich in enjoyment, [...]neither private internal experience nor pure external reality, [...]a realm of unreality that is peopled with stories that enact hypothetical possibilities."* (Nussbaum, 2015)

That potential space of play appears then as an expansion from its presumed infantilised juvenile condition, in a similar fashion as love is being broaden from its secluded feminised position. (Cancian, 1986) Anthropologist David Graeber would argue that both notion are actually reclaimed from a dismantled view of social Darwinism (Graeber, 2013) and Martha Nussbaum would advance that their exclusion is the product of human anthropodenial — *"the implicit denial (on the part of humans) that we are really animals"*. (Nussbaum, 2008) In any case, the detachment of this idea of a *"real man"* (Nussbaum, 2008) — a non-animal rational masculine selfish adult entity — from playful notions, such as love, conceivably distances human beings from the possibility of imagining potentials spaces with a relational dimension. In other words, by welcoming love as a drive for the formulation of new imageries for our built environnent, we might set in motion the expansion of a spatial language considerate of others and their differences — a forward looking space outside misogynistic, egocentric, anthropocentric, ageist and over-rationalised conceptions. A thought with which Max Weber might not have disagreed: *"The lover realizes himself to be rooted in the kernel of the truly living, which is eternaly inaccessible to any rational endeavour. He knows himself to be freed from the cold*

LOVE MAKES THE IMPOSSIBLE POSSIBLE BY SETTING UP THE PROCESS FOR PROSPECTIVE WORLDS TO COME INTO BEING.

skeleton hands of rational orders, just as completely as from the banality of everyday routine." (Weber cited in Sica, 1988)

Such image grants love of a translational character and resonates with the thoughts and words of thinkers who presented love as an inter-subjective connection. A dynamic force that supports the acknowledgement and celebration of our singularities and differences through an *in-between* — a heterotopic landscape with a relational dimension. The *I love to you* of Luce Irigaray, the *Interaction of singularities* of Hannah Arendt or the *I and thou* of Martin Buber all portray an illustration of love as a fertile imaginary grounded in the development of a mutuality; a middle-ground for the articulation of prospective alternatives in our relation to — and with — others. In the words of Andrea Wheeler in her architectural reading of Irigaray's work, love (in architecture) as a "[...] *third language [...] which unfolds between two modes of speaking; a language we still do not know, and is yet to be created.*" (Wheeler, 2005)

Not far from Robert Park's description of the city as a relation between *spatial patterns and moral orders*, (Park, 1967) Louis Marin's sense of utopics as a form of *spatial play* echoes the playful idea of love mentioned above. Pictured as a description of dynamic *potential spaces* as arenas of experimentation for possibilities regarding our social relations, Marin's spatial play, extends our understanding of forward-looking spatial thinking by indicating that "[...] *it is between them, in the separation it fills out by its imaginary presence*" (Marin, 2016) that we find ground for inspiration for alternate social relations. Equally, reflecting Karatani's views on architecture as "[...] *a game where we play and make up the rules as we go along [...]*" (Karatani, 2001), the perpetually evolving and changing networks of alternatives as portrayed in David Harvey's *Spaces of Hope*, "[...] *a dialectical utopianism [...] rooted in our present possibilities at the same time as it points towards different trajectories*" (Harvey, 2000) shows a view of architectural and urban thinking as a relational interplay residing at the intersection of hope, desire and memory. An image similar to Balzac's view on love where "[...] *made evident to him by love as it was by the abundance of his imagination. [...] the poet expresses nature in images to which he attaches both feelings and thought, and the wings of the latter are attached to his love: he feels and depicts, he acts and mediates, he intensifies his sensations with thought, he triples felicity with aspirations towards the future and memory of the past.*" (Balzac, 1838[2004])

Love, through analogy, arises here as a *potential space in between* our singularities, a *means for shaping potentiality*. In the realm of urban studies, considering love as a form of interplay opens not only the relationship that we maintain towards *potential spaces* but grounds these imagined spaces in their most *relational* dimension. Thinking more loving worlds means thinking more playfully means thinking more open worlds. Love makes the impossible possible by *setting up the process* for prospective worlds to come into being.

C

|

love : creative energy

WHAT IS ARCHITECTURAL THINKING IF NOT A CREATIVE ENERGY INTERTWINED IN ITS RELATION TO THE OTHER?

"To make love is not to make one, or even two, but to make a hundred thousand." [Deleuze and Guattari, L'anti Oedipe \(1972\); my translation](#)

While psychology has discussed up and down the creative potential of love ([Chessick, 1992, 2005](#)) ([Lieberman, 2009](#)) ([Förster, Epstude and Özelsel, 2009](#)), architecture and urban studies kept their distances and barely dared venture close to this topic that conceivably carried within itself the bright capacities of imaginative possibilities. Although we could potentially associate that reluctance to this anthropodenyng tendency mentioned above ([Nussbaum, 2008](#)) or to the very foundation of social sciences in the janus-faced french positivist thinking of August Comte ([Rabot, 2012](#)), we can observe across disciplines, as observed by Anna G. Jónasdóttir, different perspectives that identify the concept as a *"fundamentally significant and [a] unique creative/productive power, able to bring about something new"*. ([Jónasdóttir, 2015](#)) Jónasdóttir points to six conditions that a *lovedful* approach creates including a *"more valid and reliable scientific knowledge"* ([Keller, 1985](#)) ([Jaggar, 1989](#)) ([Rose, 1994](#)) and a *"fundamental role in the evolution of the human species"* ([Lewis, Amini, Lannon, 2001](#)) ([Maturana, 2008](#)), an angle that recalls the perspective of anthropologist Helen Fisher on the subject who considers love as *"fundamental survival instinct"* ([Fisher, 2014](#)) and the *"true mother of invention"* ([Fisher, 2010](#)).

While we can accept or not the rational, cognitive and scientific capacities of love, it is, however, trickier to refute its phenomenological qualities. Whereas descriptions of love find a quasi-infinite amount of diverse renditions in culture, we can set apart a thread of relevant academic conceptions that corroborate with the generative energy we are trying to depict. An image that does not picture love as an unexpected and abrupt epiphany of worldwide interconnect-edness or a brutal flash of truth coming from some cosmic mystical entity, but more as an internal outward-looking elemental productive curiosity. A perspective on love elegantly imaged by Gustave Flaubert in 1856 through Madame Bovary: *"Love, after all, is nothing but a superior curiosity, an appetite for the unknown that is throwing you headfirst in the storm with an open chest."* ([Flaubert, 1856; my translation](#)) While we can read a corresponding view as far as in Socrate's *Symposium* — where some have read his thoughts as *"[...] saying above all else [...] that love makes us explore. Love makes us blaze through new subjects and new cultures; it makes us hatch new visions. And in that way it does, in fact, transcend its human object."* ([Nehring, 2009](#)) — it is however through the words of post-structuralists philosophers that the generative aspect of love finds its most articulate delineation.

Thinkers such as Alain Badiou, Gilles Deleuze (and Guattari) and Luce Irigaray all describe, each in their way, a view of love as a creative energy intertwined in its relation to the other. A point of view worth repeating in the context of the articulation of the relevance of love within spatial practices since: *what is architectural thinking if not a creative energy intertwined in its relation to the other?* We will be emphasising here the work of Deleuze and Guattari for its explicit reference to love as such, for whom *"[t]here is no love which*

"Love, after all,
is nothing but a
superior curiosity,
an appetite for
the unknown that
is throwing you
headfirst in the
storm with an
open chest."

— Balzac

"Love as a way
of learning the
signs of others.
As if they belong
to a world not yet
knowable."

— Hannah Stark

does not begin with the revelation of a possible world as such, enwound in the other which expresses it". (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972)

In his contemporary reading of a Deleuzian conception love, John Provetti highlights the emphatic enlargement of possibilities that love is described as, the producer of "*new bodies, new flows, new affects*" (Provetti, 2002). He underlines it as a form of "*material experimentation*", by pointing to the ambiguity of the word *expérience* in its french form (meaning both experience and experimentation). According to Provetti, love is for Deleuze "[...] *the call to enter that virtual and open up the actual, to install inclusive disjunctions so that the roads not taken are still accessible [...] this creative novelty of connection, this joining of multiplicities [...] complexity yielding novelty [...] experimentation leading to adventure [...]*" (Provetti, 2002). Bridging with the notion of interplay previously considered, love appears in the work of Deleuze as a space *in between*, generator of creative paths, it "[...] *does not have people or things as objects, but whole environments which it traverses, vibrations and flows of all kinds which it marries.*" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972) In her theorisation of Deleuze's views on Love, Hannah Stark echoes Provetti and highlights love in the work of Deleuze as a "*generative movement*", "[...] *a collective practice that [...] intensifies opportunities for new imaginaries, and new ways of learning.*" (Stark, 2012) She contrasts the vision of love as an absolutist truth appeared out of nowhere and defines it through Deleuze as persisting "[...] *only through curiosity, through humility in the face of the unknown, and through the acknowledgement that certain truths will never be disclosed.*" (Stark, 2017)

Even more significantly, we find in the words of Deleuze himself a use language with tectonic resonances where he defines love as "[...] *the very process of creating novel uses for available materials*" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2009) "[...] *a force [...], a virtue that gives and produces, that engineers*" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972) Considering a view of love according to post-structuralist thinkers, who have distanced love from its uncontrollable external force into an internal generative energy anchored in alterity, opens up an understanding of love as a *dialogical imagination process* in the sense advanced by Mikhail Bakhtin (Bakhtin, 1983): a perpetual generator of openness developed through social relations. As extended to urban studies by sociologist Richard Sennett, we could consider love as a "[...] *process of exchange [where] people may become more aware of their own views and expand their understanding of one another.*" (Sennett, 2009)

D

|

love : transformative force

IT IS POSSIBLY IN
THE QUESTION
OF (LOVE AND)
BUILDING WHICH
LIES AT THE
ROOT OF THE
SOCIAL UNREST
(POTENTIAL)
OF TODAY;
ARCHITECTURE,
(LOVE AND)
REVOLUTION.

"A truly revolutionary moment is like love; it is a crack in the world." [The Radicality of Love, Srečko Horvat \(2016\)](#)

Possibly one of the most consequential angle through which we can consider love in its relevance with urban studies is how it has been described in its capacities for transformation. Even though love finds its load of disqualifications within social sciences, this distinctive and recurring motif — its competence in inducing change — emerges within various spheres of research, from which we can build bridges with spatial practices. Although most agree around this recurring theme, the field of love studies has been the theatre of much *"academic anxiety"* [\(York, 2018\)](#) by generating a plurality of opinions pulling the concept omnidirectionally [\(York, 2018\)](#) — faithfully to the ambiguous nature of love. The scope of this essay is not to portray the divergence but to expose a complementary thread across disciplines and time from which urban studies and architecture can weave a mosaic of views as a springboard to draw impelling lessons.

What Nussbaum calls a *"yes"* [\(Nussbaum, 2015\)](#), this unjaundiced and uncynical projection of the self into a realm of possibilities and acceptance, finds, in the thoughts of many authors [\(Alberoni, 1979\)\(hooks, 2000\)\(Vaneigem, 2010\)\(Hardt & Negri, 2011\)\(Badiou, 2013\)\(Horvat, 2016\) \(Han, 2017\) \(Grossi and West, 2018\)](#) to not only be generative of new but also to be generative of different, as an essential productive force for change. While volumes have been appropriately written on the currently critical situation of love in our contemporary societies in relation to its individualisation [\(Illouz, 2013\) \(Badiou, 2013\)\(Toye, 2010\) \(Han, 2017\)](#), its patriarchal historical nature [\(hooks, 2000\)](#), its capitalistic corrupted condition, [\(Bauman, 2003\) \(Evans, 2003\) \(Kipnis, 2009\) \(Han, 2017\) \(Illouz, 2008-20013-2017\)](#) its dominant hegemonic emotional model [\(Blum, 2005\) \(Esteban, 2011\)](#) or its tendency for heteronormative patterns reproduction [\(Jackson, 2006\)\(Ferguson, 2017\) \(Illouz, 2013\) \(Han, 2017\)](#), a line of leftist political thinkers, of which we'll present the ideas of a few, presents a forward-looking and open-ended view of love as a notion to think anew and reconquer from — and within — its impaired state. They stress its importance as a transformational agent of society, an approach that echoes the resounding claim of *l'Enfant Terrible* of modernity: *"Whatever it is that binds families and married couples together, that's not love. That's stupidity or selfishness or fear. Love doesn't exist. Self interest exists, attachment based on personal gain exists, complacency exists. But not love. Love has to be reinvented, that's certain."* [\(Rimbault, 1873\)](#)

In a clear claim in 2015, the political philosopher Srečko Horvat states in a declaration bathed in historical arguments that *"the reinvention of the world without the reinvention of love is not a reinvention at all"* [\(Horvat, 2016\)](#). He reminds us of the enmeshed nature of love and change by bringing about the amorous background of some of the transformational events of the 20th century — like May 68 and the October Revolution. Horvat reiterates the words of others before him, like Friedrich Engels [\(Horvat, 2017\)](#), who have argued similarly that *"[...] the solution is not love or revolution, but love and revolution"* [\(Horvat, 2016\)](#), and theorises that no true change can develop meaningful results without addressing

"Love must become the spatial constitution of the world."

— Antonio Negri

"[...] a revolutionary force that radically breaks with the structure of the social life we know, overthrowing its norms and institutions."

— Micheal Hardt

D love : transformative force

the concept of love directly, or transforming social relations through love. (Horvat, 2017) Horvat's phrasing resonates curiously with Le Corbusier's influential conclusion to *Towards a New Architecture* and indeed, we could paraphrase him and hypothesise that: it is possibly in the question of (love *and*) building which lies at the root of the social unrest (potential) of today; architecture, (love *and*) revolution. What dictators — and totalitarian architects (Dalrymple, 2009) — could only dream to suppress have perdured, resurfaced time and time again. And, what Eva Illouz has called the *magma of revolutionary politics* (Illouz cited in Horvat, 2016) — love and its transformative capacity — could, through an embrace of its spatial dimension, potentially activate the support for prospective social shifts.

While having been criticised for their tight and prescriptive approach (Berlant, 2011) (Hennessy, 2015) (Wilkinson, 2015), one of the firmest accounts for a recaptured force of love in its social dimension has been advocated by the political philosophers Micheal Hardt and Antonio Negri through their influential books *Multitude*, *Empire* and *Commonwealth*. They identify love as "[...] an action, a biopolitical event, planned and realized in common" (Hardt & Negri, 2011), "[...] a revolutionary force that radically breaks with the structure of the social life we know, overthrowing its norms and institutions" (Hardt, 2012), "[...] a producer of new worlds and new subjectivities" (Hardt & Negri, 2011), a "[...] transformative power, something in which we come out different" (Cited in Schwartz, 2009) and calls for a recovering of the concept for grounding the "[...] construction of a new society", "[...] a constructing of constellations among differences, among social differences" (Cited in Schwartz, 2009). Identifying the main deficiency of current social and political thinking as the absence or narrowness of discourse on love (Hardt & Negri, 2011), Hardt and Negri expand our understanding of love beyond the intimate sphere and state, as Horvat has historically identified it, that "[t]o arrive at a political concept of love that recognizes it as centered on [...] the production of social life, we have to break away from most of the contemporary meanings of the term [talking about the isolating nature of the couple and family life], [...] this does not mean you cannot love your spouse, your mother, and your child. It only means that your love does not end there." (Hardt & Negri, 2011). Claims that call to mind Richard Sennett's thesis on the take over of the public life by the polarisation of intimacy (Sennett, 1973) (Sennett, 1977) and distance love from its fluffy associations, recapture it from its corrupted state, let it insurrect as a form of subjugated knowledge (Foucault, 1980) and place it as an able force of resistance *and* creation. Hardt and Negri, the authors of what has been characterised as the "*Communist Manifesto of the 21st Century*" (Žižek, 2010), state openly, and summarise the angle of the current paper: "*Love must become the spatial constitution of the world.*" (Negri, 2004)

Their call is not new and follows a succession of thinkers who have advocated for analogous projects. At the end of the 19th century, the political philosopher Peter Kropotkin, was making a similar move by claiming back from Rousseau's and Böchner's perfect and harmonious view of love as

D love : transformative force

"Le nouveau monde sera amoureux ou ne sera pas."
— Raoul Vaneigem

"The beloved is the product of the imagination. But from an imaginary that is making itself a project, that wants to modify reality to realise and embody itself in the world."
— F. Alberoni

a cosmic force. He portrayed it instead, through his observations of autochthon communities, the animal world and the medieval city, as an intentional collective project for social organisation. ^(Kropotkin, 1902 [2016]) He points to the organisation of guilds in the medieval city and reminds us of a time when "[...] each guild bestowed its love upon the communal" ^(Kropotkin, 1902 [2016]), when love was literally inscribed in construction laws such as in Florence's council texts: "*No works must be begun by the commune, but such as are conceived in response to the grand heart of the commune, composed of the hearts of all citizens, united in one common will.*" ^(Kropotkin, 1902 [2016]). Similarly to the analogy made earlier on play, Kropotkin shows us a recovered notion of love from evolutionary biology and places it as an action — a mutual aid — at the expense of competition as a drive for construction and craftsmanship. An angle that found a few proponents in the 20th century.

In the 1960s, the situationists were making comparable pleas for an architecture built upon "*emotionally moving situations*" ^(Debord, 1957). Their loudest exponent of love, Raoul Vaneigem, stated in a whole book dedicated to the subject that "[t]he new world will be amoureux (in love), or won't be." ^(Vaneigem, 2010; my translation) resonating with the *Theory of Moments* ^(Lefebvre, 1977) of another post-68 thinker, Henri Lefebvre, who claimed that all he has ever written about is love. ^(Cited in Hess, 1988) Likewise, later in Italy, the sociologist Francesco Alberoni was articulating that loving and falling in love is a fundamental process of renewal and reconstruction: the start of a social movement "*for two*". In his words: "*[t]o fall in love does not correspond to the desire to love a beautiful or interesting person; but to the desire to rebuild society, to see the world with new eyes.*" ^(Alberoni, 1979; my translation)

While affects and emotions have been at the core of feminist discussions for a moment, love found itself generally — like in all academic circles — as historically discarded by feminist proponents ^(Nehring, 2009), even at times shattered ^{(Atkinson, 1974)(Evans, 2003)(Kipnis, 2009)}, as a notion. However, more recently, a large and growing group of feminist thinkers from around the world — such as Jónasdóttir, Ferguson, Toye, Grossi, Berlant (to name a few) — came together to discuss and define love in its relation and signification to feminism. Essays in work such as *The Radicalism of Romantic Love* (2018) or *Feminism and the Power of Love* (2018) picture love as an epiphenomenon of deeper social struggles while also emphasising its transformative ^(Fernández, 2017), radical ^(Cleary, 2017), social ^(Hennessy, 2015), relational ^(Jackson, 2015), creative ^(Brogaard, 2017) and political ^(Ferguson, 2017) potencies. Considering love as a transformative force within architectural and urban studies appears as essentially applicable through an angle in line with this dialogical approach made within feminist circles. Exemplified by Ann Ferguson in her essay *Love As a Political Force*, love "[...] can only be radical in a progressive way if it is tied to social justice struggles against all forms of social domination in contemporary society. Social justice activists should see love as a force to be channelled in liberating ways in order to challenge racism and chauvinism of all kinds, patriarchy, heteronormativity and capitalism." ^(Ferguson, 2017)

E

|

love : intention

THIS PAPER
 ATTEMPTED TO
 DO TO LOVE
 WHAT VENTURI
 SCOTT BROWN
 DID TO FUN
 AND WHAT
 KOOLHAAS DID
 TO CYNICISM.

Love was pictured through this text as an intention. Not an aim, not a goal, not a plan, not an objective, but an ambiguous intention. Love is inherently subjective and has as many meanings and variations as there are human beings. It is torn apart between an abstract philosophical concept and an intimately felt body of sensations, which makes it an utterly sensitive topic. It changes from culture to culture and from era to era (Swidler, 2005). It can be applied to almost anything from the love of a rock to the love of a god. For some, it does not have to do with anything (Turner, 1984) and for others it is all you need (Lennon and McCartney, 1967). Renditions of love as an undeniable truth tend to miss the richest part of love which lies in its ambiguous and changing nature, in its plurality of meaning for different individuals with different realities. (George, 1985) However, a picture of love as an intention, that can be chosen, discussed, challenged, altered, or improved shows love as a verb, a means, to be explored.

This paper attempted to do to love what Venturi Scott Brown did to fun and what Koolhaas did to cynicism. Present it as a valid concept, welcome it within architectural and urban thinking and invite the world to play with it: an awakening to a *why not*. Considering (1) the *budding of interest* within almost all branches of inquiry in both social and natural sciences, (2) the *flagrant relevance of the concept* for the field through its creative, transformative and relational capacities and (3) the *love-soaked condition* of all other forms of art, the quasi-dismissal of love as a concept of study within spatial practices appears as absurd and beyond comprehension. An understanding of the causes and roots of this reticence is beyond the scope of this essay but bears, as a process, the potential to enlighten the plausible paths that could lead to the practical way out of this indifference. The intent of the current text was to picture love's validity for architectural production and urban studies which has been realised by drawing bridges with the current relevant overlapping research tendencies within philosophical, sociological, psychological and political conceptions of love. By acknowledging that (social) space is a (social) product (Lefebvre, 1974) and that (social) *love* is a (social) product (Illouz, 2013) — and that no change in our social relations is triggered without change in our relationship to love (Horvat, 2016) — *only through the experimental and ambiguous uncovering process of a spatiality of love, that responds to the shift we want to see happen in our social relations, will we be able to support the blossoming of the transformation of that world we want to live in.*

To conclude, the closest analogy we could make to describe the way that love has been presented here is through a metaphorical collation to a concept fully detached to the current discussion but that carries relevant associations and portrays accurately the ambiguity and verve of the picture we've attempted to depict. An image that goes beyond the knee-jerk pendulumesque dichotomy of rationality and emotions. And places love as a third way with translational, generative and transformative qualities: three capacities with blatant pertinence for the sake of a creative and visionary field intertwined in its relation to the other.

JAZZ IS AN
ENERGY FOR
MUSIC LIKE
LOVE COULD BE
AN ENERGY FOR
ARCHITECTURE:
RELATIONAL,
IMAGINATIVE
AND ALIVE.

The jazz musician defines jazz at every note, at every second. And every jazz musician does so evenly, with their own subjectivity, through improvisation and experimentation. There is no Royal Institute of Jazz Musicians. The freedom the jazz musicians have is the freedom they put into their performance night after night. Jazz is not a music genre. Jazz is an intention. Coming together, the jazz musicians play with the energy of jazz, express their individuality in the common purpose of their instantly created music. They wink together to a collective past they are aware of, their thoughts are towards the forward but their intention lies in the instantaneous exchange and performance they are exercising in relation with their fellow musicians and the audience anchored in the moments they are perpetually creating. And through these moments, their world and the world of jazz is constantly changing and steadily moving. The reason for this continuous flow is that the intention of the jazz musicians at every moment is not themselves, not the group, not the respect they have for their instrument, not the technicalities of their instrument, not the fame, not the money they'll make for a gig, not even the music or the song itself. Their intention at every moment is jazz, nothing else. Jazz is an energy for music like love could be an energy for architecture: relational, imaginative and alive.

1. Ackerman, D., 1995. *A Natural History Of Love*. New York: Vintage Books a Division of Random House, Inc.
2. Alberoni, F. (1979). *Le choc amoureux*. Paris: Pocket.
3. Atkinson, T., 2001 [1974]. *Radical Feminism and Love*. In: S. Ostrov Weisser, ed., *Women and Romance : A reader*. New York and London: New York University Press.
4. Bachelard, G. (1971). *The poetics of space*. Boston: Beacon Press.
5. Bachtin, M., 1983. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
6. Badiou, A. (2013). *In praise of love*. Serpent's Tail.
7. Ball, M., 2016. *Donald Trump's Campaign Is Based On Fear*. [online] The Atlantic. Available at: <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/09/donald-trump-and-the-politics-of-fear/498116/> [Accessed 25 April 2020].
8. Balzac, H., 2004 [1838]. *A Harlot High And Low*. London: Penguin Books.
9. Barthes, R. (2010). *Fragments d'un discours amoureux*. Paris: Ed. du Seuil.
10. Bauman, Z. (2003). *Liquid love*. Polity Press.
11. Beall, A. and Sternberg, R. (1995). *The Social Construction of Love*. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 12(3), pp.417-438.
12. Beck, U. and Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2015). *The normal chaos of love*. Polity Press.
13. Berlant, L. (2011). *A properly political concept of love: Three approaches in ten pages*. *Cultural Anthropology*, 26(4), 683-691.
14. Berman, M., 2009. *The Politics Of Authenticity*. London: Verso.
15. Blum, V., 2005. *Love Studies: Or, Liberating Love*. *American Literary History*, 17(2), pp.335-348.
16. Brogaard, B. 2017. *The Rise and fall of The Romantic ideal*. In: R. Grossi and D. West, ed., *The Radicalism of Romantic Love: Critical Perspectives*. Routledge.
17. Buber, M., 1937. *I And Thou*. Mansfield Centre, CT: Martino Publishing.
18. Cancian, F., 1986. *The Feminization of Love*. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 11(4), pp.692-709.
19. Cantillon, S. and Lynch, K., 2017. *Affective Equality: Love Matters*. *Hypatia*, 32(1), pp.169-186.
20. Chabot, S., 2008. *Love and Revolution*. *Critical Sociology*, 34(6), pp.803-828.
21. Chessick, R., 1992. *On Falling in Love and Creativity*. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis*, 20(3), pp.347-373.
22. Chessick, R., 2005. *What grounds creativity*. *Journal of The American Academy of Psychoanalysis and Dynamic Psychiatry*, 33(1), pp.3-27.
23. Cleary, S., 2017. *Simone de Beauvoir, Jean-Paul Sartre, and Radical Romantic Love*. In: R. Grossi and D. West, ed., *The Radicalism of Romantic Love: Critical Perspectives*. Routledge.
24. Clough, N., 2012. *Emotion at the Center of Radical Politics: On the Affective Structures of Rebellion and Control*. *Antipode*, 44(5), pp.1667-1686.
25. Clough, P., 2007. *The Affective Turn*. Durham: Duke University Press.
26. Cooper, A., 1991. *Love Is A Loaded Gun*. Epic Records.
27. Dalrymple, T., 2009. *The Architect As Totalitarian*. [online] City Journal. Available at: <https://www.city-journal.org/html/architect-totalitarian-13246.html> [Accessed 21 April 2020].
28. Davis, H. & Sarlin, P. 2011. *No One Is Sovereign In Love: A Conversation Between Lauren Berlant And Michael Hardt*. [online] Available at: <http://nomorepotlucks.org/site/no-one-is-sovereign-in-love-a-conversation-between-lauren-berlant-and-michael-hardt/> [Accessed 21 April 2020].
29. Debord, G., 1957. *Report on the Construction of Situations*. In: K. Knabb, ed., *Situationist International Anthology* [1981]. Berkeley: Bureau of Public Secrets.
30. Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F., 1972. *L'an-ti-Oedipe*. Paris: Minuit.
31. Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F., 2009. *A Thousand Plateaus*. Berkeley, CA: Venus Pencils.
32. Due, R. (2013). *Love in motion*. Wallflower Press.
33. Esteban, m.l. 2011. *Crítica del Pensamiento Amoros*. Barcelona: Bellaterra.
34. Ferguson, A., 2017. *Love as a political force: Romantic love, love-politics and solidarity*. In: R. Grossi and D. West, ed., *The Radicalism of Romantic Love: Critical Perspectives*. Routledge.
35. Fernández, N.G., 2017. *Falling For The Collective : When love embraces the political*. In: R. Grossi and D. West, ed., *The Radicalism of Romantic Love: Critical Perspectives*. Routledge.
36. Fisher, H., 2005. *Why We Love*. New York: H. Holt.
37. Fisher, H., 2010. *Why Love Can Make You More Creative*. [online] Oprah.com. Available at: <http://www.oprah.com/relationships/the-link-between-love-and-thinking-creatively-helen-fisher> [Accessed 20 April 2020].
38. Fisher, H., 2014. *The Brain In Love*. [video] Available at: <https://www.ted.com/talks/helen_fisher_the_brain_in_love> [Accessed 20 April 2020].
39. Flaubert, G., 1979 [1856]. *Madame Bovary*. New York, N.Y.: New American Library.
40. Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Two lectures*. In: *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*, ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books.
41. Fromm, E., 1957. *The Art Of Loving*. New York, N.Y.: Harper Perennial Modern Classics.
42. George, B., 1984. *Love Is Love*. Virgin.
43. Giddens, A. (1993). *The transformation of intimacy*. Oxford: Polity Press.
44. Graeber, D., 2014. *What's The Point If We Can't Have Fun?*. [online] The Baffler. Available at: <https://thebaffler.com/salvos/whats-the-point-if-we-cant-have-fun> [Accessed 25 April 2020].
45. Grimonprez, J., 2014. *Michael Hardt On The Politics Of Love*. [ebook] Available at: <http://www.johangrimonprez.be/PDF/Michael%20Hardt%20on%20the%20politics%20of%20love_Interview%20by%20Johan%20Grimonprez.pdf> [Accessed 21 April 2020].
46. Grossi, R. and West, D., 2018. *The Radicalism Of Romantic Love : Critical Perspectives*. Routledge.
47. Han, B., 2017. *The Agony Of Eros*. MIT Press.
48. Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2001). *Empire*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
49. Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2005). *Multitude*. New York: Penguin Books.

50. Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2011). *Commonwealth*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
51. Hardt, M., 2011. *For Love or Money*. Cultural Anthropology, 26(4), pp.676-682.
52. Hardt, M., 2012. *The Procedures of Love*. Kassel: Hatje Cantz and Museum Fridericianum.
53. Harvey, D. (2006). *Paris, capital of modernity*. New York: Routledge.
54. Harvey, D., 2000. *Spaces Of Hope*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
55. Hayes, G., 2017. *Love as radical politics*. Psychology in Society, (53).
56. Hennessy, R., 2015. *Bread and Roses in the Common*. In: J. Anna and A. Ferguson, ed., *Love, A Question for Feminism in the Twenty-First Century*. Routledge.
57. Hess, R., 1988. *Henri Lefebvre Et L'aventure Du Siècle*. Paris: A.M. Métailié.
58. Hochner, N., 2014. *Machiavelli: Love and the Economy of Emotions*. Italian Culture, 32(2), pp.122-137.
59. hooks, b. (2000). *All about love*. Harper Perennial.
60. Horvat, S. (2016). *The radicality of love*. London: Polity.
61. Horvat, S., 2016. *Love Has To Be Reinvented* [video] Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7hFyo2TSH4U&t=173s> [Accessed 21 April 2020].
62. Horvat, S., 2017. *The Utopia Of Love*. [video] Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2st65gjeGHE> [Accessed 21 April 2020].
63. Illouz, E. (1998). *The Lost Innocence of Love*. Theory, Culture & Society, 15(3-4), pp.161-186.
64. Illouz, E. (2005). *Modern Love: Romance, Intimacy, and the Marriage Crisis* (review). MFS Modern Fiction Studies, 51(1), pp.243-246.
65. Illouz, E. (2008). *Consuming the romantic utopia*. Berkeley, Calif: University of California Press.
66. Illouz, E. (2013). *Why Love Hurts*. Cambridge: Polity.
67. Illouz, E. (2017). *Cold intimacies*. Cambridge: Polity.
68. Illouz, E., 2020. *Eva Illouz : "La Fin De L'Amour"*. [video] Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DoKXqHwo5Lg> [Accessed 20 April 2020].
69. Irigaray, L. (1993). *I, you, we*. New York: Routledge, Chapman and Space. Oz, 30(1). Hall, Inc.
70. Irigaray, L. (1994). *Thinking the difference*. London: Athlone.
71. Irigaray, L. (1995). *An ethics of sexual difference*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Sociologia. Cornell University Press.
72. Irigaray, L. (1996) *I Love To You*. Sketch of a Possible Felicity in History, trans. A. Martin. New York/London: Routledge.
73. Irigaray, L. (2004). *The way of love*. London: Continuum.
74. Jackson, S., 2015. *Love Social Change, and everyday sexuality*. In: J. Anna and A. Ferguson, ed., *Love, A Question for Feminism in the Twenty-First Century*. Routledge.
75. Jackson, S. (1993). *Even Sociologists Fall in Love: An Exploration in the Sociology of Emotions*. Sociology, 27(2), pp.201-220.
76. Jackson, S., 2006. *Heterosexuality In Question*. London: SAGE Publications.
77. Jaggar, Alison (1989) *Love and Knowledge: Emotion in Feminist Epistemology*, "in A. Jaggar and S. Bordo (eds) *Gender/Body/Knowledge. Feminist Reconstructions of Being and Knowing*. New Brunswick/London: Rutgers University Press.
78. Johnson, P., 2012. *Love, Heterosexuality, And Society*. London: Routledge.
79. Jonasdóttir, A. and Ferguson, A., 2015. *Love: A Question For Feminism In The Twenty-First Century*. Routledge.
80. Jónasdóttir, A., García-Andrade, A. and Gunnarsson, L., 2018. *The power of love: Towards an interdisciplinary and multi-theoretical feminist love*. In: A. Jónasdóttir, A. García-Andrade and L. Gunnarsson, ed., *Feminism and the Power of Love*, Interdisciplinary Interventions.
81. Jónasdóttir, Anna G., 2015. *Love Studies: A (Re)New(ed) Field of Feminist Knowledge Interests*. In: J. Anna and A. Ferguson, ed., *Love, A Question for Feminism in the Twenty-First Century*. Routledge.
82. Karatani, K., 2001. *Architecture As Metaphor*. Cambridge (Massachusetts): Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
83. Keller, Evelyn Fox (1985) *Reflections on Gender and Science*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
84. Kipnis, L., 2009. *Against Love*. New York: Random House US.
85. Krell, D., 1997. *Architecture*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
86. Kropotkin, P., 2016 [1902]. *Mutual Aid : A Factor For Evolution*. Middletown (Estados Unidos): Hampshire.
87. Lanas, M. and Zembylas, M., 2014. *Towards a Transformational Political Concept of Love in Critical Education*. Studies in Philosophy and Education, 34(1), pp.31-44.
88. Le Corbusier, 2014. *Towards A New Architecture*. Connecticut: Martino Publishing.
89. Lefebvre, H., 1974. *The Production Of Space*. Wiley.
90. Lefebvre, H., 2014 [1977]. *Critique Of Everyday Life*. London: Verso, pp.634-652.
91. Lennon, J. and McCartney, P., 1967. *All You Need Is Love*. [7-inch record] Parlophone.
92. Lewis, T., Amini, F. and Lannon, R. (2001). *A general theory of love*. New York: Vintage Books.
93. Luhmann, N. *Love as Passion: The Codification of Intimacy*. Trans. Jeremy Gaines and Doris L. Jones. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1986.
94. Lynch, K. (2014). *Why love, care, and solidarity are political matters: Affective equality and Fraser's model of social justice*. In A. G. Jónasdóttir & A. Ferguson (Eds.), *Love: A question for feminism in the twenty-first century* (pp. 173-189). London, UK: Routledge.
95. Majewska, E., 2015. *Love in Translation : Neoliberal Availability or a Solidarity Practice?*. In: J. Anna and A. Ferguson, ed., *Love, A Question for Feminism in the Twenty-First Century*. Routledge.
96. Marin, L., 2016. *Utopics: Spatial Play*. London: Palgrave Macmillan Limited.
97. Maturana Romesin, Humberto and Gerda Verden-Zöller (2008) (edited by Pille Bunnell) *The Origin of Humanness in the Biology of Love*. Exeter: Imprint Academic.

98. McDonough, T. (2010). *The Situationists and the City*. WW Norton & Co Inc.
99. Morris, B., 2003. *Kropotkin: Politics Of Community*. Humanity Books.
100. Morrison, C., Johnston, L. and Longhurst, R., 2012. *Critical geographies of love as spatial, relational and political*. Progress in Human Geography, 37(4), pp.505-521.
101. Musiał, M. (2013). *Richard Sennett and Eva Illouz on tyranny of intimacy. Intimacy tyrannized and intimacy as a tyrant*. LINGUA AC COMMUNITAS, Vol. 23, pp.119-133.
102. Negri, A., 2004. *Time For Revolution*. London: Continuum.
103. Nehring, C., 2009. *A Vindication Of Love: Reclaiming Romance For The Twenty-First Century*. Perennial.
104. Nira Liberman, O., 2009. *Does Falling In Love Make Us More Creative?*. [online] Scientific American. Available at: <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/does-falling-in-love-make/> [Accessed 20 April 2020].
105. Nussbaum, M. (2015). *Political emotions*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
106. Nussbaum, M., 2006. *Winnicott on the Surprises of the Self*. The Massachusetts Review, Inc., 47(2), pp.375-393.
107. Nussbaum, M., 2008. *Compassion : Human and Animal* Http://Idsk.Edu.In/Wp-Content/Uploads/2015/07/SL-4.Pdf. Institute of development studies kolkata.
108. Park, R., 1967. *"The urban community as a spatial pattern and a moral order"* in *On Social Control and Collective Behaviour*, Chicago.
109. Pérez Gómez, A. (2008). *Built upon love*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
110. Protevi, J., 2002. *Love*. In: J. Protevi and P. Patton, ed., *Between Derrida and Deleuze*, eds. Paul Patton and John Protevi. London: Athlone Press.
111. Rabot, J., 2012. *L'amour Dans L'oeuvre D'auguste Comte*. [pdf] Available at: <https://repositorium.sdum.uminho.pt/bitstream/1822/29906/1/Rabot2012CEL.pdf> [Accessed 25 April 2020].
112. Rimbaud, A., 2011 [1873]. *A Season In Hell*. New York: New Directions.
113. Rose, Hilary (1994) *Love, Power and Knowledge. Towards a Feminist Transformation of Science*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
114. Schlosser, K., 2019. *Emotion, politics and literary space in Your Heart is a Muscle the Size of a Fist*. Emotion, Space and Society, 39, pp.53-57.
115. Schwartz, L., 2009. *A Conversation With Michael Hardt On The Politics Of Love*. Interval(le) s. 810-821.
116. Sennett, R. (1973). *The uses of disorder*. Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin Books.
117. Sennett, R. (2002). *The fall of public man*. London: Penguin.
118. Sennett, R., 2009. *The Craftsman*. London: Penguin.
119. Shields, R., 1999. *Lefebvre, Love And Struggle*. London: Routledge.
120. Shumway, D. (2003). *Modern love*. New York: New York University Press.
121. Sica, A., 1988. *Weber, Irrationality And Social Order*. University of California Press.
122. Stark, H., 2012. *Deleuze and Love*. Angelaki, 17(1), pp.99-113.
123. Stark, H., 2017. *Love's Lessons*. Angelaki, 22(4), pp.69-79.
124. Stark, HL, *But we always make love with worlds : Deleuze (and Guattari) and love*, Sustaining Culture (CSAA), 6-8 December 2007, UniSA, Adelaide, Australia EJ (2008) [Refereed Conference Paper]
125. Swidler, A., 2005. *Talk Of Love*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
126. Tøye, M., 2010. *Towards a poethics of love*. Feminist Theory, 11(1), pp.39-55.
127. Tudor, A., 2003. *A (Macro) Sociology of Fear?*. The Sociological Review, 51(2), pp.238-256.
128. Turner, T., 1984. *What's Love Got To Do With It*. [7" single] Capitol.
129. Vaneigem, R. 2010. *De l'amour*. Paris: Le Cherche midi.
130. Vaneigem, R. 1967. *Revolution of everyday life*. London: Rebel press / Left Bank books.
131. Weis, K. 2006. In Sternberg, R. and Sternberg, K., 2006. *The New Psychology Of Love*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
132. Wheeler, A. 2002. *Love in Architecture*. Paragraph, 25(3), pp.105-116.
133. Wheeler, A. 2004. *About being-two in an architectural perspective: interview with Luce Irigaray*. Journal of Romance Studies, 4(2).
134. Wheeler, A. 2005. *With place love begins*. [ebook] Available at: http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/11386/ [Accessed 28 Nov. 2018].
135. Wheeler, A. 2008. *Architectural Issues in building community through Luce Irigaray's perspective on being two*. In Teaching, Luce Irigaray (ed.), London: Continuum.
136. Wilkinson, E., 2015. *Love in the multitude? A Feminist Critique of Love as a political concept*. In: J. Anna and A. Ferguson, ed., *Love, A Question for Feminism in the Twenty-First Century*. Routledge.
137. Winnicott, D. 1971. *Playing and Reality*. Abingdon: Routledge.
138. Winnicott, D., 1963. *The Capacity for concern in The Maturational Processes And The Facilitating Environment*. Madison: International Universities Press, pp.73-82.
139. Winnicott, D., 2018. *Holding And Interpretation*. Milton: Routledge.
140. York, M., 2018. *Revolutionary Love and Alter-globalisation: Towards a New Development Ethic*. Social Change, 48(4), pp.601-615.
141. Žižek, S., 2001. *Have Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri Rewritten the Communist Manifesto for the Twenty-First Century?*. Rethinking Marxism, 13(3-4), pp.190-198.

Only through the experimental and ambiguous uncovering process of a spatiality of love, that responds to the shift we want to see happen in our social relations, will we be able to support the blossoming of the transformation of that world we want to live in.