

▪ **DOI:** 10.31703/glr.2022(VII-1).16

▪ **URL:** [http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/glr.2022\(VII-1\).16](http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/glr.2022(VII-1).16)

▪ **Vol. VII, No. I** (Winter 2022)

▪ **Pages:** 180 – 189

The Dialectics of Utopia and Utopian Impulse

Muhammad Mahmood Ahmad Shaheen

Assistant Professor, Department of English, Government Sadiq Egerton Graduate College, Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan.

Email: drmahmoodshaheen38@gmail.com

(Corresponding Author)

Sohail Ahmad Saeed

Assistant Professor, Department of English Literature, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan.

Ahmad Naeem

Lecturer, Department of English Language and Literature, Gomal University, Dera Ismail Khan, KP, Pakistan.

▪ **p-ISSN:** 2663-3299

▪ **e-ISSN:** 2663-3841

▪ **L-ISSN:** 2663-3299

Abstract: This paper aims to offer a dialectical view of Utopia and utopian impulse in utopian theory. Politically, Utopia is associated with a reductionist leftist politics which overlooks essential human diversity and psychosocial conflicts by imposing harmony and progress through implicit violence. In aesthetic representation, Utopia is seen as an ideal society which offers a glorious transformation of mankind living in a society free of wants and conflicts. However, Utopian theory is essentially different from such metanarratives about Utopia and its praxis. Instead of focusing on the political or aesthetic concept of Utopia, it brings forth a dialectical analysis of Utopia and Utopian impulse to understand its aesthetic, political and theoretical dimensions. This paper claims that the utopian impulse is the central subtext of diverse utopian manifestations, which offers a narrative of critique and a continual process of theoretical sublimation and pursuit of an ideal society free of systemic ills.

Key Words: Communitarianism, Dialectics, Literary Utopia, Marxism, Utopia, Utopian Impulse.

Introduction

The postmodern culture or the postmodernity, science fiction and Utopia are intricately linked with one another as these all tend to point out a closure in their representations. Jameson's view about the praxis of postmodernity elucidates a closure of history and reality by simulacrum and depthlessness, while science fiction (SF) blurs not only the past but also the present,

and Utopia provides, literally, no place to be oriented. The history of utopian writings is marked by the seminal text of Thomas More (1516), and it has travelled a long way in representing different historical, cultural, and ideological consciousness, though it had its roots in the unconscious at individual and social levels. Central to utopian representations is the presence of utopian impulse, which has manifested itself in sociopolitical, philosophical, and literary

productions. Initially, Utopia and the utopian impulse were confused as being the same. However, now the cultural and political theorists emphasize distinguishing between the Utopia and the utopian impulse as these are the integral ontologies of the sociopolitical unconscious and this impulse is not limited to Utopia as a literary genre.

Research Methodology

This study is literature review-based research as it reviews the existing literature in its scope to offer a novel understanding of Utopia and its social, literary, political and theoretical manifestations. The study foregrounds a gap in the general understanding of Utopia and its political association, which blurs the philosophical and critical potential of Utopia in theory and practice. The paper critically investigates the previous research on the nature and praxis of Utopia to emphasize the centrality of the Utopian Impulse. Jameson's dialectical analysis of Utopia and Utopian Impulse has been foregrounded by critically comparing it to Utopian Theorists, including [Moylan \(2006\)](#), [Sargent \(1994\)](#) and [Fitting \(1998\)](#). The data has been collected from the research articles and books of acknowledged utopian theorists. This data has been analyzed by close reading and exhaustive analysis. The research has been formatted by following the mechanics of APA 7th edition.

Literal and Political Praxis of Utopia

Utopia or utopianism has varied manifestations in sociology, politics, philosophy, religion and arts. The multidimensional nature of utopianism obscures the process of its singular definition. That is why Utopia is generally understood as an idealistic approach in any field which is too abstract to explicate any concrete comprehension. [Moylan \(2006\)](#) puts forward a similar view when he quotes

the colloquial opinion of Utopia as useless wishing and fanciful speculation. Similarly, he points out that philosophical and political debates also view Utopia as authoritarian, vicious, yielding and repudiating the very freedom and fulfilment that Utopia promises. This aversion to Utopia is centred around its impractical visions as well as its supposed allegiance with the status quo. However, [Moylan \(2006\)](#) takes a dialectical stance, and instead of confronting the repugnance of Utopia, he proposes to address the historical and social value of Utopia. Implicitly, he wants to understand the nature and value of dreams and hopes of present reality and their actualization in future. In this regard, Moylan (2006) follows [Jameson's \(1971\)](#) stance on the importance of utopian impulses, which counter the pragmatic and practical approach and keep alive the radical alternatives for a better future. Theoretically, to [Moylan \(2006\)](#), the primary vocation of Utopia is to relate the wrongs of the lived world, and it is accomplished by conjuring a totally transformed society as an alternate world. Utopia does not settle for fragmentary repair or reform. Similarly, [Levitas \(1990\)](#) also considers Utopia a vision which should be pursued. She emphasizes that function of Utopia is not only to express desire but to convince people "to work towards an understanding of what is necessary for human fulfilment, a broadening, deepening, and raising of aspirations in terms quite different from those of their everyday life ([Levitas, 1990](#), P. 122). To [Moylan \(2006\)](#), Utopia is concerned with humanity's journey towards the horizon rather than its arrival at a place determined by a utopian agenda. That is why Utopia, as a concrete reality, is not possible. As [Jameson \(1971\)](#) refers to the significance of the utopian impulse, which would propel human efforts to conceive new social possibilities to create a better society out of what is available. These possibilities would be challenged, debated and may be rejected, but this is the whole point of Utopia

that it never yields fulfilment. Likewise, [Sargent \(1994\)](#), in his famous article "The Three Faces of Utopianism Revisited", defines Utopia as social dreaming in which the dreamers envision a place which is superior to their world of experience. It can be referred to as individual as well as societal dearth at social, political, psychological and literary levels. Further, he considers that utopianism is a universal human phenomenon as general human consciousness is subject to desires and fantasies which are linked to wish fulfilment either in dreams or in woolgathering. [Sargent \(1994\)](#) indicates a dual proclivity in utopianism, as on the one hand, fantasy is vital to human psychic health, while on the other hand, it is also dangerous as it leads to totalitarianism and violence. This refers to the political nature of utopianism and can be seen in the political conflicts of the twentieth century. However, the basic question is to understand the phenomenon of utopianism and its varied indexes. In this regard, [Sargent \(1994\)](#) argues that utopianism has been expressed in three different forms, which include utopian literature, communitarianism and utopian social theory. In Literary Utopia, [Sargent \(1994\)](#) indicates two basic modes of utopian expression: the body utopias or the Utopia of sensual fulfilment and city utopias or utopias of human thingamajig. Besides the communitarian and the utopian social theory, the literary Utopia is the actual place of utopian expression. As Utopia, literally, means no place. Therefore all fictional worlds, in general, are Utopia because they do not exist physically. [Sargent \(1994\)](#) considers the authorial intention an important feature in discerning utopian as well as dystopian motivation. He also alludes to the complex status of authorship in postmodernist fiction and theory. The authorial intention, in this regard, is not considered final as the reader's perception also plays an important role in

comprehending the textual content. [Sargent \(1994\)](#) clarifies that Utopia is not about the idealization or representation of a perfect society. Though, in comparison with dystopia, it is considered so. He defines utopianism as social dreaming and Utopia as a fictional society described in substantial detail and normally located in time and space, while Eutopia or positive Utopia is considered a society which is better than the society of the reader. Utopian Satire represents the criticism of contemporary society. Similarly, dystopia is a fictional society described in extensive detail, located in time and space that the author wishes the reader to view as significantly worse than the society in which that reader lived. [Suvin \(1979\)](#) also defines Utopia as "the verbal construction of a quasi-human community where sociopolitical institutions, norms, and individual relationships are organized according to a more perfect principle than in the author's community..." (p. 49). These are basic definitions which help to distinguish these relatively interrelated ideas.

Social and Literary Representations of Utopia

Utopian traditions in literature are prehistoric. Social dreaming was there before it is known as social dreaming. Utopianism, [Sargent \(1994\)](#) suggests, is not necessarily a deficiency response. Utopian impulse is the motive behind the indispensable need to dream of a better life even when the life is quite reasonable. Utopias have existed in myths, oral traditions and folk songs since the beginning. The common features of these utopias include abundance, simplicity, security, unity, benevolence, providence and harmony with nature and all forms of life. Further, these positive utopias are the gift of nature. [Sargent \(1994\)](#) names them utopias of sensual gratification or body utopias. They are the simplest version of social dreaming, and every culture has such stories which

serve as the foundations of utopianism. However, human imagination is not dependent on the gifts of nature. Therefore, humans contrive their intellectual efforts to formulate a futuristic version of utopian imagery, which is quite identical to the myths of body utopia. In these utopian formulations, the most important concern is to exercise human control and create a new tradition, which [Sargent \(1994\)](#) calls the Utopia of human contrivance or the city utopia. Plato's *Republic* is considered an early example of city eutopia. [Sargent \(1994\)](#) has devised a historical taxonomy which reflects the history of utopianism in arts. In literature, he divides utopianism into three parts; myth, fiction and non-fiction. In myth, he includes the myths of an earthly paradise, fortunate isles, noble savages, arcadias, heaven and hell, the millennium and Prester John tales. Similarly, in fiction, he includes utopias, Cockaigne, science fiction, fantasy, tales of the future, the Utopia of the mind, imaginary voyages, Uchronia, Robinsonaden, Gulliveriana, fairy tales, romance and oriental tales. While in non-fiction, he adds: instruction to princes, political philosophy, ideal cities, urban planning, visionary architecture, utopian social theory, film, painting and music. In literary Utopia, this taxonomy offers a certain boundary to the porous concept of Utopia.

[Moylan \(2006\)](#) considers the best place to understand Utopia is to view the lived experience of those who quit the mainstream societies to explore the ways of living which were radical and alternative to the conventional standards. [Moylan \(2006\)](#) traces the origin of such manifestations in Christian monasticism and political movements, which further include: republican, nationalist, feminist, socialist, fascist, and ecological. All these movements project their respective utopian visions, which could be implemented in certain ways to ensure their happiness. [Sargent \(1994\)](#) considered such groups as communitarians

or intentional communities. Communitarianism relates to social organization in small cooperative, partially collectivist communities which aim to live together for some agreed-upon objectives. [Sargent \(1994\)](#) puts forward the concept of intentional societies to trace the link between communitarianism and utopianism. Intentional society is a complicated concept as there are diverse varieties of intentional societies, and there is a lot of polarization among utopian theorists on the inclusion and exclusion of certain communities. However, the basic impulse of these communities is utopian as all these are based on the principles of social dreaming. [Sargent \(1994\)](#) defines "an intentional community as a group of five or more adults and their children if any, who come from more than one nuclear family and who have chosen to live together to enhance their shared values or for some other mutually agreed upon purposes" (p. 15). The intentional community aims to be the concrete existence of utopianism. In this regard, it differs from the literary Utopia as the literary utopias are the intellectual and creative works of authors. There is no point in the societal implementation of these works. These are published, and readers read them as an extension of their own dreams. However, communards convey their dreams by trying to put them into practice. This effort could be faltering, unproductive and even partially practical. These intentional communities have their constitutions, rules and regulations, and agreements about social conduct. These documents can be considered fiction as they do not reflect any material reality. It may be possible that these ideals are not implemented in true letter and spirit, yet they represent a common motivation which is a desire to communicate a social dream or positive Utopia. [Sargent \(1994\)](#) points out that intentional communities are part of the city utopia. Communitarian highlights the efforts to inculcate social

dreaming in the social structure of the society.

The third face of utopianism is the utopian social theory which is very controversial because society is a different entity in comparison to an intentional community or literary Utopia. [Sargent \(1994\)](#) considers that the roots of utopian social theory can be found in the idea of progress and anti-utopianism, which is the criticism of utopianism or some positive utopia. [Moylan \(2006\)](#) also confirms [Sargent's \(1994\)](#) position that conflict between utopian and anti-utopian is the central theme of utopian social theory. However, he takes a dialectical approach toward the problematic and productive aspects of Utopia. Utopia is problematic due to its allegiance with the ideology and the status quo because its political manifestations are totalizing and elitist. The productive aspect of Utopia is its ability to demonstrate social alternatives. [Sargent \(1994\)](#) reiterates the idea of welfare or progress as an essential feature of Utopia. He considers that the base of progress is the dialectical nature of the historical change. That is why the idea of progress is not without its quirks. It has been utilized to support imperialism, colonialism, and racism, and Enlightenment thought also propagated the idea of human welfare through scientific progress. Yet the conflicts of the twentieth century with two world wars and colonialism defy the very idea of progress. Similarly, anti-utopianism is also linked with the religious interpretation of original human sin, which proclaims that the human race is incapable of improvement. There can be no salvation for humanity before death. However, with the passage of time, this essentialist position was secularized, and the ideal of perfection, which was associated with Utopia, was considered materially unrealizable. Anti-utopian labelled utopianism as fanciful, impractical and unrealistic. In literature, this anti-utopianism is represented in dystopia,

which manifests totalitarianism in the form of corporate hegemony and late capitalistic closure of society and culture. [Sargent \(1994\)](#) points out the tendency to equate Utopia with force, ferocity, and absolutism. The reason behind this inclination is the essential methodology of utopian practice. A utopian author envisions a blueprint for an ideal society which he wishes to implement in true letter and spirit. However, no perfect society exists in the material world as human life is characterized by imperfections. In other words, perfect people are needed to execute a perfect or ideal utopian model. Therefore, the utopians assert force or power to make real or imperfect people agree with the proposed utopian model. Further, utopian visions are propagated as rational modes of living. In this way, they project elitism in the name of welfare and progress, which paves the way for absolutism.

Utopian Impulse in Dystopian Enclave

Contemporary dystopian narratives indicate this schema in speculative science fiction where genetic engineering, science and technology, corpocracy and consumerism are propagated as a utopian model of progress and prosperity, while they are the manifestations of late capitalism whose sole purpose is profiteering. [Moylan \(2006\)](#) also considers the profiteering dimension of mass consumer society as one of the reasons for a dystopian turn. He also enumerates nuclear and ecological threats, world wars, economic exploitation, and political repression as important factors which muted utopian narratives in the late twentieth century. He further states that Utopia was compromised by the authoritarian systems of Stalinist Russia, Nazi Germany and the substantially "powerful military-industrial-commercial complex of the United States" ([Moylan, 2006, p. 13](#)). However, the difference between Utopia and dystopia is of degree and not of

kind. Utopian manifestations can be problematic as they do not offer a critique of social reality. They present social alternatives as an escape from the world of reality. On the other hand, dystopia indicates criticism of social reality by exposing the factors responsible for the deterioration and offering implicit or explicit remedies. In both cases, the utopian impulse is the motivating factor. Utopia or dystopia are fictive constructs. They are not politically motivated, though Utopia has been associated with Marxism. It is the power and political dynamics which upset the utopian visions. In this context, Utopia is seen as leading to absolutism and violence. The political dynamics of Utopia have paved the way for a dystopian turn. Similarly, [Kumar \(2010\)](#) also points out the demise of literary Utopia as the writers are more prone to create dystopian worlds. Though the dystopia uses similar textual strategies as associated with Utopia, yet the essential dystopian shift indicates the failure of utopian imagination or the effectiveness of Utopia in the contemporary setting.

Dialectical Analysis of Utopia and Utopian Impulse

Jameson is, perhaps, the only political and literary theorist in the literary and cultural scenario who advocates Utopia and tries to isolate it from the socialist and communist tags. [Jameson \(2005\)](#) stages Utopia and the utopian impulse in sociopolitical and psychosocial contexts. [Jameson \(2005\)](#) considers the presence of utopian impulse as the motivating factor for future-oriented life and culture. The Utopia, in this sense, becomes a more cultural, social and historical issue than an individual's woolgathering. [Jameson \(2005\)](#) offers a critique of Utopia by tracing its political, social and literary aspects in a dialectical fashion. He indicates that Utopia has been considered a political issue which makes it obscure to understand as well as to implement. The political tag

stigmatized Utopia, which faltered its anthropological and representational content. Similarly, the literary form of Utopia couched in SF representations heralded the end of history and the future. It has also been associated with Stalinism during Cold War, as it was considered a political as well as ideal social system which disregards; essential human frailty, inherent inability to be uninformed, and innate inadequacies of human nature. Such a system, [Jameson \(2005\)](#) infers, could only be implemented through force and violence. Similarly, Utopia has also been associated with Marxism by neoliberals which are also quite paradoxical as Marx considered Utopia to be too idealistic to be politically possible. As [Jameson \(2005\)](#) describes that Marx was critical of utopian thought because it represented a diversion of revolutionary energy into idle wish-fulfillments and imaginary satisfactions instead of following the practical approach which was necessary to resist capitalism. [Jameson \(2005\)](#) informs that the relationship between the political and Utopia, the practical value of utopianism, and the identification between Utopia and socialism are yet to be settled. Despite the discouraging reception of Utopia on political, social, and literary fronts, [Jameson \(2005\)](#) makes a bold assertion that Utopia has recovered its vitality as a political slogan and politically energizing perspective. Apparently, this argument seems quite out of place after the fall of socialism as a viable socioeconomic system in Russia and other parts of Europe. The political utopian aspirations received implicit as well as explicit setbacks. It is in this context that [Jameson \(2005\)](#) considers Utopia to be more relevant. Considering the failure of any socioeconomic system to replace capitalism, Jameson points out that utopians can offer to conceive the alternative social system as a Utopian form as a "representational meditation on radical difference, radical otherness, and on the systemic nature of the

social totality, to the point where one cannot imagine any fundamental change in our social existence..." (2005, p. xii). The proliferation of capitalism justifies the existence of Utopia as an agency of critique on capitalist hegemony. Jameson's favouring of Utopia as a social and literary form, and a counternarrative to capitalism has its origin in the idea of the presence of utopian impulse in human nature and cultural productions. [Jameson \(2005\)](#) clarifies that he does not wish to promote the political orientation of utopianism. He emphasizes the need to see Utopia neutrally. [Jameson \(2005\)](#) claims that Utopia should not be viewed by its content but by its representation on the pretext that social and historical raw materials of utopias are of equal significance as the representational relations such as closure, narrative and exclusion or inclusion are significant in utopian productions. He implies that utopians imagine utopias by duly considering the social modes of production at all levels. Dialectically speaking, the purpose of Utopia is not only to project social dreaming in an idealistic fashion but also to expose the ideological closure at individual and social levels. That is why [Jameson \(2000\)](#) remarks that "the best utopias are those that fail the most comprehensively" (p. xiii). The need is also to understand that Utopia does not mean a positive kind of remedy for all the systemic ills. Rather, as [Jameson \(2005\)](#) puts it, the utopian remedy must be a fundamentally negative one and stand as a clarion call to remove and extirpate this specific root of all evils. That is why it is a mistake to approach utopias with positive expectations. Utopias are not characteristically embodiment of perfection, happiness and affluence all around. These aspects can be associated with idyll or the pastoral but not with Utopia. [Jameson \(2005\)](#) emphasizes that political theory decides the criterion for a desirable society and bourgeois comfort. The utopian diagnostic interventions used to be more

revolutionary, aiming at the alleviation of the sources of exploitation and suffering. However, this aspect of Utopia is overlooked by focusing on political interests. Thus, Utopia is only possible in transitional periods where the social reality can be related to Utopia. It would be more imperative to highlight that Jameson's concept of Utopia is more concerned with the presence of utopian impulse rather than utopian representation. [Kumar \(2010\)](#) counters Jameson's claims about the revival of utopian representation. He indicates that the reliability of Jameson's claim is somewhat diminished by discovering that utopias, which he refers to, are related to the genre of SF. However, Kumar overlooks [Jameson's \(2005\)](#) argument that Utopia should be viewed neither politically nor historically but as a distinct subject. Generally, utopias are considered as the pursuit of idealism, but Jameson was critical of this social dreaming as it is related to the psychosocial conflicts of ideology. As [Roberts \(2000\)](#) points out that Jameson was critical of the idealism of conformity and uniformity in utopian narratives because he understands that social existence works by repressing the antisocial impulses which prompt repression, and a repressed world cannot be utopian because repression is a sort of violence while Utopia is the world free of violence.

[Fitting \(1998\)](#) brings to light Jameson's attachment to Utopian studies. Jameson's dialectical thinking in *Marxism and Form* (1971) offered his defence of the presence of utopian impulse in sociopolitical cultural productions. He indicates that in the more classical fashion, utopian thought was considered an alteration of radical energy into idle woolgathering, but now the nature of utopian thought has undergone a dialectical reversal. The practical approach, which has become more current and tries to assimilate the principles and ideas into pragmatic politics, is countered by utopian impulse. The revival of utopian writing in the 1960s found a home in science fiction which

was a genre, per [Fitting \(1998\)](#), better suited to the task of envisaging a world qualitatively different from this one than was the realism of conventional fiction. In this regard, SF became the account for the status quo and other systemic social ills. [Fitting \(1998\)](#) further writes that Jameson was aware of these utopian novels, which were a representation of popular culture as well as offering a novel social critique. He wrote some essays on Le Guin's novels and, following Bloch's recovery of the utopian impulses at work in mass cultural phenomena, elaborated on the idea of a dialectic between ideology and Utopia. Jameson's article, "Reification and Utopia in Mass Culture" (1979), explores this dialectic in terms of popular culture and in *The Political Unconscious* (1981), he extends this concept. [Jameson \(1981\)](#) writes that "all class consciousness-- or in other words, all ideology in the strongest sense, including the most exclusive forms of ruling-class consciousness just as much as that of oppositional or oppressed classes—is in its very nature Utopian" (p. 289). [Fitting \(1998\)](#) points out that Jameson's emphasis on the utopian wish or utopian impulse was more crucial as it influenced literary studies in North America. It made theorists and cultural critics view popular culture dialectically. However, Jameson's emphasis on the utopian impulse was also misunderstood by many writers who confused the utopian impulse with the literary Utopia. [Fitting \(1998\)](#) further elaborates that Jameson's most fruitful and controversial intrusion was his view that literary Utopia should not be considered as the representation of an ideal society but as a failure to conceive Utopia. [Fitting \(1998\)](#) relates that Jameson considers literary Utopia as a determinate type of praxis whose main purpose is the defamiliarization as well as neutralization of the real. It is obvious that Jameson considers Utopia, neither political nor literary, but as an agency of critique and

negation of the real world. [Fitting \(1998\)](#) indicates a double bind in accepting Jameson's view that literary Utopia cannot be an alternative to the real world, as this view foregrounds the critical as well as negative aspects of Utopia and obscures the positive and alternative aspects. [Fitting \(1998\)](#) stresses following Jameson's call to understand the systemic, ideological and cultural closure. Jameson's most prolific and concerning contribution is his critical outlook towards science fiction and Utopia as the representation of an ideal society which helps to differentiate between utopian social theory and literary Utopia.

[Wegner \(1998\)](#) has rendered a significant study on the concept of Utopia in Jameson's work. In the postmodern context, [Wegner \(1998\)](#) cites Jameson, who believes any association with Utopia will lead to the disgraced concept of totality. [Wegner's \(1998\)](#) article focuses on the problem of Utopia in Jameson's work. He points out that Jameson's treatment of the problem of Utopia is dually dialectical. On the one hand, there is a negative dialectic which maintains that Utopia is not only impossible but also essential, while on the other hand, there is a didactic and transformative dialectic which is manifested in the aesthetic of cognitive mapping. [Wegner \(1998\)](#) decodes Jameson's articulation that the purpose of Utopia is not to imagine the future but rather to be oriented with the horizon or outer limits of utopian space, which can direct towards the pursuit of utopian visions. [Wegner \(1998\)](#) analyzes Jameson's thoughts on Utopia by tracing his dialectical method. He points out that any definitive announcement of the failure of Utopia must be considered in context and understood as an indicator of new beginnings. The emphasis on the utopian impulse or pattern can be conceived in utopian literary narratives as a literary figuration of abstract ideals. Utopia as a discursive construct complicates its political, ideological and literary scenarios. In

postmodern space, Utopia, either literary or political, cannot succeed due to its attachment to metanarratives. However, utopian impulse can provide an outlet in the form of cognitive mapping to get oriented.

Findings and Conclusion

The ambiguous nature of Utopia lies in its assertion as being radically different from the real world because, in the dialectic of identity and difference, the utopian world becomes unrealizable as well as unimaginable. Though Utopia represents the ills of the contemporary world, yet it does not offer a remedy or alternate solution for the problems. It constructs a society which is free of all psychosocial and sociopolitical conflicts which are contrary to human nature and society. As [Jameson \(1994\)](#) points out that Utopia envisions a society free of commodification, advertisements, commercialization and pursuit of profit. These speculations have been the subject matter of utopian fantasies. Considering the binary system of semantics, Utopia must be represented in relation to the lived experience of human phenomenon. However, Utopia is not a place but a process or impulse which can be manifested in apparently concordant places or systems. [Buchanan \(1998\)](#) also indicates that Jameson's emphasis on the failure of Utopia is optimistic as he does not contemplate the nature of Utopia but on the need for it. The very act of fantasizing about Utopia is more significant than the final form of fantasy. According to [Jameson \(1994\)](#), the psychosocial dimensions of Utopia are more momentous because these bring to the surface the conflicts between the pleasure

principle and the reality principle. The repressed fantasies are represented in the form of utopian visions. Utopia, in Freudian hermeneutics, is the symbolic representation of the pleasure principle, which is repressed by the reality principle of culture. That is why [Jameson \(2005\)](#) emphasizes the inability to conceive of Utopia as it is considered too idealistic, ideological as well as socialist. [Jameson \(1994\)](#) explicates that Utopia is resisted at the level of the text as well as analysis, while the former is unconscious and the latter is deliberate. However, as a desire cannot be repressed and the repressed keeps coming back, similarly, the cultural resistance to Utopia is countered at the psychological level. Utopia in the form of the utopian impulse, defamiliarized or displaced, keeps returning in dystopian texts. [Buchanan \(1998\)](#) also explains that resistance to Utopia is staged by announcing its discordancy with the societal constructs. Similarly, [Jameson \(1994\)](#) also argues that society is suffering from a collective neurosis or false anxiety, which can be countered by valuing the utopian content as essential to human sanity. As [Jameson \(1994\)](#) (2005) emphasizes the need to study Utopia as a distinct subject, he also points out that utopian text neither predicts the future nor offers any remedy. The object of Utopia is to produce its living reality, which is not possible because of simulacra and projection. The utopian image is represented in the material impressions which already exist in the world, thus making the utopian image a repetition. Similarly, the projection of the future on the pattern of repressed social habits and ideas cannot be utopian as they would be relative to the cultural inequalities.

References

- Buchanan, I. (1998). Metacommentary on Utopia, or Jameson's dialectic of hope. *Utopian Studies*, 9(2), 18-30. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20719759>
- Buchanan, I. (2006). *Fredric Jameson: Live theory*. London: Continuum.
- Fitting, P. (1998). The Concept of Utopia in the work of Frederic Jameson. *Utopian Studies*, 9(2), 8-17.
- Jameson, F. (1971). *Marxism and form*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Pr.
- Jameson, F. (1981). *The political unconscious: Narrative as a socially symbolic act*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Jameson, F. (1994). *The seeds of time*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Jameson, F., & Miyoshi, M. (1998). *The cultures of globalization*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Jameson, F. (2005). *Archaeologies of the Future /Frederic Jameson*. Verso Books.
- Kumar, K. (2010). The Ends of Utopia. *New Literary History*, 41(3), 549-569.
- Levitas, R. (1990). *The Concept of Utopia*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Moylan, T. (1998). Introduction: Jameson and Utopia. *Utopian Studies*, 9(2), 1-7.
- Moylan, T. (2006). To Stand with Dreamers: On the Use Value of Utopia. *The Irish Review (1986-)*, (34), 1-19.
- Roberts, A. (2000). *Fredric Jameson*. New York: Routledge.
- Sargent, L. T. (1994). Three faces of Utopianism Revisited. *Utopian Studies*, 5(1), 1-37.
- Suvín, D. (1979). *Metamorphoses of science fiction: On the poetics and history of a literary genre*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Wegner, P. E. (1998). Horizons, Figures, and Machines: The Dialectic of Utopia in the Work of Frederic Jameson. *Utopian Studies*, 9(2), 58-77. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20719762>