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Introduction.

Walter Benjamin in his Berlin Childhood around 1900 (Harvard UP 2006, p48-50) describes the telephone arriving in his parents house as this alien object that threatened and disturbed the calm order of his childhood family home, allowing strange voices to enter into this privileged enclave. The telephone was an illicit intruder in the bourgeois household. It was hidden in the corner of a dark back hall of the apartment, a crude black object with a mouth piece and separate earphone, both “as heavy as dumbbells”. Benjamin writing with the clarity of hindsight was able to identify this new contraption as a harbinger of a new age of mechanization, bringing individual freedom, person-to-person communication, promoting a new form of feedback and networking in modern life in the metropolis (Benjamin, 2006).

The telephone has become a potent symbol of modernity and modernization, it is a symbolic intermediary that still resonates in this age of cell phones and satellites. Many of us in the industrialized North carry small phones, Treos or Blackerries, advanced micro devices that can surf the world wide web, receive and send email, make movies and take photos, play music, as well contain your datebook, address book, and miniaturized versions of the main applications of your home computer (which theoretically could be accessed from anywhere in the world with cell service). You can even watch pre-recorded tv programs on you tiny telephone screen if you must. This mobility and such informational networks obviously has a great impact on our lives, where we work and play, how we conceive of the city and urbanism, potentially leading to the dissolution of the city. Universal communication technology can lead to a network city of non-places where events theoretically might occur at anywhere and everywhere is equal and everywhere the same (Webber, 1960’s).

In reality the impact of the telephone and the informational revolution has resulted in a splintering of the city, as communication services are matched with income and to the development of highly specialized nodes. These nodes service and enhance the system as well as providing places for face-to-face meetings and physical experiences that compensate for the extreme displacement of the body and senses in the depersonalized and deracinated global network. In these privileged milieux the new flow of information has changed our relationships with each other and with the space and time of the city. This enables us to create by mutual consent small, heterotopic, shifting, mobile, group “sites” or event-spaces at very short notice within the urban network.

1. A Note on Terminology; Heterotopic Systems.

Urban actors in networks create cities through negotiations that employ shared, symbolic intermediaries as the basis of discussion, creating a commons or shared space for activities. This commons may take the form of an enclave, with a single center, an armature with dual centers, or a heterotopia with multiple centers. Cities are made up of shifting, recombinant relationships between these three elements: the enclave, the armature and the heterotopia. The enclave is predominant in the archaic, hierarchic (Asian, Islamic, Medevial European) spatial order of localization. The armature is predominant in the spatial order of extension in the infrastructure or public spaces of the modern industrial city and the heterotopia predominates in the network space of the post-industrial city. These three organizational devices are fundamental to
Heterotopias of Illusion; From Beaubourg to Bilbao and Beyond.
David Grahame Shane

the activities of urban actors, who need shared, common, communicative, collective, conceptual models in order to create and operate the city successfully (Shane, 2005).

We can read the shifting function of heterotopic systems in the city in light of Foucault's history of space that corresponds to Kevin Lynch’s three city models (the “City of faith”, the “City as a machine” and the “Organic city”, aka Eco-City (Lynch, 1981)). We can attribute three sorts of heterotopia to Foucault s three stages: the medieval hierarchic “Space of localization” where the “heterotopia of crisis” is hidden, the modern “Space of Extension” where new urban actors create the “heterotopia of deviance” outside the city initiating an urban network, and finally the network space as “Space of relations” where urban actors enjoy “heteropias of illusion” that display shifting, mobile relationships within the network (Shane / Foucault, date). We commonly call these three urban and informational systems the pre-industrial, the industrial and post-industrial city. I prefer the terms of Archi Citta (AC), Cine Citta (CC) and Tele Citta (TC) that emphasize the communication systems and symbolic intermediaries used by different generations of urban actors, echoing Jean Baudrillard’s three, informational “Orders of Simulation” leading to the simulacra and hyper-reality (ref Simulations, 1983 and Young planners conf ref, date). Foucault investigated in particular how the “heterotopia of deviance” promoted the modern shift from the Archi Citta (City of faith) to the Cine Citta (City as machine) (Foucault, date (disc pun)).

In the elaboration of his “heterotopology” Foucault spoke of the miniaturization involved in the creation of heterotopias, as well as their mobility moving between set points (his perfect heterotopia was the ship “moving from port to port, from brothel to brothel”) and their feed-back capacity in terms of “mirroring” codes. His heterotopias were always complex, ambiguous and multi-cellular structures, capable of containing exceptional activities and new urban immigrants because of their flexible codes and their unusual, multiple compartments. Foucault describes his three major heterotopias in terms of the balance of rigid, disciplinary codes (D) and flexible codes of freedom and illusion (I). In my terms Foucault’s non-punitive “heterotopia of crisis” is balanced as D+I. In his “heterotopia of deviance” the rigid, disciplinary codes dominate (D/I). This code is reversed the “heterotopia of illusion” where the fast changing and flexible codes of dreams and images dominate (I/D) (Shane, 2005, ref.)

It is not hard to cite built examples of these three types of heterotopias. In the Archi Citta the Oxford College or the Belgian Beguinage are non-punitive sanctuaries inside the city block for people in crisis and transition provided by institutions as acts of communal charity (D+I). In the case of the Medieval Oxford College the professors provided itinerant teenage students with rooms in houses on a staircase where they themselves lived and taught as tutors. Later the professors moved to a “quad” (courtyard) to share facilities like a chapel, dining room, library, infirmary and guard in the gatehouse. Wealthy Medieval Leuven provided a similar miniature city of small houses with gardens for pious women within its own walled enclave, with its own church, common rooms and hospital inside the city. The inhabitants were free to go in and out, but knew they would be safe at night within its walls (it is now a student hostel and a UNESCO World heritage site) (Oxford/Leuven refs?).

In the Cine Citta Foucault listed hospitals, clinics, asylums, cemeteries, prisons, schools, universities and military barracks (as well as colonies and ships) as “heterotopias of deviance” placed outside their host cities. His prime example was Jeremy Bentham’s Panopticon where rigid, “scientific” disciplinary codes (invented by specialized
professionals) shaped the living arrangements and built environment to compensate for the criminals failure to honor the codes of a modern, just and egalitarian society. Here criminals were isolated as much as possible from each other by thick walls, with speaking tubes connected to the central observation point of the jailer in his tower. High perimeter walls and guardhouses surrounded the whole enclave. British prison reformers went so far in the 1820’s as to require prisoners to wear masks when chained together in the exercise yard and to screen them from one another in the seats at the weekly chapel services (Evans ref). Later scholars added other examples of highly regulated places of “alternative social ordering” (Hetherington, date) including factories, warehouses, docks, and port facilities. Robert Owen’s New Lanark, Scotland, the largest cotton mill in the world in the 1780’s, is exemplary of this expansion of the “heterotopia of deviance” to include a small industrial town with its many “philanthropic” regulations, company store, schools, hospital, chapel, owners house and workers housing blocks (also now a UNESCO World heritage site) (Owen ref).

Foucault gave as examples of the “heterotopia of illusion” gardens, theaters, cinemas, world’s fairs, stock exchanges, bordellos, casinos and museums where space and time could be collaged at will (in museum period rooms or on stage) and codes of behavior and fashion could change very rapidly. The French Crown, for instance, considered theaters dangerous in Eighteenth Century Paris, subjecting them to censorship and restricting them to peripheral locations, like the Theatre de L’ Odeon by the Luxembourg Palace. Royal permission for the development in the 1770’s was only granted after the royal relations pleaded poverty. The privileged aristocratic enclave of the Palais Royal in the center of the city beside the Louvre, provides an excellent, early example of a “heterotopia of illusion” that included all of Foucault’s examples and also served as an incubator for the French Revolution in the 1780’s. The Duc D’Orleans, owner of the Palais convinced the King, his cousin, to allow commercial activities on the site, which was already exempt from the rules of the City of Paris as it was royal land (Peyre and de Wailly, Geist refs).

The resulting “heterotopia of illusion” at the Palais Royal was a handsome courtyard of apartments above clean, long shopping arcades of expensive shops, banks, money exchanges, book stores, galleries, high fashion stores and excellent restaurants. The first French stock market was located here. At night the theater, an underground circus, shadow puppet shows, cafes, gambling and prostitution set the tone in the well-lit, arcades. Private police and private street cleaners provided the disciplinary and hygienic components. The world’s first, wooden, glass-covered shopping arcade appeared here, behind the Duke’s palace, leading to the side of the newly constructed Theatre Palais Royal. It was in this spectacular, heterotopic enclave that the Revolutionary pamphleteers established themselves beyond the reach of the Paris police and here that incendiary speeches in the courtyard led to a group of women revolutionaries bringing the royal family back from Versailles (to be imprisoned in the Temple, another extra-legal enclave within Paris belonging to the Knights Templar from the Crusades) (ref Parisian theater/arcades/palais royal/ temple).

3. Heterotopias of Illusion; Cine Citta, Beaubourg and Modern Urbanism.

At the end of his short section on the arrival of the telephone in the home of his Berlin youth, Benjamin described its later migration to the front of the house as a sleek, modern object that swept all the Victorian bric-a-brac before it, as a younger generation moved into power. The telephone symbolized the modern metropolis, linked to ocean liners
speeding to distant colonies, connected to modern factories and warehouses and all serving the bourgeois consumer in specialized spaces of display, the Parisian shopping arcades, department stores, world’s fairs etc (“heterotopias of illusion”). Benjamin saw these places as supporting the urban dream world of the bourgeoisie, his “Phantasmorgoria”, fed by advertising and marketing promotions, creating a frenzy of consumption and commercial fetishism about objects of desire. Advertisers attempted to brand a preference for their products on the collective unconscious of consumer’s to influence their purchases in the spectacular showplaces of global production and luxury. As Foucault pointed to the fairs, we can also list these showplaces, the arcades, department stores and world’s fairs as “heterotopias of illusion” (Benj/Foucault ref?).

Both “heterotopias of deviance” and those of illusion depended on networks. The project of the modern city presumed that engineers would provide networks of clean drinking water, proper sanitation, good paved roads, efficient railways, electricity, telegraph and telephone services everywhere. The services that we now take for granted in the industrialized North began as local networks and then expanded to form national and international networks. Every nation state sought to bundle together modern urban services and to provide them as a package with near universal coverage. Sometimes the state itself would intervene to achieve economies of scale, as when the UK government underwrote the construction National Grid for the distribution of electricity in Britain. The US Government similarly encouraged the creation of large private communication monopolies, like the Bell telephone system or national television networks in America, to service the new, sprawling suburban growth. (Grahame & Marvin, date)

Benjamin also pointed to a fundamental, contradictory dynamic in capitalism; the drive for vast, global, efficient networks that ended up in creating highly compressed, relatively small, miniature cities as marketing centers, elaborate urban fragments devoted to the display of luxury, pleasure and leisure either for the privileged elite or mass-market consumers. In Post-war America Walt Disney demonstrated the essential mechanisms of the “heterotopia of illusion” in the TV age when he built Disneyland in the orange groves of Anaheim on the edge of Los Angeles in 1954. Disney added several new features to the traditional “heterotopia of illusion”, such as the world fair. First TV media coverage was essential to success. Disney struck a deal with the NBC television network to show his cartoons to the children the fast expanding suburbs of America (40 million people moved in 15 years) in exchange for financial help building his theme park. Second control of the image of the park was crucial, both in terms of its record of safety and security, but also in terms of its compensatory, nostalgic themes. The new suburban frontier might inspire cowboy themes, such as Frontier Land and Future Land, but Disney was savvy enough to scale the entrance through the Main Street armature of Disneyland at 2/3 scale. Children felt empowered and parents felt like giants. The simulacra street, with its hidden underground realm containing the “City as a machine”, compensated for the newness of suburbia as its historic facades symbolized a lost community. This “heterotopia of illusion” attracted 12 million visitors in its first year of operation (Disneyland ref).

In Europe the Situationalist critics, like Guy Debord, were quick to denounce the American “ Society of the spectacle” (Debord, 1967), yet American developers were slow to learn Disney’s lesson. In their Cine Citta view the center of the city stood for blight and decay, while Debord was busy collaging together his “Naked City” map (1956), cutting out the fragmentary “atmospheres” of the central Paris and connecting them with red arrows of desire. In the U.S. the downtown “Festival Mall” only slowly
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ccaught on after the initial success of Ghiradelli Square in San Francisco (Halprin, 1961?), followed by James Rouse’s heavily subsidized Quincy Market, Boston (Thomson, 1976?) that attracted 12 million people a year like Disneyland (Maitland?, date ref). European planners were quicker to rediscover the potential of historic cores, as Copenhagen began the long process of pedestrianizing its central area in 1962 (ref Gehl). In London protesters fought against the demolition of Covent Garden Fruit and Vegetable market and won in 1971, allowing the GLC to develop the area as “Festival Mall” (ref cg). French groups protested the demolition of Baltard’s steel and glass structures at Les Halles markets but lost to an underground mall (now being rebuilt), resulting in the promise of a new art center in central Paris. In the same period artists transformed Soho in New York into a new arts quarter, after the defeat of Robert Moses highway plans (1968). Each New York artist studio acted as heterotopic cell inside the decaying, cast-iron factory buildings that had been slated for demolition. In an unusual case of bottom-up, cell-by-cell transformation of the city from the inside (reminiscent of the “heterotopia of crisis” when change was hidden inside the city), artists hid their existence in the lofts behind blacked out windows at night until they were legally recognized as occupants (Sharon Zukin, date, ref).

The 1971 competition organizers for the Pompidou Art Center presumed that arts lead development would transform the surrounding Les Marais district, turning art into a spectacle. Renzo Piano and Richards Rogers’ winning design looked like a modern factory inserted into Central Paris to contain art collections in a giant, flexible, loft-like art palace. A gridded fragment of the modern Cine Citta machine stood in deliberate and stark contrast to the historic district, a “social condensor” descended from the Russian Constructivists theory of inserting a new social facility to reverse the code of the feudal Archi Citta. This new building was intended as a new wired, electronically connected commons, with its associated, slopping plaza. It promised to plug the impoverished inner city neighborhood into the universal, global city network of the Tele Citta. The project attracted over 6 million visitors in 1977 its first year, beating the Louvre into second place as a tourist attraction (the ride up the escalators to the spectacular view from the rooftop terraces was free until the 1997-99 renovations) (ref). I.M.Pei renovated the Louvre in 1989 with an shopping mall leading from the underground coach park to the new entrance under the central glass pyramid. Planned for 4 million visitors a year, the museum recalled I.M.Pei to re-plan the circulation after 8 million visitors followed the path of the bestselling Da Vinci Code in 2005 (ref).

Beaubourg helped re-center Paris and renewed the tradition of the “heterotopia of illusion” in a city that had forgotten the role of its arcades, its theaters, world’s fairs and art galleries. Learning lessons from the 1960’s avant-guard theories of Cedric Price and Archigram in London, the Pompidou Center appeared to be a miniature fragment from an advanced, hyper-modern, network city. The designers deliberately exposed its giant trusses, exterior escalators and elevators on the façade, as well as the gigantic hvac service pipes on the rear. The winning competition drawings included huge video screens and ticker tape displays on the façade serving “the society of the spectacle”, with movable platforms suspended in the large, long-span, unobstructed interior galleries. The designers topped out the entire confection, a perfect “heterotopia of illusion”, with a large, prominently displayed, satellite dish acting as a high-tech, symbol on the roof. The French state also planned Mediatheques as smaller heterotopic versions of the Beaubourg in provincial cities, like Norman Foster’s Carre D’Art (1984-1993) beside the Roman temple in Nimes (ref).
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In the “Beaubourg Effect” Baudrillard condemned the museum as a “monument to disconnection” that brought the “hyper-reality of Disneyland” to central Paris and killed the art that it displayed. He argued the museum was a mechanical dinosaur and monument to mechanical flows that attempted to freeze the city’s artistic production. The museum was dangerous because it represented “the model of all future forms of controlled “socialization”; the re-totalization of all the dispersed functions of the body and of social life (work, leisure, media culture) within a single homogeneous space-time” (Baudrillard, the “Beaubourg Effect” October 20, 1982, in Sawchuck 1994 ref). In his view the single space-time of this reintegration destroyed the freedom of artistic creativity and replaced it with the frozen domain of the hyper-real simulacra. In this “Third Order of Simulation” (the Tele Citta) there is “no original and no copy” and new originals (“the real”) could be created “from miniature units, matrices, memory banks and control modules” and ceaselessly circulate in the media and society in an “ecstasy of communication” that he both welcomed and feared (Baudrillard 1982 in Luke 1994 ref).

4. Heterotopias of Illusion in Global Networks; Bilbao and Beyond.

“Heterotopias of illusion”, as Beaudrillard feared, proved potent engines for urban development in the Tele Citta, whether in the Disney theme park version or the European cultural heritage version. In Florence, the Uffizi Gallery, the biggest cultural attraction in Europe (12 million visitors) expelled the tourist busses and parked cars from its street armature and the Piazza della Signoria (repaved in 1980), leading to the pedestrianization of all of downtown Florence (which became a UNESCO World Heritage site in 1982). In America Disney built Disney Land, Florida on 25,000 acres of swampland, beginning in 1967, opening the Magic Kingdom (1971) replica of Disneyland and the Experimental Planned Community of Tomorrow (EPCOT, 1982). This vast “heterotopia of illusion” is now the largest single employer in the US with 58,000 “cast members” hosting 42 million “guests”. After the Magic Kingdom Disney established a global brand, starting with EuroDisney outside Paris (1975) that attracted 12 million visitors a year by the late 1990’s. Tokyo Disneyland (1983) followed to become the world’s most visited theme park (until 2003). In 1993 Disney invested in the New Amsterdam Theater at Times Square on Manhattan’s 42nd Street, prompting the rebirth of that street armature as a spectacular tourist attraction (42 million tourists visited New York in 2005). Hong Kong Disneyland (2005) expects 10 million people a year on completion of its second themed enclave.

Thomas Krens, who became the Director of the Guggenheim Museum in New York in 1988, fulfilled Baudrillard’s worst fears, transferring the corporate concept of the global network to the art world, merging it with the national Beaubourg model, to propose the Guggenheim as a “global brand” of art museums. In Italy, Peggy Guggenheim’s palazzo on the Grand Canal (opened to public 1979) represented an accidental, initial outpost of this empire. Before his appointment Krens had proposed the Massachusetts Museum of Contemporary Arts (Mass MOCA) in an enormous abandoned factory in North Adams, Mass. (it opened with state funding in 1996). Based on a similar public-private hybrid model, Krens built a global chain, from the Berlin Guggenheim (1997) to the Las Vegas Guggenheim in the Venetian Casino, (Rem Koolhaas, 2001- closed 2003). Krens proposed branches in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (Jean Nouvel, 2002) and Guadalajara, Mexico (Enrique Norten, 2005). In addition Krens dreamt of an Asian branch in Hong Kong (designed by Foster) or Taiwan (designed by Zaha Hadid), but in 2005 Peter B. Lewis, the Chairman of the Board and largest donor in the museum’s history ($50million)
resigned. Lewis opposed the global brand strategy, saying he wished the Museum would "concentrate more on New York and less on being scattered all over the world." The following year Krens announced an Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates Guggenheim to be designed by Frank Ghery (ref).

Like Disney, Krens depended on the growth of global tourism, leisure and pleasure activities centered in specialized "heterotopias of illusion", fed by networks of communication and transport. The Bilbao Guggenheim, designed by Ghery (1997) represented both Krens’ global ambitions and those of the Basque province to reassert its presence on the world stage after years of repression by General Franco (Guernica, the subject of Picasso's painting is located closeby). In contrast to the original New York Guggenheim and the Beaubourg, this museum was located on the edge of downtown, in a river flood plain where it formed part of a plan for apartments and new commercial district to connect across to a pre-existing, regional theater. Ghery articulated the building in two parts, an upper tower and atrium-like structure with small interior balconies reminiscent of Wright’s spiral ramps, and a long, low shed beneath reminiscent of Beaubourg in its scale and column free interior. One part addressed the reaction against the machine aesthetic represented by Wright's Organic theory and emphasis on the individual. The other part gloried in the mass-scaled machine aesthetic of Beaubourg, pushing it to its new, CAD-powered, fragmented conclusion as a flexible, single story factory shed diminishing the individual below its huge roof. Hiding the junction between these two parts and scaling the building to its position in the tight valley section, the multi-faceted titanium skin created a shimmering, signature profile, wrapping around the elegant bridge that crossed the river.

Ghery’s hybrid recombination of models from the Beaubourg and Wright created a striking global attractor for Guggenheim brand and a positive “Bilbao Effect” (1.3 million visitors in 2005). The split into multiple parts mirrored a new rhyzomatic dynamic within the post-modern Tele Citta where despite the cohesion of the fractured public image, the provision of services was no longer universal and the individual had the illusion of a new choice and freedom. Further the museum represented the globalized situation in miniature in terms of the mobility of its collections and its visitors. The art was on loan and would be moved from point-to-point within the Guggenheim network (except Richard Serra’s heavy works in the big shed). The well-healed visitors were drawn by advertising and word-of-mouth, traveling by plane, bus, taxi and car to the art center of the moment, connected to home by cell phones and internet.

At EPCOT in 1982 Disney placed the Atlantic Telephone and Telegraph (ATT) company pavilion in a huge Buckminster Fuller dome on axis at the entry, commanding the car park behind and circular pond beyond, around which he formed an urban of small, scenographic streets representing cities, such as Paris with the Eiffel Tower, Venice with the Piazza San Marco, Tokyo with a wooden temple. Benjamin’s telephone now commanded and tied the world together in this corporate vision. In the subsequent 25 years the development and miniaturization of the cell phone has enhanced and further people’s ability to move and communicate in the network city, making just-in-time social engagements normal and allowing people to enjoy the “space of relations”, the space of Foucault’s “heterotopia of illusion”. Even Foucault’s ultimate “heterotopia of deviance”, the prison, has dissolved in the Tele Citta to become a mobile, miniature networked device that prisoners wear as ankle bracelets that report their location at all times to the police when on parole. The prison becomes a strange new hybrid, part disciplinary apparatus and constraint, part illusory mechanism of freedom enabling shifting, changing
relationships, and part local institution built into the community like the old “heterotopias of crisis”. Artists are beginning to map the movement of individual cell phones en masse as ever-shifting, time-based clouds in the urban environment. Geo-tagged images of addresses help people find each other and their way.

The break down of the modernist ideal of universal service meant the private provision of different levels of service to mobile, connected individuals resulting in a post-modern, fragmented system of patches. As in the Bilbao Guggenheim urban actors could orient their patch to the privileged, mobile individual or the anonymous mass under the rubric of globalization. On the upper deck the individual was a valued customer, here the private company promised “premium” services with enriched feed-back, elsewhere in the vast space symbolizing the majority of the world’s population, private global satellite broadcasting systems provided a minimal, top-down propaganda service (Chomsky and McC?, date). On a global scale Antonio Scarponi portrayed the resultant “Digital Divide” where the United States, Canada, Japan and Western Europe (a small percentage of the global total) represent the majority of the people digitally connected to the internet with bottom-up feed-back, while China and India represent the majority of the global population served on the old top-down propaganda model (date. Ref). The feed-back from hand-held, cellular and remote satellite devices is fundamentally altering the perception of the city for the planning and design professions. This flexibility and speed will soon to be extended to the rest of the population as the telecommunications revolution continues in post-industrial and Asian nations. Inevitably, as in the US, Europe and Japan now, the “heterotopia of illusion” will play a central role in this shift to a performative, mobile urbanism.

Conclusion; “Heteropias of Illusion” and the Global Urban Future.

“Heterotopias of illusion” deal especially with information and images. Here urban actors compensate for their displacement by displaying images of home or modernity depending on their needs of the moment. As more and more people have moved, so the importance of these heterotopias has increased. Modernization often involved internal migration from the undeveloped, rural countryside to the city, or migration for economic or political reasons from one country to another, or global mass migrations for survival, all in the hope of a better life. The UN estimates that this year, for the first time in history, half of the world’s 3 billion population now lives in cities, with one third of the urban population, half a billion people, living in poverty in “slums”. Meanwhile every shanty-town sprouts with antennas or satellite dishes and a third of the world’s population is estimated to have cell phones, even as people carry water into their houses and have no basic services, sanitation or security of tenure. The “heterotopia of illusion” has drawn people to the city. It has played an important role in the transformation of European and American cities. It will obviously play an enormous role in the future of Asian cities, in India and China, where the majority of future urban growth will be in the next 15 years. The forms of these future heterotopias will evolve and change, both as miniature devices proliferate and liberate individual, bottom-up feed-back creating strange, new, hybrid modernities. Already the 5 largest malls in the world are in Asia, often served by archaic communal bus tours, sometimes by futuristic sky-trains (ref).
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