The Capsule and the Network

Notes for a General Theory

0   Anthropological Preamble

The word capsule comes from the Latin *capsa*, which means box or container, and *capsa* is derived from *capere*, which means to grasp, to hold or, in other words, to keep in *captivity*. In a general sense, a capsule is a holder, a container. In a more specific sense (with the space capsule as a paradigm), a capsule can be defined as a tool or an extension of the body which, having become an artificial environment, shuts out the outer, hostile environment. It is a medium that has become an envelope. In honour of McLuhan the most succinct definition might read as follows: *a capsule is a medium that has become, quite literally, a milieu, an environment.*

This is the starting point of Kurokawa's 1969 essay entitled 'Capsule Declaration'. Cars were paradigmatic for Kurokawa, who saw them as tools that had become extensions of the home. Thus he called the capsule 'architecture' and capsular architecture 'cyborg architecture', writing of a cybernetic organism and a man-machine unit. In one sense, however, the capsule is as old as the human species, or as old as human culture. For human beings, needing artificial environments, are enclosed in their extensions (clothes, buildings and even language). Culture can be called the capsule of man, and the capsule (defined as an extension of man or a tool that has evolved into an artificial environment of containment) the matrix of man.

One may reject my terms (and some have done so): the matrix is literally a womb. Its appeal is organic (and feminine); it is constantly permeated, breathing, breeding. The capsule, in contrast, is inorganic, fixed, closed (and therefore masculine?). To avoid a scholastic discussion of terminology, perhaps we should take a simpler approach, rephrasing these ideas in terms of architecture. If clothes are the second skin of human beings, architecture is the third skin. Architecture is one of the more important extensions of man. McLuhan has called such extensions 'media'. Medium means both means and midst, and thus also milieu or environment. Because architecture is both means *and* midst, it is the true milieu of man. Architecture is man's ultimate medium. Therefore we can define man, without exaggeration, as an architectural being (he is, after all, a 'naked ape'). We are, and have been for the last 3000 years, 'voluntary prisoners of architecture'.

The fact that humans have to hide in clothes, architecture, settlements, fortresses and cities is, in a sense, obvious and transhistorical, but it may be enhanced by other tendencies. One might

say that all civilizations have been 'capsular', so what's the point? My point is that it makes sense to speak of a capsular civilization once a certain threshold has been crossed. The transhistorical capsular logic emerging from the knowledge that culture and all things cultural are capsular (in the extended sense of the word) can be called capsularization of the first degree, or *the anthropological logic of capsularization*. This does not contradict my hypothesis that we are witnessing the rise of a capsular civilization. On the contrary: *It may well be that precisely because it appeals to an anthropological logic, which is deeply rooted in human culture, high-intensity capsularization (or capsularization of the second and even third degree), combined with other mechanisms, might be reinforced.* In that case, we become – more than ever and more than we should – voluntary prisoners of architecture.

1   Technological Capsularization

All media enhance speed in some way or another: the speed of travel, commerce, communication, information, transmission and so forth. Owing to the speed of transport and the increase of flows of information brought about by the constant increase of technological media throughout history, human beings, with their fragile bodies and sensitive central nervous systems, have to provide themselves with protection. Apart from being extensions of man, most media, if not all, are capsules or have a capsular counterpart. For instance, the wheel as a means of transport requires, beyond a certain speed, the addition of capsular devices: carriages, cars, coachwork. In biological, anatomical terms, one could say that the speed of media makes *exoskeletons* (external shells, as in beetles) essential to the survival of man, one of the most delicate creatures since the invention of evolution.

Besides these tangible capsules, there is a capsular response of a biological nature to speed and its shocks. Since, according to McLuhan, each extension is simultaneously an amputation of the extended sense or organ, each new extension brings its own narcosis. It is what he calls the *narcosis of Narcissus*. Giving the capsule a cosmic foundation is Freud's hypothesis (on which McLuhan relied) that for all organisms, defence against stimuli might be more crucial than intake: Freud conceives of both the amoeba (the unicellular organism) and the brain as capsules. Both are an inner space protected by a membrane (in the brain, it is the outer cortex). These membranes are protection against stimuli and shocks from a (hostile) environment. As both Freud and McLuhan would surely agree, capsules are vital for protection against shock, a thought that leads to the structure of modern experience. Many authors – including Freud, Simmel, Benjamin

and McLuhan – have argued that modern man is under constant attack from an overload of stimuli (shocks), which induce a sort of defence mechanism. Therefore, *the greater the increase in physical and informational speed, the greater the human need for capsules*. Let's call this *the first law of capsularization*.

The protection discussed here has a paradoxical result: speed and the defence against the hostile environment (air in the case of aeroplanes, water in the case of boats and so forth) are transferred to the tool, making the passenger immobile, passive. In primitive, *cold* machines like bicycles, skis, roller skates and the like, man moves by becoming one with the tool. But in sophisticated, *hot* machines, speed and active defence against shocks is transferred to the device itself. This is capsularization. Students have pointed out to me that the motorcycle contradicts my scheme. It does, in a sense: it is a high-speed device without a capsule. But it is precisely this aspect of the motorcycle that makes it so damned dangerous and thus adventurous, if not mythical. In the end, therefore, it is the exception that proves my point. Conclusion: the more mobile we become, the more capsular our behaviour: *we are sedentary nomads* (in the literal sense of seated travellers).

Kurokawa and, to a lesser extent, Peter Cook and Archigram pointed towards a deep tendency in our society when they described the capsule as the paradigm of future life. Nonetheless, mobile, Plug-In architecture has not materialized exactly as projected. We do, however, spend more time in capsules than ever before. In the 1960s, Kurokawa and Archigram, while drawn by the science fiction of the space capsule, were well aware that the car was the new earthbound model of mobile residence: immediately, the car was seen as an extension of the house, an artificial interior – in short, a capsule. As 'the in transit condition is becoming universal', according to Koolhaas, we spend an exponential amount of time in capsules: in trains, tubes (metros), trams, buses and, most of all, cars and aeroplanes.

Besides real capsules, there are more and more virtual capsules. Much of recent technology can be described in terms of virtual capsules: all screens (film screens, television screens, computer screens) are mental capsules. *A world of screens is a capsular world.* When looking at a screen, you are in an enclosed space, mentally and virtually, that is far away from the actual space in which you sit. *Our media are getting more capsular as technology moves on from extensions of the body to extensions of the mind* (information technology). Both high-speed transport and microelectronics obey a deeply rooted capsular logic. This we can call *the technological logic of capsularization*.

2   The Dual Society: The Socioeconomic Logic Behind Capsularization.

Capitalism has become transcendental. It is without counterpart. It is the most intensive and extensive concept in the world today. It is ruled by 'the holy trinity of the Divine market: liberalization, deregulation and privatization' (Ricardo Petrella). In his trilogy on *The Information Age*, Manuel Castells shows that the restructuring of capital in the network society, corresponding to the shift from industrial to 'informational capitalism', has brought about a gigantic social exclusion, a polarization of society in the global economy. He gives special attention to the rise of the Fourth World: disconnected population groups, abandoned zones, whether ghettos or almost entire continents, like Africa. Castells says that parts of the world and its population are 'switching off' from the network: a major premise in his trilogy. He believes the rise of the network society and the formation of ghettos are intimately linked.

Deindustrialization, which leads to the unemployment of unschooled workers, individualization of labour (under the magic word *flexibility*) and the disintegration of the patriarchal family are, according to Castells, the main processes behind the rise of the Fourth World. The infernal logic of global economy and the destruction of the welfare state (Petrella) – combined with demographic growth and migration waves and a new 'decentralized', scattered network version of the old centre-periphery logic (Braudel/Wallerstein) – may change the global territory into plugged-in and unplugged areas and segments of the population. This economic logic can and does affect the use and control of space and territories: the inside ordered and connected, the outside out of order and disconnected. It is what Castells calls 'the black holes of informational capitalism'. In short, globalization has engendered a dual society and dual cities. This now well-known (and, alas, just as often readily dismissed) constellation can be called *the economic logic of capsularization*. The capsular civilization might be a return to older phases in history, in which public space – the world outside the fortress – was, by definition, unsafe and uncontrolled territory.

In his balance sheet of five centuries of capitalism, Wallerstein sees the rise of different forms of violence and even civil war as inevitable. The nation state, he writes, can no longer take care of its citizens: 'The scramble for protection has begun.' In the words of my friend John King: 'Privilege engenders fear.' When fear and the mechanism of defensible space take over, the result might be another sort of ironclad rule: *fear leads to capsularization, and capsularization enhances fear*. (Anyone who has been burgled will realize that this is not just an academic word game, but a very down-to-earth process that is hard to escape.) One vicious circle reinforces the other: *exclusion leads to crime, and crime leads to exclusion*. We are tempted to call these repetitive vicious circles *the second law of capsularization*. What Mike Davis has termed 'the ecology of fear' is the basic engine of inclusion and exclusion in a dual society. It may end up changing the world into *an archipelago of insular entities* – fortresses, gated communities, enclosed complexes (like hotels and shopping malls), enclaves, envelopes, cocoons – in short, *capsules in a sea of chaos*.

3   Hyperindividualism and the Suburbanization of Daily Life

We have seen a massive disinterest in the concept of society in terms of sociability and solidarity. Individualization has been a modernist theme since Weber and Simmel, but the transformation of individualism into the official ideology of neo-liberalism is fairly recent. Margaret Thatcher summarized the notion when she said: 'There is no such thing as society; there are only individuals, individuals and families.' Not much can be added to this. It is the all-too-well-known syndrome enhanced by the restructuring of capital, as described by Castells (notably as the individualization of labour) and by the logic of temporary contracts (Ellen Dunham-Jones). It is a syndrome imposed upon people – in an age of ubiquitous management, everyone is a corporation – and, at the same time, it is one that they seem to want. The consumer is always an isolated, atomized individual: single, sometimes part of a couple or, at most, a member of a nuclear family. The last term is particularly relevant to this discussion. The nuclear family is a capsular institution. It describes how we are projected in advertising, how we live. We can call this the *logic of hyperindividualism*. It is enhanced by our technological tools and our daily politics of space.

Suburbanization is, of course, a key process in the modern politics of space and (closely linked to space) the politics of daily life. René Boomkens has described the space and life of the suburbs in a concise and evocative manner: 'Suburbia is one of a whole range of twentieth-century spaces that seek to disguise their own locality as much as possible. From shopping malls, airports, industrial estates, bus stations and other transferia to boulevards of furniture stores, they are all, like suburbia, capsules, inner-directed spaces closed in on themselves, which are supposed to represent security, shelter and hygiene (without being really safe) and to radically ignore their surroundings. This cellular or capsular reality of inner-directed spaces is sustained by a network of connections, equally disconnected from a particular space, or at least disconnected from it as much as possible – connections that, characteristically enough, form the conditions for

existence of the reality of the capsules; adter all, it is the collection of traffic and transport movements that makes this archipelago of silent spaces necessary and possible. Mobility and immobility, in this universe, have become a dyad.'

In one way or another, we are all suburbanites; even fervent city dwellers have to fight the suburbanization of daily life: cars, telephones (mobile or land-line), televisions and computers (linked to the Internet) are the basic tools (and causes) of this process. Cocooning (an activity for capsular institutions like the nuclear family) is just a sweet, glossy-magazine word for the hard reality of capsularized living. Our daily lives can be perfectly described as movement via transport capsules from one enclave or capsule (home, for example) to another (campus, office, airport, all-in hotel, shopping mall and so on). *The third law of capsularization* might be: *neo-liberal individualism plus sub-urbanization of daily life equals capsularization.*

When we do go out – when we leave the capsular routine – it is to enjoy a rare moment of leisure (and for many imbued with the new work ethic, leisure is a thing of the past, something for outsiders, for the have-nots). And although I cannot deny that many people seem to have time to sit at outdoor cafés and stroll down shopping streets, we all know that even leisure is being organized to an increasing degree in enclaves, in heterotopian structures.

4   Heterotopian Urbanism and Capsular Architecture

Foucault defined the heterotopia (as opposed to Utopia, a non-existent inversion of real society) as an existent but enclosed inversion of the continuous space of daily order. As I see it, within the space of the network, heterotopias become the rule. In a territory in which non-spaces, non-places and the spaces of flows prevail, heterotopias are an attempt to make real places (or a simulation thereof). Heterotopias are no longer an inversion of the continuous space of daily order (Foucault's definition), but an inversion of this inversion. *In a territory in which the space of flows (Castells) or the non-place (Augé) prevails, the heterotopia is the paradigm of (simulated) 'places to be' or 'places to stay'*: the historical city centre, the shopping street, the city walk, the mall, the university campus, the all-in hotel and, of course, the theme park. We live in the midst of an amazing proliferation of heterotopias and forms of heterotopian urbanism. The transformation of urban neighbourhoods into heterotopias may be more than a sign of social, emotional and economical reinvestment in the city centre (a process known as gentrification); it may also be yet another sign of capsularization: the historical quarter as enclave, as theme park. One could say that the almost excessive emphasis

on *plein-airism* – known locally as *terrace culture*, but also worthy of the term *mediterranization of the city* – is an indication that the historical centre is becoming a theme park.

If the theme park is the ultimate paradigm of *heterotopian urbanism*, the postmodern atrium is the paradigm of *capsular architecture*. No longer simply an opening to draw light and air into a building (as in Roman times), the contemporary atrium is a simulation of the outside within or, in the words of Koolhaas, a space 'sealed against the real'. Besides the atrium, the fortress has become a fashionable model in American architecture. We see this clearly in the work of Morphosis, a firm that not only makes impressive architecture, but also designs houses whose stunning aesthetic refers to the fortress, the bunker, the dungeon. Heterotopian urbanism and capsular architecture are indeed the tools of a (seemingly) seamless synthesis of consumption and segregation. *The more the* non-place, the space of flows *becomes the dominant spatial dynamic, the more heterotopian urbanism and capsular architecture will flourish.* This is another basic mechanism of the capsular society, which can be called *the fourth law of capsularization.*

5   Spectacle, Hyperreality and Simulation

Capsules are simulation machines. The logic of the capsule is to exclude the hardship of the hostile environment. Think of the space capsule as the origin of the concept. Within a capsule, reality is represented only on screens. Virilio's description of the windscreen is paradigmatic here. All screens virtualize or even simulate reality. Debord's society of the spectacle is reaching full bloom only now. He called it 'the completed separation' between daily life and representations. *The Society of the Spectacle* is a book to be reread. Let one thing be clear, however: the impressive analysis of the neo- and post-Marxist tradition, which criticizes consumer society, is a view that remains within. Baudrillard's hyperreality exists only within the capsule. The outside (Africa, ghettos, the Fourth World, illegal immigrants, drug addicts, child soldiers and child prostitutes) – *them*, the outsiders, do not live in this hyperreality. One could say that this sort of criticism reached its limits once consumer society had shifted towards a capsular society. That is one way to put it. But we can also say that the growth of the outside can only enhance the logic of the spectacle and the simulation. *The grimmer and uglier reality on the outside becomes, the more hyperreality will dominate the inside of the capsular civilization.* In short: *the more infra-reality, the more hyperreality.* One could call this *the fifth law of capsularization.* The spectacular logic of media and of high culture (festivals, cultural capitals and so on) is a sure sign of this tendency. And, as Pierre Henri Jeudi

has argued, even the good intentions of artists and organizations to work with the city and to build bridges with *the other*, with immigrants, under the aegis of multiculturalism may be just an *aesthetization of poverty*.

6   The Rise of Biopolitics

Biopolitics, a term used by Foucault, means that biological life is the object of direct political interference. The term reappears in some of Giorgio Agamben's recent books. Immigrants and refugees are not citizens, and, as non-citizens, they have a strange status that hovers between inside and outside, between *bios* (community life) and *zoē* (bare life), between law and outlaw, between human being and *homo sacer*. The inscription into *bios* (life in the polis) occurs, in the modern nation-state, on the basis of nation or *naissance*: the fact of being born somewhere. For those living *outside* the nation (and unprotected, as when citizenship is refused), legal status becomes uncertain. The risk of being reduced to *zoē* is, as seen in reports on refugees, all too real.

Extrapolating from this constellation and others, Agamben claims that the camp and not the cité (the city as community) is the paradigm of planetary biopolitics. What he says would explain some of today's horrors: the trade in human beings; the ruthless exploitation of children (Castells gives a terrifying account in his trilogy); the logic of mass imprisonment of sections of the population (expanding in the United States); the increasingly unclear legal status of refugees because they do not fit into the nation (precisely because the nation is based on birth); the growth of the criminal economy; the rise of biotechnology and the accompanying trade in human organs, et cetera – all of this might well produce a biopolitics that will be difficult to digest.

Agamben's analysis is considered to be provocative. If he is right, the concept of the capsule will have to be completed by the concept of the camp. I have been criticized for calling the detention centre for illegal immigrants at Steenokkerzeel (Belgium) a concentration camp. As Agamben has shown, however, and as anyone familiar with the history of the term should know, a concentration camp is not an extermination camp per se, but simply the extraterritoralization of a given group. An example is the internment of Japanese immigrants in the United States during the Second World War to protect them from the temptation of committing acts of sabotage in their host country, which was at war with their native land. A camp is an extraterritorial enclave within the territory of a nation; it is a locus of exclusion and concentration. Viewed through the logic of biopolitics (in which biological life is the object of direct political interference), the camps and their horrors in ex-Yugoslavia are more easily understood.

Even refugee camps are, in a sense, humanitarian concentration camps that are often targets for ruthless murder and rape. (Middle Africa is a tragic example.) We can only hope that Agamben is mistaken in his hypothesis about the rise of biopolitics. But the wall in Ceuta and Mellila and the detention camps for illegal immigrants are facts that are difficult to put aside. The wall in Ceuta and Mellila, 20 kilometres of barbed wire, is the most painful *urban* intervention in Europe since the Berlin wall.

Agamben's theory inspires awe (as is the case with theories that seem contaminated by the sinister quality of what they try to describe). But one could say that it points to the rise of bare life, which is, of course, barely life (life that can be taken without an act of homicide: the *homo sacer*). *The rise of migration, legal and illegal, and the exponential growth of the refugee problem, will mean the rise of biopolitics: the crude inclusion and exclusion of unwanted bodies as mere animal life.* Do we even dare to call this *the sixth law of capsularization*?

7   The Capsule and the Network

The economic, sociological and technological logic of the networks unites in what Castells has termed the network society (organized under *informational capitalism*). He claims, and rightly so, that the new dominant spatial structure is the 'space of flows', a phenomenon increasingly disconnected from the logic of the 'space of place'. I think the capsule might supply the missing link between the two. In the hype surrounding the rise of the network society, people tend to overemphasize the flow, the blurring, the sampling, the crossover, the integration, the smoothness of thresholds and so on. These factors may be only one side of the picture, however. *The network obscures the capsule, so to speak. We don't live in the network; we live in capsules.* All networks – railway network, vehicular-traffic network, aerial-transport network, telephone network, World Wide Web – function with capsules. If I view the situation from the perspective of the network, therefore, I can refine or even redefine the concept of the capsule, in its most general sense, as the designation for all closed-off and plugged-in entities, which, as a sum, make networks what they are. *No network without capsules. The more networking, the more capsules. Ergo: the degree of capsularization is directly proportional to the growth of networks. This seems to be the seventh law of capsularization.* All networks need capsules, enclaves, envelopes: as nodes, as hubs and as terminals. The computer terminal is a virtual capsule for our voyage through cyberspace. The house as 'machine à habiter' (in the famous words of Le Corbusier) is an immobile capsule. No one can deny that today's house functions only when plugged into all sorts of

networks: water, electricity, gas, fax/telephone, cable television, Internet and, of course, the network of motorways. These networks define the contemporary home. Without them, it is like a satellite lost in space. A house unplugged is barely conceivable nowadays (even though for the majority of the world population, the unplugged dwelling is a daily reality). Seen from the perspective of the network, the house is a plugged-in terminal, a capsule.

But is it *really* a capsule? We could come up with a whole range of new spaces that are capsular. We could call the capsular house a *cocoon*, and self-contained complexes (airports, shopping malls, all-in hotels) could be designated *envelopes*, leaving the term *enclave* for theme parks, shopping streets and ghettos. Products of capsular technology and a dual society, all these spaces demanding capsular architecture and heterotopian urbanism create what Jameson has termed 'the space of the post-civil society'.

It may well be that in order to understand the space of the post-civil society, we have to further conceptualize the control systems that come with a network society. No network without control: the plug-ins, the passwords, the cards, the cameras, the voice-recognition systems and so forth. We may be witnessing, as Deleuze has suggested in a short essay that refers to Foucault, the transition from a disciplinary society to a control society. Discipline elaborates on *internalization* of control. In a disciplinary society, as Foucault has pointed out, the ideal type of control is self-control. In a control society, control is *externalized*, transferred to sophisticated machinery like encryption equipment, devices requiring passwords, cameras, banking systems, urban and architectural technologies, high-tech security systems and so forth. This is yet another aspect of capsular logic. We could summarize this by simply defining the capsule as the ideal tool for control. In essence, the capsule is a controlled environment. Thus the capsule is the ideal spatial configuration for a control society. *The more control is externalised, the greater the encapsulation of our environment.* This could well be *the eighth law of capsularization*.

Conclusion

Only if and when all eight mechanisms start to work together and to reinforce one another – through a reciprocal process or in a vicious circle – can we truly speak of the rise of a capsular civilization. Beyond a certain point, individuals are forced into a state of high-intensity capsularization. In the era of globalization, two basic developments – which I see as the technological logic of capsularization and the logic of exclusion in a polarized society – are taking us towards high-intensity capsularization.

Our only hope is that such developments will be countered by a political will to impose social corrections upon transcendental capitalism and to defend and spread the welfare state and metropolitan *urbanness*. Pitted against objective clusters of various systems of logic, however, such optimism may prove to be naive voluntarism.

One should not forget, of course, that *encapsulation is always local and, by its very essence, a minority phenomenon*: the outside is always bigger than the inside. Thus when describing this single, deep-rooted tendency in our society, we cannot deny that many things are going on outside this logic. Outside the archipelago is a sea of various interactions within old and new forms of communality. Let's hope that all sorts of networking will prove stronger than encapsulation.

Postscript on Doom Prophecies

At the end of his essay 'Jenseits des Lustprinzips', in which he formulates his daring hypothesis that all desire and all lust are ultimately a longing for rest and peace, and thus for death, Freud writes that he doesn't know whether or not he believes his own hypothesis, but that it might explain a few things. In the case of my hypothesis of the rise of a capsular civilization, the situation is even worse: I hope with all my heart that it is not true. Then why this prophecy of doom?

I believe in the healing power of doom prophecies. Doom prophecies are early-warning systems in the collective consciousness of mankind. That many times they have proved to be (at least partly) false alarms, all the better. But if you are acquainted with the tradition of authors such as Carlyle, Nietzsche, Benjamin, Adorno, Luckàcs, Mumford, Debord, Baudrillard, Wallerstein and Agamben, you must admit that their work warns that Western civilization has been, and still is, in an alarming state. Even Castells, who tries to be objective and cautious, is rather pessimist in his third volume on the problems of the new millennium. I am convinced that the prophet Jonah bears a message for doom prophets: God asked him to tell Nineveh to amend its ways or be destroyed. Unlike Jonah, we should rejoice if Nineveh is saved (by divine clemency or by changing its ways for the better: the means is unimportant, although I think the latter is our only hope).

In spite of many warnings against 'the apocalyptic tone' all too readily adopted in philosophy (Derrida's expression), I prefer doom prophecies to the optimistic pep talk that surrounds us. For the fact that the logic of management permeates all layers and facets of life is quintessential to an understanding of transcendental capitalism. There is something thoroughly rotten about managerial pep talk. Is it not this sort of technocratic optimism

that we should invert to discover what really awaits us?

Can the picture be darker? It can be. Look at Lyotard's 'black hypothesis'. In a postmodern fable (in *Moralités postmodernes*), he suggests that the ultimate teleology of techno-science, the real aim of technology, might be to survive the death of the sun and, if necessary, to survive mankind. Perhaps the capsular civilization is a first step towards a world in which mankind will be super-fluous. By excluding the majority.

(2000)

Literature

Agamben, 'Qu'est ce qu'un camp ?' in : id., *Moyens sans fins. Notes sur la politique,* Payot & Rivages, Paris 1995.

Agamben, *Homo Sacer I, Le pouvoir souverain et la vie nu*, Seuil, Paris 1997.

René Boomkens, 'Babbelen in het Paradijs', *K&M. Tijdschrift voor empirische filosofie*, vol. XXI, 1997, 3 (p. 233).

René Boomkens, *Een drempelwereld. Moderne ervaring en stedelijke openbaarheid*, NAi Publishers, Rotterdam 1998.

Manuel Castells, *The Rise of the Network Society (The Information Age. Economy, Society and Culture. Volume I)* Blackwell, Malden (Massachusetts)/ Oxford 1996.

Manuel Castells, *End of Millennium (The Information Age. Economy, Society and Culture. Vomue III)*, Blackwell, Malden (Mass.)/Oxford 1998.

Mike Davis, *The City of Quartz. Excavating the Future in Los Angeles,* Pimlico, London 1998. (Verso, Londen 1990).

Mike Davis, *Ecology of Fear, Los Angeles and the Imagination of Disaster*, Metropolitan Books, New York 1998.

Gilles Deleuze, 'Post scriptum sur les sociétés de controle', in: id., *Pourparlers*, Paris 1990.

Michel Foucault, 'Des espaces autres' (Une conférence inédite), *Architecture, Mouvement, Continuïté*, 5, October, 1984, pp. 46-49.

Frederic Jameson, Michael Speaks, 'Envelopes and Enclaves: The Space of Post-Civil Society – An Architectural Conversation', *Assemblage*, 17, pp. 32-37.

Pierre Henry Jeudi, 'De esthetisering van de armoede', *De Witte Raaf*, November-December, 1999.

Rem Koolhaas, 'The Generic City', in Rem Koolhaas, Office for Metropolitan Architecture & Bruce Mau, *S,M,L,XL,* 010 Publishers, Rotterdam 1995.

Kisho Kurokawa, 'Capsule Declaration' (1969), in: *Metabolism in Architecture*, Studio Vista, London 1977.

Jean-François Lyotard, 'Une fable postmoderne', in, id., *Moralités postmodernes,* Galilée, Paris 1993.

McLuhan, *Understanding Media. The Extensions of Man,* Pinguin, New York/London, 1964.

Sigmund Freud, 'Jenseits des Lustprinzips', in: id., *Psychologie des Unbewußten, Studienausgabe*, III, Frankfurt am Main 1975.

Ricardo Petrella, *Het algemeen Belang. Lof van de solidariteit*, VUB Press, Brussels 1997. (*Le bien commun*, Editions Labor, Brussels 1996.)

Graham Shane, 'The Migration of Heterotopias', in: *Een stad in Beweging / Une ville en mouvement / A Moving City*, Studio Open City, Brussels 1998, pp. 108-116.

Michael Sorkin, *Variations on a Theme Park. The New American City and the End of Public Space,* Hill and Wang, New York 1992.

Paul Virilio, 'Dromoscopie', in: id., *Het horizon-negatief. Essay over dromosopie.* Duizend & één, Amsterdam 1989 (*L'horizon négatif: ezssay de dromoscopie,* Galilée, Paris 1984).

Immanuel Wallerstein, *Historical Capitalism,* Verso, London/New York 1993 (1983).