Paper for *Azimuth. Philosophical Coordinates in Modern and Contemporary Age*
S.I. *Intersections: At the Technophysics of Space*

Airspacing the City

Where Technophysics meets Atmoculture

Andrea Pavoni & Andrea Mubi Brighenti, 2017

TOC

domesticating

In this paper, we seek to show how the notion of *technophysics* can be applied to better understand the experience of contemporary urbanism. We argue that technophysics exists in dynamic relation to an *atmoculture* of urban space, whereby the technological and the cultural meet on a deeply affective-atmospheric terrain. Contemporary technophysics and atmoculture collaborate in the quest for comfort and the flight from its antonyms (stress, unease, and fear), but they are also riddled with tensions and contradictory outcomes.

To highlight this, we focus on the phenomenon of 'airspacing', that that includes practices such as the diffusion of internet-mediated temporary commercial uses of local places (including, for instance, bedrooms and apartments), as well as more generally the emergence of sociable spaces such as cafés, shared offices and studios inserted in a network of connections. In airspacing practices, the technophysical and atmocultural dimensions of contemporary urbanism come to the foreground and can be captured *in vivo*. The puzzle we are confronting in large part depends on the fact that such practices are ambiguously located across different domains that have traditionally been thought of as distinct – most notably, at the threshold between domestic and urban. Let us frame our argument, firstly, within a larger trend of 'domesticating' and 'interiorising' the city.

In 1867, the Catalan Ildefons Cerdá coined the notion of *urbanisation*, which he assumed to be 'an essential category of humankind', intrinsic to the coming-together of human beings in cohabitation, and coessential with civilisation. Diagnosing the urban crisis of his times as caused by the political corruption of the *city*, he envisioned a return to the simple principle of the *oikos*, as opposed to the perilous antagonisms of the *polis*, the management of the *urbs* as opposed to the ideal bond of the *civitas* – in other words, a reorientation towards the material constitution of the city and its functional integration. A necessary generic and universal matter of organisation was to take pride of place, depurated from political and spatio-temporal contingencies, and implemented through a novel normative science – *urbanism*.

If the city was to become a productive developmental machine, then it was paramount for the circulation of people, services and goods, to be functionally smooth, whilst at the same

time making sure that, as Foucault (2004) put it, the 'inherent dangers of this circulation be cancelled out.' Hence, the need to immunise circulation from disease, dissent and other potentially disruptive events. Regulation, sanitation, surveillance and security were to be the tools of choice to accomplish this aim. To transcend the city into an expanded, infinitely replicated domestic space was also the vision of the early 20th century German planner Ludwig Hilberseimer, whom Pier Vittorio Aureli (2013: 14) interprets as the ideal continuator of Cerdá's. Hilberseimer envisaged a complete coordination between the overall city plan and the single inhabitable cell, focusing on an scalar replicable typology. Hilberseimer's is a city in which the inhabitants 'live, work, and move *everywhere*'.

While at first Cerdá and Hilberseimer might look like long-forgotten figures, it is in fact important to recall that they are the founders of a currently thriving trend in the conception of urban space. If for instance we consider the work of contemporary global archistars such as Rem Koolhass, we notice how in many cases the city is conceived by them as a post-political machine whose core mission lies in the extraction and circulation of value – in one word, *oikonomia* (Agamben 2009). What is most interesting, the oikonomic conception of urban space first created by Cerdá lies in the non-separation of the domestic functions of dwelling and the economic functions of work. Their reconciliation, and even fusion, is pivotal to this spatial project.

Spatial abstraction forms the kernel of the capitalist formulation of urban space as a 'universal matrix of circulation' (Adams, 2014: 6) that characterises the modern economic-industrial machine of the metropolis, so aptly expressed by Cerdá. This spatial formula for a 'Single City, megalopolis or megamachine' (Deleuze and Guattari, 2008[1980]: 480), Cunningham (2008: 156-7) sees as the urban form of the capital, in which 'every particular place is rendered *equi-valent* in a universal circulation and exchange'. At least in theory, that is. The living world is constitutively not amenable to the precision of scale of the capital's abstract form, and urban abstractions always 'come to life in "friction," the grip of worldly encounter' (Tsing 2004: 1).

Processes of territorialisation and deterritorialisation are always problematic, frictional, turbulent and sketchy. On the one hand, it is not possible to understand the life of a place without taking into account the extent to which it is constantly pulled away by de-territorialising forces; on the other, deterritorialisation is always re-rooted by the inescapable fact of its taking place (Brighenti and Mattiucci 2008). Abstractions are consequently always actualised in the contingency of a given locale: they take place in the turbulent singularity of everyday life, a singularity riddled with animosity (Brighenti and Pavoni 2017) which always resists translation into a precise order. There seem to be inherent limits, in other words, to the domestication of the city.

Interiorising

As urban space is ontologically shaken by processes of de/re-territorialisation, at the phenomenological level it is rearticulated by an aesthetics of immersion that attempts to provide at least partial solutions to these contradictions. The peculiar 'immersiveness' of contemporary urban space can be linked to what Peter Sloterdijk (2013 [2005]) has called *interiorisation*. Between the end of the 15th century and the beginning of the 19th, the epoch of modern colonial expansion was exemplified by the unilateral, outward movement of missionaries, conquerors, explorers, towards the unknown. As the world's edges were

reached, however, the expansionist hubris was gradually recalibrated into the task of arranging our being-together within a by-now dense, limited space.

This major transformation has entailed a shift from a vertical aspiration to a horizontal project. Cerdá's focus on the production of co-habitation can be observed in this light. In particular, Sloterdijk (2013: 171) identifies the paradigmatic building of interiorisation in the 1850s architecture of Crystal Palace in London. Since the mid 19th century, a global realisation occurred that has paved the way towards contemporary atmoculture, namely, the idea that the interior possesses its own atmosphere. Crystal Palace – 'perhaps the only building in the world in which *atmosphere* is perceptible', as Mary Merrifield (1851: 2) wrote in the catalogue accompanying the London *Great Exhibition* – precipitated a new awareness Sloterdijk calls *explication*: namely, the gradual surfacing of a social consciousness of our common immersion in a three-dimensional space.

From chemical warfare to environmental sciences, from the development of building types such as shopping malls and stadia to the emergence of the so-called 'experience economy', a convergence towards an atmospheric appreciation of urban space seems to have been under way for quite some time. The fact of immersion, together with the idea that space is atmospheric, beg above all the question of *how to organise* materially, emotionally and symbolically, our common spaces. Humans, as space-creating beings, are caught in a 'praxis of world-making' that produces tangible and intangible interiors charged with the task of securing physical and affective immunity. In this sense, Sloterdijk (2006: 477) has diagnosed how the rise of a novel awareness towards the spatiality of coexistence has meant consciousness of (as well as concern towards, and obsession for) our co-fragile, foam-like condition.

If a new immunitary ethos has imposed itself, superseding the old theological paradigm, it can be said that the movement toward the explication of the atmosphere is correlative to the affirmation of a rounded, more or less articulated, atmoculture. Atmocuture has a specifically *urban* nature. We may accordingly understand interiorisation as the historical trend towards the 'integration' of social life into a series of technological, normative, affective and physical enclosures, as result of which everyday life has been increasingly moulded inside safe, comforting, commodified and entertaining spaces, relations and practices, from which excessive events must be expunged. Enter the society of comfort.

Today, comfort seems to function as a phenomenological complement to the ontological process of urbanisation, triggering a domestication of urban space in its aesthetic, socio-cultural and legal facets. Among the many possible examples, a telling one is Gothenburg's public campaign THINK, whose stated intention is 'to create a feeling of being at home by making everyone seeing the city as our common living room' (Thörn 2011: 989). The attempt to make cities 'safer, beautiful, and comfortable' signals how security and entertainment, safety and aesthetics, converge in the concept of comfort – here exemplified by the Swedish term *trivsam,* indicating a simultaneously comfortable and attractive quality: cosiness.

Critical analysis, however, should not grow too cosy. Such a quest for immunising space from unease, discomfort, or fear, always intersects with the socio-economical asymmetries of the urban, and is therefore bound to exclude those unable to afford or unwilling to enter the 'comfort-animated artificial continent in the ocean of poverty' (Sloterdijk 2013: 195). To those who are able to access to them, the comfort bubbles promise free movement *cum* protection within a mobile cocoon of security. Here, it seems, the core contradiction of liberalism, namely the simultaneous quest for autonomy *and* protection – the libertarian

strive for the unconstrained realisation of one's own interests, and the interconnected demand for the protection of these interests – finds a phenomenological solution: the comfort bubble 'becomes the place where the individuals follow their vocation to the accomplishment of pure immanence. The realisation of oneself is a disguised definition of the consumption of oneself' (Sloterdijk, 2006: 498; Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos 2016).

Neoliberal nomadism rests on this peculiar domesticity, or, the pre-emptive domestication of the territory over which the neoliberal subject smoothly slides. In other words, it is not really the individual who moves freely in a frictionless space – rather, it is capitalism itself that is finally able to move freely into the increasingly unbounded space of the singular body and the reunited atmosphere, reshaping the urban accordingly, into a disembedded geography that reproduces a sense of familiarity and sameness across multiple locales – a spatiality the atmoculture of comfort plays a key role in sustaining, and that an emerging technophysics allows to cement, complexify and multiply. Enter airspace.

airspacing

> it's a truly nomadic vision of what space could be … You just carry your body from point to point to point and those points are endless and those points are everywhere. For me, that bubble of comfort in which you exist talks about an eventual future where we just have a cushion of air that surrounds us. There is no enclosure, there is just a buffer of air that keeps us comfortable and that thing can spring up at any moment where we stop.[1]

Popular digital platforms such as Airbnb, Foursquare, Couchsurfing, Uber, Tripadvisor or Roam, through their architecture of reputation and reviews, trust and visual imaginary, play a key role in what can be described as an applied strategy of domesticating and interiorising the city. The business model here is premised upon reproducing 'the notion of feeling at home across time zones in any country' – as a Roam investor articulated it. A methodical reproduction of domestic comfort is likewise stated at its most eloquent level in Airbnb's motto: *belong everywhere*.

'Airspace', a term recently coined by Kyle Chayka, thus appears to be marked by a 'profusion of symbols of comfort and quality' and 'an easily recognisable mix of symbols – like reclaimed wood, Edison bulbs, and refurbished industrial lighting – that's meant to provide familiar, comforting surroundings for a wealthy, mobile elite' (Chayka 2016). They are the privileged corridors through which so-called *city users* may slide across multiple geographies whilst never actually leaving their cocoon: their freedom of movement is played out within a precise horizon immanently surfacing around them. The blueprint for such airspaces has perhaps been first provided by Don DeLillo in his novel *Cosmopolis* (2003).

In fact, these spaces are increasingly produced neither by state-led standardisation programmes nor simply corporate chains. Thanks to the advent of social media and digital, airspacing platforms, their production is outsourced onto the individuals, as well as

[1] Aaron Taylor Harvey, Environments Team, Airbnb. From the video http://www.aayr.xyz/all-that-is-solid/ (Accessed March 30, 2017).

increasingly dematerialised. In a sense, airspacing may be said to actualise, in a perverted form, the idealistic promise of radical urbanism: a city built from below – only, this seems to occur through a parasitic and hyper-commodifying aesthetic of comfort. Self-expression and self-entrepreneurialism, the freedom to move, work and live anywhere in comfort and safety, result in the spontaneous emergence of an impersonal, collective 'planning' from below. A convergence of outcomes in this case is created, not by the constraining power of social structure, but by shared, participatory atmoculture.

Airspaces are produced independently, sometimes even without investment or material work – one's own room, house or car can be instantly turned into rentable space. Even the minimal living units can now be instantaneously 'valorised' by the spirit of individual entrepreneurship. In fact, these digital platforms, we suggest, operate as technophysical infrastructures that 'abstract and dissolve, even fiscalize, core notions such as what constitutes a home' (Hirsch et al., 2015). At the same time, the aestheticisation and commodification of the urban that this process of domestication engenders also leads to a soothing – or, more polemically, narcotising – of urban life, which increasingly 'revolves around never feeling less than fully at ease' (Williams 2013).

For this to occur, unwanted feelings such as suspicion, mistrust and fear must be minimised via technological and aesthetic design aimed to confirm the framework of comfort upon which airspacing – and the transactions that occurs within it – is premised. In airspaces, discomforting feelings are often infused via a technophysics of seduction, by tailoring various sensuous regimes to foster inclusion within an atmosphere that is meant to be comfortable, consensual, shared, convivial (Allen 2006: 442). 'Our prime product is trust', Airbnb's co-founder David Gebba guarantees, and 'there is a precise correlation between trust and design', he adds.[2]

Digital architectures are accordingly designed in order for trust to be produced, via economies of reputation. Reputation is crucial, for instance, to decide whether to rent one's home to a Airbnb stranger, or take a ride with a Uber stranger. Interestingly however, it seems that the user gradually becomes accustomed to the system, and for instance the need to actively seek information about a potential guest decreases, as one increases his hosting experience. At some point, as the other AirBnb's co-founder Brian Chesky observes, you 'start blindly accepting people', that is, 'you start trusting people. So really what we are doing is not just renting out spaces but helping to change the way people trust humanity.'[3] We could not agree more.

The way people trust humanity does change indeed, as what 'used to be a sociological or ethical problem, how to get a community to function, [is transformed] into an engineering problem' (Arvidsson and Peitersen, quoted in Hearn, 2010: 431). Trust, in other words, fully delegated to the system's architecture of reputation. Reputation economy subjects reputation to quantitative measurement, algorithmic aggregation, and rampant commodification. To most involved actors, entering the reputation game means above all engaging in permanent self-branding. A surplus of affective-relational work is thus produced, something that may easily slide into self-exploitation, a condition whose potentially dystopian popular culture increasingly helps to envisage (e.g. Eggers, 2013; 'Nosedive', 2016).

[2] Retrieved from http://www.rivistastudio.com/standard/airbnb-intervista-joe-gebbia/ (Accessed March 30, 2017).

[3] Retrieved from http://www.wired.co.uk/article/welcome-to-the-new-reputation-economy (Accessed March 30, 2017).

These are key questions. What interests us more in this context are the concerns about a supposed loss of authenticity in airspaces, and urban space in general, this evolution appears to trigger. 'Every coffee place looks the same', as Igor Schwarzmann, a Berlin-based communication strategy consultant, laments.[4] Likewise, 'obsessively repetitive' is the organisation of the interiors of Airbnb houses, Massimo Martignoni observes.[5] We may hear the echoes of classic essays like those by Marc Augé and Rem Koolhaas, reminding us of the terrible homogenising effects that have been produced by globalisation. An evident romanticism inform these accounts, namely a certain nostalgic element mixed with the idea of having to fulfil heroic cultural models that are precious precisely because they are going lost or have gone lost already.[6] But, only those who have already lost their identity are worried by the theme of the loss of identity.

Incidentally, the coffee shop as building type and a type of commercial service is a category that is already a colonial product. Western colonisation has proceeded by precisely exporting similar formats, such as schools, prisons, colleges and so on. In this sense, one may ask, why should it be surprising that cafés look alike after all? Traditional retail and socialisation building types never claimed to be 'original'. They just don't need that qualification as something distinctive or relevant. Being distinct and unique is an added value only to the romantic mind. This suggests that the complaint about the homogenisation of places is actually a chapter in the same story of gentrification that first installs homogenisation.

Zukin (2010) has carefully analysed the 'paradoxes' of such a quest for authenticity, a quest that systematically destroys what it praises most and purports to find. The point, in other words, is that we cannot understand aesthetic without situating it within a larger social context where it makes sense. 'Authenticity' and 'originality' are longed for by a social class that is already sufficiently homogeneous and recognisable. This rhetoric is conservative, relying on the erasure of spatio-temporal complexity in the projection of somewhat idyllic, a-political pasts. The real question is not so much homologation, as it is the decentralised nature of this process, the extent to which capitalist realism has outsourced its work onto willing individuals (Fisher 2009). Finally, they are contradictory, since in the end reproduce the same logic they set up to challenge in the first place.

In the 60s Andy Warhol (2007: 159) famously remarked that restaurants were not selling food anymore, but rather atmosphere. McDonald's, Starbucks and other key multinational players have materialised this idea, creating tangible and intangible brandscapes in which sameness and recognisability across the world is an assurance of belonging. Comfort here results from the experience of being part of a brand, and the values it embodies. 'There is now concerted attempt to re-engineer the *experience* of cities,' (Amin and Thrift 2002: 124), reflecting on the increasing tendency to theming whole cities into recognisable and capitalisable urban brandscapes.

At the intersection between digital platform and urban space, airspacing signals a qualitative upgrade of this tendency, into a paradoxical promise: that of a technophysically and atmospherically engineered uniqueness. Experiences are no longer superimposed on the urban, it is rather the supposed uniqueness of the urban that is mobilised in order to

[4] Retrieved from http://www.theverge.com/2016/8/3/12325104/airbnb-aesthetic-global-minimalism-startup-gentrification (Accessed March 30, 2017).

[5] Retrieved from http://www.pagina99.it/2016/09/25/il-mondo-piatto-dellestetica-airbnb/ (Accessed March 30, 2017).

[6] As Adorno (1964: xxi) once warned, in the lexicon of authenticity 'the sublime becomes the cover for something low'.

offer experiences in which what is supposedly recognisable and guarantee of belonging is not a given space itself, but rather than technopysical and atmocultural apparatus that allows for the experience to occur. Again, nowhere is this evident as in the case of Airbnb Experiences, in which the technophysics and atmoculture of airspacing converge and sublimate.[7] This new smart phone app option allows individuals to 'book experiences' in cities, which are then provided by local 'micro-entrepreneurs,'

If the shift to corporate to independent coffee shop is obviously part of a wider trend, what is peculiar of this technophysics is the way it allows for inserting a paradoxical belonging vis-à-vis uniqueness: 'the local coffee shop is yours, too'.[8] The contradiction of this logic is apparent. Territoriology teaches us that the power of territories lies in their thick, stratified, multiple, slow temporality (Brighenti 2010). 'Belonging everywhere' is not simply difficult, it is logically impossible in the measure in which belonging means precisely *not being anywhere*. The surfacing of airspacing exactly express this contradiction, as sameness no longer depends on cloning of the same model, but on the constant reproduction of same attempts to breed difference. Evidently, therefore, are the limits of nostalgic rhetorics of authenticity. In fact, it seems the contradiction at the core of airspacing materialise the very stress of differentiation that emerges in a society relentlessly championing uniqueness, coolness, locality and authenticity.

resisting

The pop-sociological notion of *normcore*, recently introduced in a report by K-Hole (2014) in response to the dilemmas of a society in which to think and act differently has become a postulate, may offer some clues in this sense.[9] Normcore is an attitude of being-in-the city by evading the constant pressure to be different, unique and special, and 'finds liberation in being nothing special, and realizes that adaptability leads to belonging' (*ibid.*: 36). On a level, it is a spatially conscious mode of action that, challenging the illusory freedom of unilateral action, embraces a different type of freedom, one grounded on the conscious acceptance of the existence of *limits* to freedom itself. In the dense and constraining being-together in which we live, then, 'being adaptable is the only thing that will set you free', through a situational empathy that refuses authenticity or exclusivity.

Every situation, says the Taoists sage, is an objective configuration in which the *dao* ('the natural course of things') flows, guiding without determining the possibilities for action. Reality, therefore, is not an external object to be acted upon but a materiality in evolution to which we must *conform* (Jullien 2004: 132). Beneath the half-serious solemnity of *normcore* cogitations we find the kernel of Taoism, that is, a strategy of acting by merging within the immanence of a situation, and for which liberation does not proceed from revolt, but from the 'self-regulation of reality' to which we must adapt (Jullien 2004: 118). Yet, conformation risks becoming conformism. The faithful reliance on the self-regulation of reality blinds on the fact that reality is not innocent, neutral and flat, but rather tuned by power asymmetries and socio-historical sedimentations. The 'course of things' is not

[7] See https://www.airbnb.co.uk/livethere# (Accessed March 30, 2017).

[8] See https://www.airbnb.co.uk/livethere# (Accessed March 30, 2017).

[9] K-Hole is a self-styled 'trend forecasting group', which introduced the term in Youth Mode, a text ambitiously subtitled 'a report on freedom'

natural, but always socio-political. Translating Taoism into contemporary world risks to easily turns its phenomenology of adaptation into a strategy utterly exposed to co-optation (Tiqqun 2010).

Likewise, normcore assumes, as Rory Rowan (2014) observes in his compelling critique, 'that individuals can float freely from situation to situation, adapting to the norms of each, without encountering the rifts, fences, and stratifications that play such a fundamentally structuring role in our societies'. Normcore proposes as resistant (being anywhere, *belonging everywhere*) what is a receipt for a-political conformism. In fact, we may understand airspacing exactly as the surfacing of a spatial formations in response to the crisis normcore proposes to address – and ultimately finds entangled with. Whereas normcore leaves it to the individual the task to find 'a path to a more peaceful life' through chameleon-like adaptation and well-intended empathy, airspacing provides individuals with spaces that are themselves adaptable and empathic, comfortable vessels for a peaceful life in the ocean of crisis. Spaces which shape a 'community' of individuals, in which what is common is above all the reliance on a comfort bubble to which the task of 'coping with difference' and 'adapting to situations' is outsourced. In domesticated and interiorised airspaces, the dream to belong everywhere is made possible by the techno-physical pre-adaptation of space to us, together with the atmocultural horizon of expectations providing the aesthetic empathy of comfort.

Comfort bubbles remove the rifts, fences and stratification of the social, only to re-assert them in the form of socio-economical, cultural and racial exclusiveness. The problem with the contemporary society of comfort is thus not that it alienates an allegedly authentic, reciprocal and egalitarian interaction, or that it produces a suffocating or dystopian homologation. Instead, what must be remarked is the systematic delegation of responsibility that it produces, along with the invisibilisation of power relations. In conclusion, resistance in airspaces is anything but simple, and calls for sophisticated elaborations. Ethical strategies of resistance are bound to fail unless they are also capable of taking into account the specific nature of urban environments shaped by technophysics and atmoculture. Producing a sense of belonging is a tough task that must first and foremost address the very structures that neutralise belonging in the first place.

As we have seen, the trend towards the domestication and interiorisation of urban space enacted by the new technologies produces and reproduces 'sick' atmospheric-affective airspaces. However, becoming aware of the perils of comfort does not necessarily mean to resort to grandiose heroism. No great men theory needs to be resurrected to evade the vaporous cage of airspaces. It is in uncharted ethical territories beyond the passive acceptance of what exists and the grandiose romantic myth of authentic exteriority that new ways of life must be searched, defined, experimented, and constructed.

References

Adams, Ross (2014) 'Natura Urbans, Natura Urbanata: ecological urbanism, circulation, and the immunization of nature.' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 32: 12-29.

Adorno, Theodor (1964) *Jargon der Eigentlichkeit: Zur deutschen Ideologie*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Agamben, Giorgio. (2009) *Il Regno e La Gloria*: *Per Una Genealogia Teologica dell'Economia e del Governo* (Bollati Boringhieri)

Amin, Ash and Nigel Thrift (2002) *Cities: Reimagining the Urban*. Cambridge: Polity.

Aureli, Pier Vittorio (2013) 'Means to an End: The Rise and Fall of the Architectural Project of the City.' In Aureli (Ed.) *The City as a Project*. Berlin: Ruby Press, pp. 14-38.

Brighenti, Andrea Mubi & Cristina Mattiucci (2008) 'Editing Urban Environments. Territories, Prolongations, Visibilities.' In Frank Eckardt et al. (Eds.) *Mediacity. Situations, Practices, and Encounters*. Berlin: Frank&Timme / Bauhaus Universität, pp. 81-104.

Brighenti, Andea Mubi (2010) 'On Territorology. Towards a General Science of Territory.' *Theory, Culture & Society* 27(1): 52-72.

Brighenti, Andea Mubi & Andrea Pavoni (2017) 'City of Unpleasant Feelings. Stress, Comfort and Animosity in Urban Life.' Forthcoming in *Social & Cultural Geography*.

Cerdá, Ildefons (1867) *Teoría general de la urbanización, y aplicación de sus principios y doctrinas a la reforma y ensanche de Barcelona.* Madrid: Imprenta Española.

Chayka Kyle (2016) http://www.theverge.com/2016/8/3/12325104/airbnb-aesthetic-global-minimalism-startup-gentrification and https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/aug/06/hipster-aesthetic-taking-over-world

Cunningham, David (2008) 'Spacing Abstraction: Capitalism, Law and the Metropolis'. *Griffith Law Review* 17(2): 454-485.

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari (2008[1980]) *A Thousand Plateaus Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: Continuum.

Eggers, Dave (2013) *The Circle*. Hamish Hamilton.

Fisher, Mark (2009) *Capitalist Realism: Is There No Alternative?* Hants: Zero Books.

Foucault, Michel (2004) *Sécurité, territoire, population. Cours au Collège de France 1977-1978*. Paris: EHESS, Gallimard, Seuil.

Hearn, Alison. (2010) 'Structuring feeling: Web 2.0, online ranking and rating, and the digital "reputation" economy'. *ephemera* 10 (3/4): 421–438

Hirsch, Nikolaus et al. (2015) 'Editorial—"Architecture as Intangible Infrastructure," Issue One'. *e-flux journal* 64. http://www.e-flux.com/journal/64/60836/editorial-architecture-as-intangible-infrastructure-issue-one/

Jullien, François (2004) *A Treatise on Efficacy: Between Western and Chinese Thinking*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

K-Hole (2014). *Youth Mode. A Report on Freedom.* http://khole.net/issues/youth-mode/

Merrifield, Mary P. (1851) 'The Harmony of Colours as exemplified in the Exhibition.' *The Art-Journal Illustrated Catalogue Of The Industry Of All Nations 1851*. London: G. Virtue.

'Nosedive', *Black Mirror.* Netflix. 21 October 2016

Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos, Andreas (2016) 'Withdrawing from atmosphere: An ontology of air partitioning and affective engineering'. *Environment & Planning D* 34(1).

Rowan, Rory (2014) 'SO NOW! On Normcore'. *e-flux Journal* 58. Online at: http://www.e-flux.com/journal/58/61168/so-now-on-normcore/ (Accessed March 30, 2017).

Sloterdijk, Peter (2006) *Sphères: Tome 3, Ecumes, Sphérologie plurielle*. Paris : Hachette.

Sloterdijk, Peter (2013 [2005]) *In the World Interior of Capital: For a Philosophical Theory of Globalization*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Thörn, Catharina (2011) 'Soft Policies of Exclusion: Entrepreneurial Strategies of Ambience and Control of Public Space in Gothenburg, Sweden', Urban Geography 32: 989-1008.

Tiqqun Collective (2010) *Introduction to Civil War*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Tsing Lowenhaupt, Anna (2004) *Frictions: an Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Williams, Thomas Chatterton (2013) 'How Hipsters Ruined Paris,' *The New York Times*, 8 November. Online at: http://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/10/opinion/sunday/how-hipsters-ruined-paris.html (Accessed February 7, 2016).

Warhol, Andy (2007). *The Philosophy of Andy Warhol: From A to B and Back Again*, 159 Penguin

Zukin, Sharon (2010) *Naked City. The death and life of authentic urban places*. Oxford: Oxford university press.