Beyond Verticality and Horizontality: Arcological Thinking and the Neoliberal Subject

François Debrix

Over the past two decades, several critiques of neoliberalism have relied on a binary understanding of space to depict neoliberalism's operations and objectives as well as to offer modes of mobilization and contestation against neoliberal politics and economics. For quite a few scholars, the challenge of neoliberal capitalism and the need to resist it can be summed up as an opposition between verticality and horizontality. In particular, this challenge, we are told, is what the contemporary subject of neoliberal politics (or what commonly has been referred to as the "neoliberal subject") is faced with. While neoliberalism's vertical structures, institutions, aspirations, and metaphors (building higher, accumulating wealth, raising one's socio-economic profile, reaching for the top, elevating one's competitive capacities, increasing one's portfolio, etc.) confront the neoliberal subject with what often looks like an insurmountable neoliberal capitalist monolith, horizontality is presented as a somewhat new and often welcome, even if dispersed, spread out, and sometimes unrooted, "on the ground" mode of political organization, mobilization, and emancipation from contemporary forms of neoliberal capitalist growth.

This essay takes issue with this simplistic understanding of neoliberal capitalism and of some of its actual or imagined political responses. It suggests that the verticality versus horizontality binary framing fails to capture the political textures of neoliberalism today, or what German-Korean philosopher Byung-Chul Han has referred to as "neoliberal psychopolitics" (Han 2017a). In particular, an emphasis on the verticality of neoliberalism and/or on its horizontal challenges is unable to make sense of the forms of subjectivity constructed by contemporary modes of neoliberal capitalism. Put differently, vertical and horizontal perspectives (and, often, their antagonism) cannot persuasively account for what the contemporary neoliberal subject is and does. This does not necessarily mean that vertical analyses of neoliberal capitalism cannot provide meaningful insights about the ways neoliberalism has developed and has been put to use. Nor does it suggest that horizontalist challenges to neoliberalism are no longer of any critical political or social value. Still, too often, critiques of neoliberal capitalism remain confined within two-dimensional understandings of space that rely on an either/or binary framing that pits verticality against horizontality whereas, in more recent modalities of neoliberal capitalism, verticality and horizontality are simultaneously involved and sometimes fused together.

Today's subjects, in particular, are neither mainly defined by their capture in vertical neoliberal capitalist institutions nor easily identified as radical agents with a potential to be liberated by horizontal anti-hegemonic formations intent on confronting dominant capitalist forces.   Indeed, turning to Han's writings, I argue that the neoliberal subject is an "achievement subject" (Han 2017a; Han 2018). As an achievement subject, today's neoliberal subject is driven by performance, generally measured as a series of digital outputs, and it is expected to generate data about itself. For Han, the neoliberal subject as achievement subject appears to be a "free" subject that can operate and often expand its reach without limits or constraints (horizontally) within neoliberal political and economic vertical social structures and institutions. As Han argues, this subject does not face "repression on the part of sovereign entities external to itself" (Han 2018: viii). Yet, the achievement subject of neoliberal psychopolitics does not enjoy unfettered freedom. It thinks of itself as free and operates as if it is free, but only to the extent that it has internalized the conditions necessary for it to succeed, compete, and maximize its productive capacities in the context of neoliberal capitalist accumulation. Thus, the achievement subject lives and acts on a daily basis both *with* verticality and horizontality, but also *beyond* verticality and horizontality, or, to put it slightly differently, with structures or under conditions that blur any clear distinction between vertical and horizontal spaces as well as ways of occupying/ making use of space. I suggest that the contemporary neoliberal subject is placed in organizational designs and relies on operational principles that, similar to data, data systems, and digital platforms that are the "lifeblood" of contemporary neoliberal capitalism, often make the matter of a horizontal opposition to vertical neoliberal institutions obsolete since such a concern remains stuck within a binary spatial analysis that no longer seems to define today's subject.

Following Han's theoretical lead, and supplementing his insights with spatial and architectural analytical tools that transcend a verticality versus horizontality framework, I look for a different configuration of neoliberal space, one that can better articulate the various challenges faced today by the neoliberal subject. I settle on a spatial/architectural configuration that has been referred to as arcological. Arcological architectural designs (or visions) defy both vertical and horizontal postulates. Arcological conceptualizations are partly derived from the work of Italian architect Paolo Saleri (later in his life, a professor of architecture at Arizona State University) who, in the 1960s and 1970s, envisioned arcologies as atypical lived-in democratic utopias. More recently, arcologies (and other related constructs, like horizontal skyscrapers) have been revisited by a few architectural firms, including Arcosanti, a firm named for Soleri's initial project and influenced by Soleri's visions about spatial and architectural forms. Arcologies are often conceived as spatial domains that are fluid in their design since their goal, through the use of both horizontal and vertical configurations and of forms that are neither clearly vertical nor horizontal, is to realize conditions of life and work that can suit the neoliberal subject and, importantly, can enhance the subject's capacity to achieve by emphasizing reliance on data and data systems.

In the first section of this essay, I review the verticality versus horizontality debate. I (re) introduce analyses that insist on tackling neoliberal capitalism as a set of market and/or post-market based vertical structures and institutions that leave little to no room for individual subjective creativity or emancipation and, often, are seen to stifle the neoliberal subject, depriving it of agency. I also examine counter-hegemonic and counter-vertical critiques of neoliberalism that, sometimes as complements to analyses of neoliberalism's alleged vertical structures, pin their hopes for a radical challenge to neoliberalism and for a rediscovery of the neoliberal subject's political agency on horizontal(ist), decentered, and "on the ground" forms of political organizations.

In the second part of the essay, I seek to steer clear of the binary framework relied upon by proponents of both vertical and horizontal perspectives by showing, via Han's work, that these approaches are often ill-equipped to address the question of what the neoliberal subject today is

and does, largely because critiques of neoliberalism premised on either verticality or horizontality (and their antagonism) do not capture what contemporary neoliberal politics is about. Particularly, they fail to account for the ways data and data systems have reworked what freedom and constraint are and mean for the neoliberal subject. I briefly explain how Han's theoretical insights are better able to provide intelligibilities about contemporary neoliberal politics, or what, once again, he calls psychopolitics, and can offer a more useful grasp of today's neoliberal achievement subject. I also argue that we need to look for different analytical approaches, with possibly new concepts and new terminologies, to make sense of the spatial settings in which today's neoliberal achievement subjects operate. To do so, I turn to arcological perspectives, describing what they are, where conceptually they come from, and how they can be thought to be in line with the understanding of neoliberalism (and of neoliberal subjects) that Han gestures toward. To be clear, I do not intend to support or advocate for arcological postulates and visions. By and large, as I suggest in this essay, arcological ventures, or at least their assumptions and principles, can be seen as models or platforms for future (in some cases, current) modalities of neoliberal life and work, in other words, for psychopolitics. Yet, arcological perspectives, actual or fictive, already realized or imagined, provide architecturally derived spatial images, terms, and concepts that need to be taken seriously as they give credence to the theoretical analyses (and warnings) offered by Han about present and future forms of neoliberal subjectivity.

The verticality versus horizontality debate

Starting with the assumption that contemporary societies "are increasingly dense and stacked societies in which uses of space are built upwards and downwards with ever greater intensity within geographical volumes" (Graham 2016: 4), urban geographer and theorist Stephen Graham has sought to shed light on neoliberalism's "hierarchies of power and worth" (Graham 2016: 17). These neoliberal hierarchies take place in cities above all and are shaped by vertical spaces and structures. For Graham, any critique of neoliberalism must tackle the matter of verticality. For too long, Graham deplores, the emphasis placed by political scientists, geographers, and economists on horizontality and horizontal spaces, or what Graham calls "the global extent of the earth's surface" (Graham 2016: 2), has privileged modalities of territorially grounded power, sovereignty, violence, and wealth acquisition. They have neglected to study how vertical planes have been involved in the making and perpetuating of class antagonisms, modes of domination premised upon economic or even financial value, and capitalism's global hegemony.

According to Graham, neoliberalism (or neoliberalization, as he often calls it), which for him amounts to "the reorganization of societies through the widespread imposition of market relationships," imposes "today's dominant, if crisis ridden, economic order" (Graham 2011: 4). This dominant (geo) economic order is less about horizontal expansion as it is about concentration or densification of wealth. This argument resonates with David Harvey's claim that neoliberal capitalism moves along vertical axes as much as it does along and across global horizontal planes (although Harvey, unlike Graham, is not willing to give up just yet on the relevance of horizontal analyses). Even in an era of global capitalism, neoliberal flows are steered upwards as much as laterally since late-capitalist assembly and growth require vertical structures. Thus, "the circulation of capital… entails spatial movement" that is vertical as much as (if not more than) horizontal since money is always "assembled somewhere" (Harvey 2011: 42). In the context of neoliberalism, it is not only capital that is affected by these vertical movements, but also the everyday life of neoliberal subjects since, as Mark Fisher has noted, neoliberalism, or what Fisher labels "capitalist realism," subsumes all social relations under an economic logic of capitalist organization and control (Fisher 2009). Thus, to quote Harvey again, "the space and time configurations of social life are… revolutionized" (Harvey 2011: 42), and one such

revolution according to many scholarly critiques of neoliberalism is a shift towards vertical spaces and structures of concentration, accumulation, and growth. Political and economic theorist Yann Moulier-Boutang agrees with this interpretation of contemporary forms of neoliberal capitalism, or what he has renamed "cognitive capitalism," and he takes issue with the idea that capitalist globalization has only been horizontal. As Moulier-Boutang notes, "globalization does not expand space… Rather, it 'de-territorializes' and 're-territorializes' spaces" (Moulier-Boutang 2011: 49). Even though for Moulier-Boutang contemporary capitalism as cognitive capitalism is based upon "the accumulation of immaterial capital" and the expansion of a "knowledge economy" (Moulier-Boutang 2011: 50), accumulation and expansion demand a vertical imaginary, one where vertical growth and upward movement are key to the neoliberal subject and to social life governed by a generalized cognitive economy.

Neoliberalism has forced power away from the horizontal plane and moved it towards vertical augmentation. In their work *Inventing the Future: Postcapitalism and a World without Work*, theorists Nick Srnicek and Alex Williams tell us as much when they contrast the construction of capitalist markets under contemporary conditions of neoliberalism (or what they term post-capitalism) to the way classical liberalism and its laissez faire approach viewed the market logic. They write that "whereas classical liberalism advocated respect for a naturalized sphere supposedly beyond state control (the natural laws of man and the market), neoliberals understand that markets are not 'natural'… [They] must instead be consciously constructed… *from the ground up*" (Srnicek and Williams 2016: 53; my emphasis). Srnicek and Williams understand that today's markets must be built up, often with the help of state interventionism. By extension, neoliberal life must be constructed upward, too. Here, the "building up" or "constructing upward" phrases are not just metaphors, but rather clear expositions of an operative arborescent model of economic accumulation and growth, as well as of vertical social life whereby intensified production and competition are meant to be the daily regimens for the neoliberal subject in structures and institutions designed to facilitate such a demand for intensification and competition (Alphin 2021: 5). For quite a few scholars, contemporary neoliberal conditions of intensified competition and exacerbated accumulation make the need to detail vertical power increasingly urgent.

For Graham, it is not so much that vertical geographies have not existed prior to neoliberalism. Rather, as he argues, "vertical schemes for assigning value and worth" were primarily "translated into horizontal cartography" (Graham 2016: 19). This scheme was designed to neutralize the effects of a different kind of power, one centered around capitalism and operating by way of wealth accumulation, concentration, and surplus. According to Graham, the translation of "vertical schemes" into horizontal arrangements explains how political and economic spaces have remained largely horizontal matters that have continued to privilege "flattened" state-centric modes of organization of power and social order (Graham and Hewitt, 2012), both domestically and internationally. In order to remedy this failure of (geo)political and (geo)economic thinking, and to be more attuned to neoliberal regimes of power and wealth, "vertical politics and economics," operating within, through, and as "vertical geographies," must be emphasized (Graham 2016: viii; see also Davis 1998: 360-362).

Urban spaces seem to be particularly suitable to be studied as neoliberal spaces (Alphin 2021) and, crucially, as sites where a critique of neoliberalism's verticality can be deployed. As Graham and Hewitt suggest, "vertical qualities of contemporary processes of urbanization" (Graham and Hewitt 2012: 73) can make sense of power and wealth relations in a neoliberal era (see also Brenner and Kiel 2006). By extolling the values and virtues of neoliberalism's concentration of wealth and intensification of competition, vertical spaces in urban contexts are supposed to facilitate the mobility of neoliberal subjects along vertical planes (Graham 2016: 11) while isolating them from other less successful (that is, less productive and less competitive) subjects so that the more successful

neoliberal subjects may be able to concentrate on being efficient and on contributing to capitalist accumulation. Thus, verticality, once again, is not just a spatial metaphor for neoliberal growth or ascendancy. Conceptually, it also serves to encourage the neoliberal subject to look up and move up, to build higher and taller, to circulate upwards or downwards (although any downward movement must have a bottom threshold below which the neoliberal subject's life is no longer sustainable or desirable) rather than laterally, to buffer itself from the non-productive or not competitive masses by living and working in high places (high finance, high tech industry, cloud-based economy, etc.), and away from those elements that the neoliberal capitalist economic logic has left behind or, better yet, below (and scattered across the globe, sometimes in other parts of the city). As Graham and Hewitt argue, vertical structures and spaces, in the name of providing the neoliberal subject with work and life environments where it can thrive, "contribute in many cities to the emergence of a myriad of vertically stratified, gated 'communities,'" which, in turn, exacerbate the ongoing desolation of the rest of the city and its occupants and, by extension, of global society, perceived as a "flattened" or "residualized [urban] surface" (Graham and Hewitt 2012: 79).

Thus, verticality seems to describe the life conditions of neoliberal subjects well. The allegedly vertical politics and economics of neoliberalism provide the neoliberal subject with an environment that has designed, through its geometry and geography, structural solutions for how to demarcate oneself from others with which contact is to be avoided (Davis 1998). Vertical spaces also offer the neoliberal subject the lure of self-reliance, power over oneself and others, control, or heightened competitiveness (Graham 2016: 162-163) as the neoliberal subject is invited to look upon the leftover and largely horizontal world of the masses from above, from the sky, at heights from which it can no longer clearly distinguish forms down below (which is acceptable or even desirable since the neoliberal subject needs to concentrate on being productive and competitive for the sake of capital accumulation). This association between verticality and power or control is not necessarily new or unique to neoliberalism. As Sharon Zukin once argued, the "landscapes of the powerful" have traditionally been "understood in terms of verticality" (Zukin 1991: 186). Still, for the neoliberal subject, the enticement to intensify by striving to go higher parallels the physiognomy of the city's landscape, a landscape once again dominated by the neoliberal capitalist push towards ascendancy, growth, and surplus making (Graham 2016: xi; Davis and Monk 2007).

For scholars who emphasize the vertical extent of neoliberalism's power and wealth (Davis 2007; Day 2007; Adey 2010), verticality is a form of "re-territorialization" (Graham 2016: 11), seemingly well-adapted to the needs of the neoliberal subject. Often, this vertical re-territorialization is also a layering or stacking up of socio-economic strata that is designed to guarantee some movements (up and down, across some of the layers or levels) to the detriment of others. Lateral movements are limited or relegated to the "flat" spaces where the neoliberal subject generally does not belong, even though, as Harvey notes, an expansion or even proliferation of capital, or better yet, of neoliberal capitalist verticalities (creating more and more vertical urban spaces across the globe), is always at stake too (Harvey 2011: 143). The upward trajectories enabled by vertical structures, and the simultaneous threat of having to go back down, to fall below, perhaps all the way to the ground, substantiate neoliberalism as an ideology that requires the subject—a subject in constant need of achievement—to think of itself in terms of upward mobility, always wanting to realize more, always seeking to self-maximize along a vertical axis. Thus, the neoliberal subject's main imaginaries, its dreams for and about itself, conditioned as they are by neoliberalism's productivist requirements, can remain tethered to a logic of achievement for the sake of achievement or of competition for the sake of competition (Alphin 2021: 114).

Important as the arguments about neoliberalism's verticality may be, they have faced a series of challenges. Often, these challenges have emerged from scholars who, similar to proponents of

vertical analyses, have sought to deploy effective critiques of neoliberal capitalism and of the forms of social life and relations that are said to define the neoliberal subject. Among these critiques, a few urban geographers have attempted to offer insights designed to make Graham and his colleagues' perspectives more nuanced. For example, Andrew Harris has stated that "the emerging focus on verticality across urban and political geography has tended to lack an engagement with… multiple everyday worlds." (Harris 2015: 609). Such a lack of engagement, Harris suggests, has driven the focus of urban geographers eager to critique neoliberal spaces away from social worlds and realities where verticality is more varied, diffuse, and complex as well as where, crucially, the horizontal stretch of capitalism still matters. Relatedly, neoliberal verticalities may not be as fixed, uniform, or monolithic as some have claimed. Again, Harris writes: "The vertical—set perpendicularly against the horizontal—has largely been understood within a three-dimensional (volumetric) space of Euclidean geometry. This means there can be a tendency, particularly in work on 'vertical gated communities'…, to assume that high-rise buildings and structures, including self-declared 'vertical cities', are necessarily undifferentiated and homogeneous communities above the horizontal plane" (Harris 2015: 612).

Harris's comments invoke a different critical perspective with regards to the spatial dimension of neoliberal capitalism, one that, for purposes of radical mobilization against neoliberalism, refuses to give up on horizontality and, in fact, suggests that horizontal planes still hold the key to providing emancipation for the neoliberal subject. Reacting to pro-neoliberal globalization views that have posited that the world at the beginning of the twenty-first century is flat and that, as Thomas Friedman famously put it, this "flattening of the world" is clear evidence that, through neoliberal capitalist markets, high tech travel, flows of information, and means of instantaneous communication, "we are now connecting all the knowledge centers on the planet together into a single global network… which could usher in an amazing era of prosperity, innovation, and collaboration" (Friedman 2007: 8), several anti-neoliberal globalization perspectives have sought to deploy alter-horizontalist modes of thought and, at times, of political action too. These new horizontalist perspectives, on display since about the turn of the millennium, have attempted to reclaim horizontality as a form of critique as well as a way to mobilize subjects against recent modes of capitalist exploitation and control. In so doing, while rejecting pro-globalization world flattening arguments, they have often relied on understandings of neoliberalism as a vertical hegemon that must be uprooted at the base, on the ground, and by way of horizontal(ist) strategies of organization of individuals and groups that supposedly do not fit the model of neoliberal order and subjectivity as it has been presented by vertical theories. Thus, while relying on understandings of neoliberal verticality deployed by some of the scholars mentioned above, these anti-neoliberal capitalism analyses have cast their arguments against the background of verticality and vertical perspectives while looking to reclaim horizontality. While the turn to horizontality as a critical modality of thought and action may have been rekindled of late, this is perhaps not a new phenomenon. As social organization theorist Rodrigo Nunes notes, "for decades, debates on the left have tended to pitch conceptual pairs like horizontality and verticality." (Nunes 2021: 13).

New horizontalist perspectives largely subscribe to the view that neoliberal capitalism, despite its many vertical nodes and modes of accumulation and growth, is about "de-territorialization." And de-territorialization unfolds according to a spatial logic of lateral connections and networks, whether they are the dominant networks that sustain contemporary modalities of neoliberal capitalist power or radical, critical, and counter-hegemonic loose connectivities of individuals and collectives that seek to resist neoliberal capitalism. For example, this is how Moulier-Boutang understands the requirement to innovate in the current dominant mode of capitalism (which, again, he terms cognitive capitalism). As Moulier-Boutang claims, "innovation is no longer, or is not only, solely, within the individual company; it is wherever the territory provides a productive… network" (Moulier-Boutang 2011: 54). Since in

cognitive capitalism, innovation, knowledge, and what Moulier-Boutang calls the "management of immaterial resources" are key, the networking, connectivity, or "cooperation of brains" from across the globe and throughout the socio-economic order is the main organizational modality of neoliberalism (Moulier-Boutang 2011: 79). Such a "networking of brains" does not do away with command, but rather spatially de-centers forms of control across the social, political, and economic spectrum.

To some critics, this horizontal scattering of immaterial resources and knowledge networks that is the lifeblood of the economic system can also give rise to types of popular political and social organizations or movements that devise similarly horizontal strategies in order to resist the modalities of command and control of neoliberal capitalism. In so doing, these spatial strategies of political organization and protest also reject the image of the stereotypical (vertical) neoliberal subject constantly driven and defined by upward maximization, intensified competition, and a need to find ways to go or be higher. According to Srnicek and Williams, the development of a "counter-hegemonic project that requires the toppling of neoliberal common sense" (Srnicek and Williams 2016: 169) can only take shape through a horizontal infrastructure of networks of contestation made up of individuals and groups that have been cast away (or left below, as I put it above) by neoliberalism. These individuals and groups organizing horizontally as networks are the meaningful subjects that have been shaped by neoliberal capitalism. They are the ones that require horizontality as a radical mode of political organization and emancipation. As Srnicek and Williams would have it, to adequately represent the political demands of these true neoliberal subjects, "the overarching architecture of such an ecology [of resistance] is a relatively decentralized and networked form" (Srnicek and Williams 2016: 163) (although it bears mentioning that Srnicek and Williams see such a horizontal architecture of popular networks as different from what they call "a standard horizontalist vision," which for them would be akin to pure popular sovereignty with little hope for political groupings or collectives).

Possibly one of the most frequently cited forms of horizontal reclaiming of neoliberal capitalist space for counter-hegemonic purposes is Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's "multitude." For Hardt and Negri, in the face of what they call Empire (Hardt and Negri 2001) (which, for them, encompasses both the horizontal dimensions of late-capitalism's global flattening, as noted by Friedman, and the vertical extent of neoliberal accumulation, concentration, and piling up of wealth embodied by some urban spaces, as described above), the multitude is both an organizational principle of political resistance and emancipation that unfolds spatially (and primarily in a horizontal fashion) and an organic social reality that encompasses de-centered (or spatially scattered) subjects in need of networking and connectivity. Thus, in their words, the multitude is "a concept of applied parallelism, able to grasp the specificity of altermodern struggles, which are characterized by relations of autonomy, equality, and interdependence among vast multiplicities of singularities" (Hardt and Negri 2009: 111). But the multitude is also "a multiplicity of social singularities defined more or less by their culture or ethnicity or labor position" that can manage to "coordinate their struggles together" (Hardt and Negri 2009: 111). At stake in the unfolding of the multitude is a fight over space, and in particular the need to recapture social space away from neoliberal capitalism and its model of vertical subjectivity. For Hardt and Negri, horizontality is a rediscovered political instrument that can revive what they call "global public space." As they argue, "constructing global public space requires that the multitude, in its exodus, create the institutions that can consolidate and fortify the anthropological conditions of the resistance of the poor" (Hardt and Negri 2009: 247).

Among other things, this retaking of global social space requires a new horizontal vision of the city. The city, or what they call the "metropolis" or "biopolitical city," must be revisited as a horizontal plane of and for life. The excessive building up of the neoliberal city must be undone and verticality must be brought down to earth so that the city can become "a site of biopolitical production" (a space of and for life beyond neoliberal vertical structures) as well as "the space of the common, of people

living together, sharing resources, communicating, exchanging goods and ideas" (Hardt and Negri 2009: 249). Thus, in the name of the multitude of subjects cast away by contemporary forms of neoliberal capitalism, a horizontal "metropolization of the world" is Hardt and Negri's answer to the verticality of the neoliberal city and of neoliberalism more generally.

Whether it is defined as the product of neoliberalism's "vertical spatial stretching" (McNeill 2005) and, accordingly, it is given attributes conditioned by vertical and hierarchical ways of thinking social life, or whether it is seen as part of a collective or even a living multitude that can offer it a new capacity of resistance and a new hope for emancipation, the neoliberal subject is conceptualized by most critiques of neoliberal capitalism as an outgrowth of either verticality or horizontality. The neoliberal subject's social characteristics, its needs and desires, are thus typically those that are conditioned either by vertical modalities of accumulation, growth, and intensified competition or by horizontal potentials for radical organization, political mobilization, and resistance through and across networked connections, lateral "metropolization," and decentered collectives. In a way, the picture that each perspective gives of the neoliberal subject is one defined by "exclusive disjunctions: either one thing or the other" (Nunes 2021: 13). According to these configurations, the neoliberal subject is thus either a verticality-driven subject that shuns horizontal planes of life/living or a politically re-energized counter-hegemonic subject that seeks to spread radical potentials by joining or forming networks across the globe.

In the next section, I turn to the work of political philosopher Byung-Chul Han and his notion of "neoliberal psychopolitics" to provide an understanding of the contemporary neoliberal subject that is not constrained by either verticality or horizontality, nor by their opposition. As I will show, Han's theory of the neoliberal subject as an achievement subject problematizes any description of neoliberalism and of the neoliberal subject as either vertical or horizontal. Put differently, the spaces of neoliberal psychopolitics and for the neoliberal achievement subject are neither just vertical or just horizontal. While retaining some properties of verticality and horizontality (and, sometimes, of both at the same time), the spaces and structures of social life of and for the neoliberal achievement subject may best be apprehended as arcological spaces and structures.

The neoliberal achievement subject and arcological spaces

According to philosopher Byung-Chul Han, "[w]e are living in a particular phase of history [when] freedom itself is bringing forth compulsion and constraint" (Han 2017a: 1). Han adds: "As the entrepreneur of its own self, the neoliberal subject has no capacity for relationships with others that might be free of purpose" (Han 2017a: 2). To be an "entrepreneur of its own self," the neoliberal subject must turn onto itself and must constantly seek to improve itself, invest in itself and its own productive capacities, and ultimately exploit itself. Here, in part, Han borrows some of Michel Foucault's insights about the late-liberal subject, or what Foucault termed *Homo Oeconomicus*, as a self-entrepreneur that had internalized the demands of the system, particularly by adopting a set of conducts that would remain in line with the dominant socio-economic expectations and norms of the times and would regularly check itself to ensure that it continuously fit the norms, particularly in terms of productivity and efficiency (Foucault 2008: 270-271; see also Foucault 2016). But Han goes one step further by stating that the late-liberal, or now neoliberal, subject internalizes the need for exploitation too. As Han puts it, "neoliberal psychopolitics is always coming up with more refined forms of exploitation. Countless self-management workshops, motivational retreats and seminars on personality… promise boundless self-optimization and heightened efficiency… Neoliberalism has discovered integral *human being* as the object of exploitation" (Han 2017a: 29).

For Han, the subject at the heart of contemporary neoliberal schemes is what he calls the

"achievement subject" (Han 2018: viii). Contrasted to Foucault's "obedience subject" of disciplinary power and biopolitics (Han 2018: ix), the achievement subject of neoliberal capitalism is a self-optimizer that depends on what Han calls psychopower to strive to be and to want more. Psychopower for Han is a power that relies on data and digital technologies, or perhaps on what Moulier-Boutang has referred to as cognitive capitalism, in order to maximize psychic or mental processes with a view to realizing more effective self-control and self-productivity. According to Han, self-exploitation managed by way of data and digital platforms is primarily a psychic or mental endeavor (not a physical one) that breaks down subjectivity into a series of data bits, algorithms and formulas, and digitalized numerical factors and aggregates that enable computation-based management and measurement. Through data and digitalized numerical values that can be accessed and used at all times, techniques of self-enhancement, self-surveillance, and self-enforcement geared towards constant performance evaluation translate the self/subject into a series of data points always available for assessment. Such a psychopolitical (no longer biopolitical) tracking and such a striving for digital improvement of one's self/subjectivity take place all the time, in all sorts of ways, and through all kinds of social environments and structures or domains of life and work that need not be assumed to be either horizontal or vertical prior to their operationalization.

By and large, this is what the neoliberal subject is and does for Han. This is how and why it always seeks to achieve. To achieve means for the neoliberal subject that it has to turn itself into a series of digital measurements or computations that can be readily accessed and assessed. In this manner, the achievement subject of neoliberalism is also what Han calls a "project" (Han 2017b: 48). A project is not actualized or finalized. It always requires further enhancement or improvement. A project always demands more. Thus, the achievement subject as project can always do or be better. In this way, the neoliberal achievement subject is also perpetually a work in progress, often coming short (as the digital computations and the data points tell the subject it can do more or better), and thus always striving, always seeking to improve on its previous outputs.

The neoliberal subject or project as Han conceives it to be is also never its own master. It is always someone or something else's object or objective, although the achievement subject does not see it this way since, by and large, the achievement subject understands its constant push for better performances as a matter of freedom, as Han notes (Han 2015: 35). Even as it works on itself, the achievement subject as project pushes or throws forward (pro-ject is from the Latin *projectere*, which means to throw or aim forward, or to push ahead) what the system has already set up and given. Key to neoliberal exploitation under psychopolitics is, through an endless enhancement of achievement driven subjects, the making of subjects into projects, or, put differently, the construction of a projected subjectivity (and this projection can go in many directions, can take various shapes and forms, and can unfold in diverse spatial contexts) that compels subjects to measure themselves against themselves in a bid to maximize their capacities, often represented as always shifting sets of data.

In many ways, neoliberal psychopolitics, as Han has theorized it (Han 2017a), challenges the verticality versus horizontality binary relied upon by critiques of neoliberalism. The neoliberal achievement subject is not simply stuck in vertical structures that impose upward mobility and conditioned to produce more by way of vertical stratification. And this neoliberal subject is also not easily defined by its emancipation potential, or as a subject that can spread its capacity of resistance and its newly found political agency laterally, across horizontally reconstructed multitudinal networks. Rather, empirically and theoretically, the achievement subject is given the "freedom" to expand its potential for self-maximization and/as self-exploitation in ways that can be at once vertical and horizontal, and to the point where the distinction between horizontality and verticality may no longer be determinant. Han started to perceive the futility of verticality versus horizontality debates when he suggested that neoliberal psychopolitics unfolds in contexts that simultaneously combine "boundless

self-optimization" (that is to say, a horizontal plane of limitless expansion) and "heightened efficiency" (a vertical modality of intensified capitalist productivity and growth) (Han 2017a: 29). For Han, it does not matter if the achievement subject as project throws itself forward or backward, upward or downward, horizontally or vertically, as long as it is able to work on itself and its data outputs to be more competitive and to more efficiently internalize the demands of the system (which, again, the subject does not see as a demand but rather as a set of opportunities).

For Han, under conditions of psychopolitics, the neoliberal subject once again experiences freedom as and through compulsion and constraint. It is data that "frees" the subject from what Han calls "subjective arbitrariness" (Han 2017a: 58). Thanks to a "freedom" to access data and to assess data outputs about one's self, everything the neoliberal subject is, does, or wants can be transparent, readily available, known, and thus quantifiable, trackable, and actionable too. Some have referred to this neoliberal subject as a quantified self (Wolf 2011; Lupton 2016; Han 2017a: 60). Data seemingly provides unlimited access and movement for the subject, but such a freedom of movement and access is also a matter of control. As it moves "freely" out and about with data in search of self-maximization, the neoliberal subject is monitored (by itself, to start with) and data is instantaneously gathered and potentially publicized as the subject performs (but never fully achieves). For the neoliberal achievement subject, as Han explains, freedom via data is always a matter of digital surveillance (Han 2017a: 55-56; see also Zuboff 2019). Crucially, Han adds, data "freedom" as digital surveillance works for neoliberalism and the neoliberal subject "because it is *aperspectival*. It does not suffer from the perspectival limitations [of] analog… systems" and spaces (Han 2017a: 56). Thus, what the neoliberal subject needs to remain with this logic of constant openness onto data systems is an environment or spatial configuration that can accommodate or, better yet, encourage the subject's moves (often as a series of data points, once again). This is why the spaces of the neoliberal achievement subject are indeed, as Han states, without or beyond perspectives, or "aperspectival."

The "aperspectivalism" of neoliberal psychopolitics cannot be adequately represented by the notions of verticality and horizontality (or their opposition), notions or dimensions of (geo)political and (geo)economic thinking that remain tethered to analog settings and systems. Vertical axes and horizontal planes, visually or metaphorically useful as they may be thought to be when it comes to allegorizing neoliberalism and the role/place of the neoliberal subject, fall short of making sense of the neoliberal achievement subject as a subject/project whose freedom and control, fused together, are constantly made and remade by the performative work of data (Deleuze 1992: 5; Davis 2015, Birchall 2018). Put differently, spaces of digital subjectivity cut across the rigidity of horizontal versus vertical dichotomies and their analog, material, and representational anchors.

Instead of vertical or horizontal, I want to suggest that the spaces of and for the neoliberal subject under conditions of psychopolitics can be thought of as "arcological." Arcological spaces or domains, or arcologies, are built environments and spatial configurations that neoliberal subjects both crave and rely on for life and work. As zones that simultaneously enable expansion and concentration of neoliberal capital and competition, arcologies accommodate the neoliberal subject as the product of data systems and digital outputs, and they condition it to want to achieve. Arcologies are often thought of as all encompassing, autonomous, and ecologically self-contained and self-sustaining spaces of and for competitive life and efficient work that possess what could be described as biospheric characteristics (Baudrillard 1994; Luke 1995; Kershaw 2000). Like biospheres, arcologies are meant to be hermetic zones of life and work, somewhat sealed from the world and social reality found on the outside. In them, a saturated neoliberal universe of labor, consumption, but also home life, leisure time, and communal relations (as needed) is provided to the achievement subject through a thorough reliance on data and digital interfaces (including social media). Arcologies are organized according to a logic of quotidian achievement. Thus, arcologies can provide daily material confirmation, through the

objects and subjects that inhabit them, of freedom and constraint as key principles of psychopolitical living.

To this day, arcologies often remain the product of science fiction imaginaries or visionary post-urban architectural utopias. Science fiction author Paolo Bacigalupi has introduced arcological spaces in several of his novels and short stories (Bacigalupi 2010; Bacigalupi 2016). In Bacigalupi's often dystopian near future, arcologies are lived-in spaces that rely on both horizontal and vertical principles. While Bacigalupi's arcologies are often imagined as sitting a few hundred yards above the earth's surface (above a city, a desert, swamp lands, etc.) (Bacigalupi 2016: 9; 201-202), they are also above-ground horizontal expanses, possibly looking like post-urban floating islands that, in a cloud-like manner, are suspended between earth and sky (as we will see below, it may not be coincidental that arcologies seem to mirror for the neoliberal subject the digital cloud where much of the subject's personal data now reside). They are still anchored to the earth thanks to massive vertical pillars, but they stretch out horizontally across or just below the clouds. Often described as being enclosed by glass structures that offer them exposure to the sun, they are meant to operate ecologically through a fully self-reliant recycling system (with seemingly limited runoffs evaporating in the air or dumped down below, back into the outside world). Arcological spaces, through these biospheric traits, can potentially be deployed under all climatic conditions and in any of the earth's eco-systems (in deserts, over ice caps, in swamps, over and across oceans, on top of or adjacent to decaying urban landscapes, etc.). Arcologies are their own built-in eco-systems, and since they supposedly can adapt to various land, water, and air conditions, there is not one unique spatial principle or shape that they must privilege.

Considerations of horizontality and verticality are thus secondary concerns with arcologies. What primarily matters are the life/work conditions and, in particular, the exposure of the neoliberal subject, as the main dweller of these spaces, to data-based achievement, competition, and intensification that arcologies are designed to optimize throughout their interior. Put differently, arcologies are envisioned as fluid spatial constructs that maximize horizontality and verticality principles, as needed, but without privileging one over the other, in order to guarantee an uninterrupted circulation of data since data is the driving force of arcological life and work. Arcologies thus ensure total saturation of the subject by way of data and data systems, but they also seek to buffer the neoliberal subject and its data outputs from any influence or contagion coming from outside the arcological domain. In some of Bacigalupi's fictional renditions of arcological living spaces, the possibility of horizontal travel for the subjects exists. But this possible horizontal movement mainly takes place within a given arcology or across different arcological entities, with the understanding that hermeticity somehow can remain unscathed during inter-arcological transport.

In a way, arcological spaces created for neoliberal subjects' psychopolitical living anticipate a built-in life and work whereby subjects exist as data and data points. Cloud computing and social media platforms (Facebook, Instagram, Google Earth, Amazon Prime, etc.) have already sought to optimize what can be thought to be some arcological principles imagined by SciFi authors like Bacigalupi, thus turning arcologies into tangible, albeit virtual, domains that can do away with a strict adherence to verticality and horizontality. Digital platforms and networks where data are produced and stored (like the cloud) but also where a great deal of social life and work in a neoliberal age take place both mimic and enhance arcological imaginaries. Similar to arcologies, social networking today provides what French theorist Bernard Stiegler has called "a kind of vertical flatness" to life and work (Stiegler 2016, 133). Thanks to such a "vertical flatness," neoliberal subjects can start to see themselves as the tenants of arcological spaces where, as Han recently suggested, they "no longer dwell on the earth or under the sky, but on Google Earth and in the Cloud" (Han 2022, 1). Yet, as social critic Shoshana Zuboff has shown (2019), neoliberal capitalism remains firmly in control of

these "cloud-like," "Google-earthy," or "vertically flat" spaces.

According to Zuboff, and reminiscent of Han's argument about the neoliberal subject, the goal of these spaces or domains is to maximize coercion and harmony for the sake of enhancing productivity and achievement, while giving the dwellers of these spaces a sense of unlimited movement, unobstructed potential, and free access to objects and (fellow) subjects. As Zuboff puts it, a new "human hive" of and for neoliberal subjects is thus imagined (in a way, virtually constructed) through these platforms that can be readily fitted with what she calls the "machine hive" (Zuboff 2019, 414), that is to say, the neoliberal capitalist system of production, achievement, and expansion in the age of data and data systems. According to Zuboff, the motto of these social domains and spaces, a motto that, as we shall see below, is in line with arcological thinking, is provided by Microsoft CEO Satya Nadella who, in 2017, declared that "people and their relationship with other people is now a first-class thing in the cloud" (Nadella 2017; Zuboff 2019, 410). Likewise, in their study of cloud computing and cloud thinking, media theorists Rob Coley and Dean Lockwood note that the seemingly evanescent, amorphous, and yet ever-present space of the cloud (or what they call "cloud culture") is designed not only to offer virtual platforms (neither here nor there, neither vertical nor horizontal) for data gathering, storage, and dissemination, but also to move digital domains towards the construction of new "unifying structures" for neoliberal life and work (Coley and Lockwood 2012, 27). Similar to arcological designs, what Coley and Lockwood call "cloud capitalism" (their name for neoliberal capitalism in a data-driven era) is meant not only to operate as an imaginary or visionary potential, but also to move towards actual, concrete, and built-in physical applications for the alleged benefit of neoliberal subjects. They refer to these concrete applications in the making as a matter of "constructed plausibility" (Coley and Lockwood 2012, 27).

Just like science fiction imaginaries and cloud computing prospects, arcologies have been "constructed plausibilities" for a few decades now. Indeed, a few arcological structures have already been attempted, sometimes with limited success, particularly in some urban areas in China where they have sometimes been labelled "horizontal skyscrapers" (Roxburgh 2018). Recently, Saudi Arabia ordered American architectural design studio Morphosis to initiate the planning of an over 100-mile long, a third of a mile high, and only about 300-yard wide entirely self-enclosed "linear city" that would stretch above and across the Arabian desert (Ravenscroft 2022). To this day, this project remains at a planning stage. Over a decade ago, an article in Wired magazine mentioned that five "real world" arcologies were about to start construction, although, ten years later, it is still not clear what their present status is (Geere 2011).

Perhaps one of the most successful and well-known arcologies/horizontal skyscrapers to date is the Vanke Center in Shenzhen, China, which was completed in 2009. The product of the imagination of the Steven Holl Architects group, and designed to house the headquarters of the Vanke real estate corporation, the Vanke Center is meant to be a fully contained space/domain where work takes place, but also where Vanke corporation employees and guests can reside and enjoy family and community life inside living quarters (apartments) and in open and "public" spaces (this arcology contains a large natural park, movie theaters, restaurants, at least one hotel, an auditorium for concerts, and several public gardens). The Steven Holl Architects group describes the Vanke arcology/horizontal skyscraper as follows: "Hovering over a tropical garden, this 'horizontal skyscraper'—as long as the Empire State Building is tall—unites into one vision the headquarters for Vanke Co. ltd, office spaces, apartments, and a hotel. A conference center, spa and parking are located under the large green, public landscape" (Steven Holl Architects 2023; no page given). The Steven Holl Architects group's narrative captures the arcological spirit of the Vanke Center by stating that "the building appears as if it were once floating on a higher sea that has now subsided, leaving the structure propped up high on eight legs" (Steven Holl Architects 2023; no page given).

Reminiscent of Bacigalupi's fictional arcologies, the Vanke Center seeks to maximize "vertical flatness" so as to "create views over the lower developments of surrounding sites to the South China Sea, and to generate the largest possible green space open to the public" (Steven Holl Architects 2023; no page given). Yet, it is clear that the so-called public targeted by this arcological space are the neoliberal subjects who live and work, and are meant to enjoy the amenities on offer, inside this contained yet fluid domain. Indeed, what the designers of this neither vertical nor horizontal space call a realized "tropical vision" of a future where "building and landscape" are now "integrated" in a "new sustainable way" is first and foremost provided to the Vanke corporation and many of its corporate leaders, most of whom (one would presume) have already internalized the needs and requirements of psychopolitical living and neoliberal capitalist work (Vanke corporation is often considered to be the second largest real estate company and property developer in China, with ventures throughout Asia and across the globe, including the United States, and it claims to be ranked #178 on the Fortune Global 500 list).

Even though there is no obvious mention of it, it seems that the Vanke Center in Shenzhen has been able to put to use arcological principles that have been envisioned since at least the 1970s. The arcological imaginary of the Steven Holl Architects group on display in southern China is not unlike that of one of the forerunners of arcological thinking, the transnational architecture firm Arcosanti. Inspired and founded by visionary Italian architect Paolo Soleri, Arcosanti started to imagine concrete applications of key arcological principles a few decades ago. Arcosanti has touted the virtues of arcological spaces by stating that arcologies combine "architecture and ecology" (hence, the neologism "arcology") in fostering a "comprehensive urban perspective" and in being in tune with the ways "organisms evolve" (Arcosanti 2017: no page given).

Soleri started to imagine futurist architectural designs, including one that he dubbed Arcosanti, in the 1970s and 1980s (Soleri 1987). Timothy W. Luke has noted that, in Soleri's initial vision, Arcosanti was thought of as "a working prototype for a new kind of city, one that… [would be] designed, built, and inhabited as a three-dimensional, highly concentrated megastructure" (Luke 1997: 153). In Arcosanti, Soleri's prototypical arcological model, ecology and technology would come together to transcend the unsustainable "two-dimensional explosion of urban areas" with the hope of "reconceptualizing the morphology of individual houses, towns, and cities as social aggregates with immanent rational potentialities" (Luke 1997: 162). According to Luke, the fears, dangers, threats, pollutions, and other nefarious living conditions caused by the out-of-control horizontal sprawl and vertical reach of megalopolitan entities like Los Angeles, Mexico City, or Phoenix led Soleri to imagine Arcosanti as a somewhat amorphous space or, better yet, as what anthropologist Marc Augé has called a "nonplace" (Augé 2009). As a nonplace, Arconsanti would be (quite literally) a perfect utopia, one whose arcological properties would nonetheless enable it to concentrate "the production/ consumption/circulation/administration of commodities in the bowels of an immense megastructure, while arraying the spaces for residences, schools, entertainments, and the arts on its top and along its exteriors, like some superluxury [ocean] steamer permanently run aground" (Luke 1997: 170).

While the ideological impulse behind Soleri's project was dubious at best (as Luke rightly noted, Soleri's Arcosanti was the dream of "a totalitarian civilization that mystifies its totalitarianism in the ideologies of choice, liberation, and convenience" [Luke 2019: 101]), in recent years, Arcosanti, the arcological utopia, has been revitalized and repurposed by what is now an architectural firm bearing the name of Soleri's vision. Today, it is argued that the arcological qualities extolled by Soleri can be an opportunity for Arcosanti, the transnational architecture firm, to take advantage of resources and ways of living championed by neoliberal politics and economics. As we saw above, other architectural firms and ventures have taken advantage of neoliberal capitalism and of the needs/requirements of the neoliberal subject, and they appear to have developed similar visions and projects (even

if sometimes they prefer to call them horizontal skyscrapers). In his study of arcological utopian thinking, Luke writes that Arcosanti (Soleri's original project) was "languishing because it [needed] a political economy to operate" (Luke 2019: 103). However, for today's Arcosanti (the architectural firm), and for other similar ventures, neoliberalism now provides a fitting ideological setting and political economic platform for arcological designs and for updated arcological values to be put to use. Thus, what Arcosanti (the architectural firm) wishes to exploit these days are the values that the neoliberal achievement subject allegedly embodies and relishes, such as living in/as "a compact system," readiness to "complexity," or the necessity to adapt and see oneself as part of a fully "functioning living system" (Arcosanti 2017: no page given), values that also promote a neoliberal mode of subjectivity through self-improvement and achievement.

Described as an "integral process" that brings together architecture/space and ecology/life, contemporary arcologies are also an answer to the non-competitive or non-achievement driven world that neoliberalism has seemingly left behind. For Arcosanti, arcological spaces are "a response to the many problems of urban civilization: population growth, pollution, energy/natural resource depletion, food scarcity, and quality of life" (Arcosanti 2017: no page given). Thus, arcologies—realized or imagined, cloud-like or sitting above ground yet still anchored to the earth—propose to "radically re-organize" life into what, for example, Arcosanti calls "dense, integrated, three-dimensional cities [that can] support the diversified activities that sustain human culture and environmental balance" (Arcosanti 2017: no page given). This, Arcosanti claims, amounts to nothing less than a "complete reformulation of how we exist" (Arcosanti 2017: no page given). And again, how we "exist" today is a psychopolitical demand as much as (if not more than) a biopolitical requirement since the subject's existence is constantly data-driven and data-dependent.

Thus, whether they are imagined in SciFi narratives, thought of as precursors to fully integrated cloud-computing forms of life and work, or architecturally and spatially designed as lived-in domains floating above ground, contemporary arcologies are "constructed plausibilities" for neoliberal maximization and self-optimization. Protected by and appearing as what Arcosanti calls an "ecological envelope" or a "bounded density" (Arcosanti 2017: no page given), an arcology's main mission indeed appears to be to "envelope" and "densify" neoliberal life and work as they are constantly made and remade by data. And since arcological domains seem to offer everything the neoliberal subject needs, all the subject has to do is, once again, concentrate on itself, on improving its own efficiency, and on being ever more competitive through data and digital computations. Arcosanti has coined an interesting phrase for what is now expected of the neoliberal subject in arcological settings: "frugal resiliency" (Arcosanti 2017: no page given). Overall, frugal resiliency does not negate the quest for affluence. But it also emphasizes the point that the subject's freedom and well-being under optimized conditions of neoliberal life/work can only be realized if and when this subject endlessly seeks to be self-efficient and self-sufficient, and, furthermore (and back to Soleri's utopia), if it understands that its life/work environment will help it to fulfill these exigencies.

Conclusion

According to Han, neoliberal psychopolitics is an answer to the contemporary limitations of biopolitics and biopower as critical modes of analysis of late-capitalist life and work (Alphin and Debrix 2021). Biopower's emphasis on the subject's body, on its capacity for obedience and discipline, and on the physical spaces where the subject's disciplinary normalization is best realized does not capture the psychic/mental operations by way of data and data systems that define the contemporary neoliberal subject as an achievement subject, a subject that, furthermore, has lost its capacity to distinguish freedom from self-exploitation. Under neoliberal conditions, psychopolitics "is taking the

place of biopower [since]… [w]ith the help of digital surveillance, psychopolitics is in the position to read and control thoughts" (Han 2017b: 78). Whereas disciplinary/biopolitical power was "tied to perspective" across a horizontal plane or along a vertical axis, the psychopower of data is now "more efficient because it is aperspectival… [and thus it] can intervene in psychological processes themselves" (Han 2017b: 78; author's emphasis).

In this essay, I have suggested that space is allied to neoliberal psychopolitics and to the making or re-making of the neoliberal subject. But not all spatial configurations are able to capture what the neoliberal subject has become. The vertical model of power, worth, and growth may seem to give us an apt representation of what neoliberalism is and does. But verticality remains tied to a way of understanding power that, by and large, is unable to explain how data has reshaped the spaces of life and work of and for the neoliberal subject. Similarly, a rekindled form of horizontality in recent critical analyses operates primarily in relation (and opposition) to the idea of verticality, or to the view that the neoliberal subject is trapped in and controlled by vertical structures, since the main goal of the proponents of new horizontal(ist) challenges is to develop a spatially decentered form of counter-hegemony vis-à-vis neoliberal capitalist systems and institutions, often by way of laterally connected networks of individuals, collectives, or multitudes. Vertical perspectives and horizontal modes of organization provide critical analyses of neoliberalism that remain tied to disciplinary or biopolitical configurations of power. As such, their critical potential has become limited in an era of psychopolitical neoliberalism. Moreover, vertical analyses and horizontal counter-hegemonic perspectives seem to be driven by a desire to challenge each other rather than by a careful attention to the ways neoliberal psychopolitics works today. Following Han's thinking, vertical and horizontal spaces, planes, or dimensions of analysis remain perspectival at a time when neoliberal capitalism has become aperspectival.

Arcological thinking or designing is ambitious, visionary, sometimes virtual, and the ideologies or imaginaries (about space, but also about future life, and about the role and place of human subjectivity in data and digital domains) that it promotes are often problematic (Luke 2019: 106) and possibly dangerous. As I suggested above, arcologies are spaces, environments, and domains of and for neoliberal achievement subjects and neoliberal psychopolitics. As they continue to materialize, in physical and virtual settings, arcologies are likely to reinforce the domination of neoliberal capitalism as a form of life/living, and possibly as the only viable form of life/living on earth. Arcologies are suited for the ways data has been molding the neoliberal subject (and not just in the cloud) so that it can remain a subject in endless search of achievement, and with a sense of freedom always already adjusted to the constraints of data systems and digital technologies. The "aperspectivalism" of arcological spaces has the potential to provide the neoliberal subject with all the life and work compulsions it craves. With such a spatial rethinking of subjectivity, it is also not clear where challenges to contemporary and future forms of neoliberalism, if any, can reside since previously deployed critiques of verticality and horizontal(ist) counter-hegemonic strategies look like they have missed much of what defines today's neoliberal subject and its surroundings.

References

Adey, Peter. 2010. "Vertical Security in the Megacity: Legibility, Mobility, and Aerial Politics," Theory, Culture, and Society. 27, 6: 51-67.

Alphin, Caroline. 2021. Neoliberalism and Cyberpunk Science Fiction: Living on the Edge of Burnout. London: Routledge.

Alphin, Caroline and Debrix, François. 2021. "Biopolitics in the 'Psychic Realm': Han, Foucault and neoliberal psychopolitics," Philosophy and Social Criticism. online first. https://doi.org/10.1177/01914537211033011. Last accessed December 2, 2022.

Arcosanti. 2017. "The Arcology Concept: Architecture + Ecology." arcosanti.org/project/arcology/. Last accessed November 26, 2022.

Augé, Marc. 2009. Non-Places: An Introduction to Supermodernity. London: Verso.

Bacigalupi, Paolo. 2010. "Pop Squad." Pp. 137-161 in P. Bacigalupi, Pump Six, and Other Stories. San Francisco: Night Shade Books.

Bacigalupi, Paolo. 2016. The Water Knife. New York: Vintage Books.

Baudrillard, Jean. 1994. The Illusion of the End. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Birchall, Clare. 2018. Shareveillance: The Dangers of Openly Sharing and Covertly Collecting Data. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Brenner, Neil and Kiel, Roger. 2006. "Editors'

Introduction: Global City Theory in Retrospect and Prospect." Pp. 1-15 in The Global Cities Reader, edited by N. Brenner and R. Kiel, London: Routledge.

Coley, Rob and Lockwood, Dean. 2012. Cloud Time: The Inception of the Future. Winchester, UK: Zero Books.

Davis, Erik. 2015. TechGnosis: Myth, Magic, and Mysticism in the Age of Information. Berkeley: North Atlantic Books.

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

Davis, Mike. 2007. "Sand, Fear, and Money in Dubai." Pp. 48-68 in Evil Paradises: Dreamworlds of Neoliberalism, edited by M. Davis and D. B. Monk, New York: New Press.

Davis, Mike and Monk, Daniel Bertrand, eds. 2007. Evil Paradises: Dreamworlds of Neoliberalism. New York: The New Press.

Day, Joe. 2007. "Hubrispace: Personal Museums and the Architectures of Self-Deification." Pp. 219-240 in Evil Paradises: Dreamworlds of Neoliberalism, edited by M. Davis and D. B. Monk, New York: New Press.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1992. "Postscript on the Societies of Control," October. 59: 3-7.

Fisher, Mark. 2009. Capitalist Realism: Is There No Alternative? Winchester, UK: Zero Books.

Foucault, Michel. 2008. The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France, 1978-1979. New York: Palgrave.

Foucault, Michel. 2016. On the Government of the Living: Lectures at the College de France, 1979-1980. New York: Picador.

Friedman, Thomas. 2007. The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century. New York: Picador.

Geere, Duncan. 2011. "Five Real-World Arcologies under Construction," Wired. June 21. www.wired.co.uk/article/paolo-soleri-arcologies. Last accessed November 28, 2022.

Graham, Stephen. 2011. Cities under Siege: The New Military Urbanism. London: Verso.

Graham, Stephen. 2016. Vertical: The City from Satellites to Bunkers. London: Verso.

Graham, Stephen and Hewitt, Lucy. 2012. "Getting off the Ground: On the Politics of Urban Verticality," Progress in Human Geography. 37, 1: 72-92.

Han, Byung-Chul. 2015. The Burnout Society. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Han, Byung-Chul. 2017a. Psychopolitics: Neoliberalism and New Technologies of Power. London: Verso.

Han, Byung-Chul. 2017b. In the Swarm: Digital Prospects. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Han, Byung-Chul. 2018. Topology of Violence. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Han, Byung-Chul. 2022. Non-things.

Cambridge: Polity.

Hardt, Michael and Negri, Antonio. 2001. Empire. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hardt, Michael and Negri, Antonio. 2009. Commonwealth. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Harris, Andrew. 2015. "Vertical Urbanisms: Opening up Geographies of the Three-Dimensional City," Progress in Human Geography. 39, 5: 601-620.

Harvey, David. 2011. The Enigma of Capital and the Crisis of Capitalism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kershaw, Baz. 2000. "The Theatrical Biosphere and Ecologies of Performance," New Theatre Quarterly. 16, 2: 122-130.

Luke, Timothy W. 1995. "Reproducing Planet Earth: The Hubris of Biosphere 2," The Ecologist. 25, 4: 157-164.

Luke, Timothy W. 1997. Ecocritique: Contesting the Politics of Nature, Economy, and Culture. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Luke, Timothy W. 2019. Anthropocene Alerts: Critical theory of the Contemporary as Ecocritique. Candor, NY: Telos Press.

Lupton, Deborah. 2016. The Quantified Self. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

McNeill, Donald. 2005. "Skyscraper Geography," Progress in Human Geography. 29, 1: 41-55.

Moulier-Boutang, Yann. 2011. Cognitive Capitalism. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Nunes, Rodrigo. 2021. Neither Vertical nor Horizontal: A Theory of Political Organization. London: Verso.

Ravenscroft, Tom. 2022. "Saudi Arabia Reveals 170-Kilometer Long Mirrored Skyscraper to House Nine Million People." www.dezeen.com/2022/07/26/neon-170-kilometre-long-skyscraper-city-saudi-arabia/. Last accessed November 28, 2022.

Roxburgh, Helen. 2018. "Is Chongqing's 'Horizontal Skyscraper" the Answer to Overcrowded Cities?" The Guardian. June 4. www.theguardian.com/cities/2018/jun/04/is-chongqing-china-horizontal-skyscraper-the-answer-to-overcrowded-cities-raffles. Last accessed November 20, 2022.

Soleri, Paolo. 1987. Arcosanti: An Urban Laboratory? Santa Monica: VTI Press.

Srnicek, Nick and Williams, Alex. 2016. Inventing the Future: Postcapitalism and a World Without Work. London: Verso.

Steven Holl Architects. 2023. "Horizontal Skyscraper – Vanke Center 2009: Description." https://www.stevenholl.com/project/vanke-center/. Last accessed January 24, 2023.

Stiegler, Bernard. 2016. Automatic Society, Volume 1: The Future of Work. Cambridge: Polity.

Wolf, Gary. 2011. "What Is the Quantified Self?" quantifiedself.com/blog/what-is-the-quantified-self/. Last accessed November 26, 2022.

Zuboff, Shoshana. 2019. The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power. New York: Public Affairs.

Zukin, Sharon. 1991. Landscapes of Power: From Detroit to Disney World. Berkeley: University of California Press.