

Başlık/ Title: Gri Mekânlar: Akışkan Modernitedeki Geçici Mekânlar / Grey Spaces: Transitory Spaces in Liquid Modernity

Yazar/ Author

Nihan Muş ÖZMEN

ORCID ID

0000-0002-6137-882X

Bu makaleye atıf için: Nihan Muş Özmen, Grey Spaces: Transitory Spaces in Liquid Modernity, *KARE*, no. 9 (2020): 74-90.

To cite this article: Nihan Muş Özmen, Grey Spaces: Transitory Spaces in Liquid Modernity, *KARE*, no. 9 (2020): 75-91.

Makale Türü / Type of Article: Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

Yayın Geliş Tarihi / Submission Date: 08.02.2020

Yayına Kabul Tarihi / Acceptance Date: 30.06.2020

Yayın Tarihi / Date Published: 30.06.2020

Web Sitesi: <https://karedergi.erciyes.edu.tr/>

Makale göndermek için / Submit an Article: <http://dergipark.gov.tr/kare>

Uluslararası İndeksler/International Indexes



Index Copernicus: Indexed in the ICI Journal Master List 2018 Kabul Tarihi /Acceptance Date: 11 Dec 2019

MLA International Bibliography: Kabul Tarihi /Acceptance Date: 28 Oct 2019

DRJI Directory of Research Journals Indexing: Kabul Tarihi /Acceptance Date: 14 Oct 2019

EuroPub Database: Kabul Tarihi /Acceptance Date: 26 Nov 2019



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

Yazar: Nihan Muş ÖZMEN*

Gri Mekânlar: Akışkan Modernitedeki Geçici Mekânlar**

Özet: Hayatlarımızın mütemadiyen bir yerden bir yere sürüklendiği günümüz küresel çağında mekânlar geçici olarak tüketilmektedir. Kurulan kısa süreli ilişkilerde bu mekânlarla bağ kurmak da oldukça zor olmaktadır. Hiçbir bağ kurulamayan, aidiyet duygusunun eksik olduğu bu mekânları tanımlamak adına birçok düşünür kafa yormuştur. Bu makale kapsamında bu konuda yapılan çalışmalardan literatürde en çok yer edinen çalışmalar olan, Foucault – *Des Espace Autres (Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias – Diğer Alanlar: Ütopyalar ve Heterotopyalar)*, Relph – *Place and Placelessness (Yer ve Yersizlik)*, Augé – *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity (Yer Olmayan: Süpermodernite Antropolojisine Giriş)* ve Koolhaas – *Junkspace (Atıkmekân)* ele alınmıştır. Öncelikli olarak ele alınan bu çalışmalar detaylıca incelenmiş, daha sonrasında ise tüm terimler birbirleri ile kıyaslanmıştır. Tüm terimlere üst ölçekten bakmak adına ise bu makale kapsamında ortak bir terim geliştirilmiş ve tüm bu mekânlar Gri Mekânlar olarak tanımlanmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yer, mekân, aidiyet.

Grey Spaces: Transitory Spaces in Liquid Modernity¹

Abstract: In the global age of today, while our lives are constantly dragged from one place to another, we consume places temporarily. It is also difficult to establish a connection with these places during short-term relationships. Many thinkers have pondered to describe these places where there is no attachment and where the sense of belonging is lacking. Within the scope of this article, the studies of Foucault – *Des Espace Autres (Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias)*, Relph – *Place and Placelessness*, Augé – *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity* and Koolhaas – *Junkspace* are discussed, which take the most place in the literature. First, these studies were examined in detail, and then all terms were compared with each other. In order to speak of the terms from a general view, a common term has been developed within the scope of this article and all these spaces have been defined as *Grey Spaces*.

Keywords: Place, space, sense of belonging.

* MSc – AGU Architecture Ph.D. Student
0000-0002-6137-882X.

E-mail: nihan.mus@agu.edu.tr, ORCID ID:

** Placelessness and Non-place sections of this article are based on the Masters' Thesis of Nihan Muş Özmen, "A Critical Prospect into the Working Spaces for Immaterial Labour".

¹ Liquid Modernity is "Zygmunt Bauman's term for the present historical condition of globalized capitalism. It is defined by a chronic weakening of the relationship between labour and capital and the unleashing of capital's power to dissolve social and communal bonds. It is characterized by the pervasiveness in contemporary society of what Bauman refers to as the 'unholy trinity' of uncertainty, insecurity and unsafety, or as he more bluntly puts it the failure of government to act as the principal guarantor of existence." "Liquid Modernity." <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803100108465>.

For more information, see also Zygmunt Bauman's *Liquid Modernity* (2000).

Introduction

We were born in houses, which have histories of less than 35 years. Some of us grew up in public lodgements of factories that are abandoned now. Our elementary schools, which we went, do not exist anymore. The cities we live are in a change in decades so that it is not the same city, as we know from our adolescence. Some of the lucky ones graduate from rooted universities. We get education in renovated buildings, which were factories once upon a time. Our apartments are not more than five years old. Our lives pass in shopping malls, at airports and on the motorways, our feet do not touch the ground most of the time. We have career paths that we have not planned yet. In the end, everyone goes to six feet under for eternal sleep. Having said all these things, the big question is that do we feel belonging anywhere? As if, we have missed the possibility to attach a long time ago. As far as I am concerned, searching for a meaningful place becomes inevitable for all of us. In this study, I would like to introduce some of the terms in the literature about the spatial belonging and to explain the similarities and differences of those terms related to the issue. In the light of previous works, there have been developed very different terms covering the issue. Having said that, I have chosen to use the term *Grey Spaces*² to cover up all these confusing terms under a single umbrella.

Architects, planners, and sociologists have tried to explain and title the uncertain sites, which cannot be classified as places/spaces. The term *Grey Spaces* is created to define these uncertain sites and to refer to all of them with a common saying. Grey is ambiguous; it is faceless. It is "a colour intermediate between black and white," it is the middle of two poles. Therefore, it is located in uncertainty. The character of the site mentioned above and the colour grey is similar; thus, *Grey Spaces* fits the idea. This article is written to analyse the different explanations about *Grey Spaces*. In the following pages, the articles of Michel Foucault, Edward Relph, Marc Augé, and Rem Koolhaas are summarized to examine their terms. After the summary, the terms are compared to each other through some charts and visuals.

1. Heterotopias

Michel Foucault is a revolutionary philosopher with his views on basic issues such as power-potency relations. The views of him have influenced many fields such as philosophy, history, anthropology, sociology, political science and cultural studies. *Heterotopia* is a concept explained by Foucault and he used the concept to describe some other spaces that are deviating,

² "Grey." Oxford Dictionaries Online, <https://www.lexico.com/definition/grey>.

disturbing, changing and contradictory. According to him, *heterotopias* are real places—places that do exist and that are formed in the very founding of society—which are something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted...outside of all places...different from all the sites they reflect and speak about.³

Heterotopias are contrasted to utopias, “utopias are always imaginary, while *heterotopias* are always real.”⁴ He believes that there is an experience between *heterotopias* and utopias like a mirror. The mirror is real by existing on a wall (*heterotopia*), but at the same time, it is unreal (*utopia*) because it is a virtual place. “As in all of Foucault’s work, there is no sense of a realm of freedom or liberation in these heterotopian sites. They shift and transform endlessly, opening new dangers and opportunities”.⁵

Foucault uses a systematic way of descriptions, which he calls *heterotopology* to describe *heterotopias*. He mentions six principles for the definition of those *other* spaces. According to the first principle of *heterotopias*, since there is not a single culture in the world, there are different types of *heterotopias*. However, they can be classified into two main groups as crisis *heterotopias* and *heterotopias* of deviation. Crisis *heterotopias* “are privileged or sacred or forbidden places, reserved for individuals who are, in relation to society and to the human environment in which they live, in a state of crisis: adolescents, menstruating women, pregnant women, the elderly, etc.”.⁶ Nonetheless, these crisis *heterotopias* have disappeared, and they have replaced with *heterotopias* of deviation. The individuals, who have deviant behaviours concerning the norms, are placed in those kinds of *heterotopias* such as prisons, psychiatric hospitals, and rest homes.

The second principle of *heterotopias* is every *heterotopia* has a precise function and that *heterotopia* can have one purpose or another as its history spreads out. They are part of the culture, connected and related to every individual and to all the sites of the city. In order to give an idea about this principle, Foucault uses cemeteries as an example. Cemeteries have always

³ Foucault, Michel. "Des Espace Autres (of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias)." *Architecture /Mouvement/ Continuité* (1984).

⁴ Topinka, Robert J. "Foucault, Borges, Heterotopia: Producing Knowledge in Other Spaces." *Foucault Studies* 9 (2010): 54-70.

⁵ Johnson, Peter. "The Ship: Navigating the Myths, Metaphors and Realities of Foucault’s Heterotopia Par Excellence." <http://www.heterotopiastudies.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/The-ship-navigating-the-myths-metaphors-and-realities-of-Foucaults-heterotopia-par-excellence-pdf.pdf>.

⁶ Foucault, Michel. "Des Espace Autres (of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias)." *Architecture /Mouvement/ Continuité* (1984).

existed in every culture; however, in western culture, they have undergone some changes. Although they were located in the centre of the city, beside the church until the end of the eighteenth century, they have been moved out to the outside border of the cities since the beginning of the nineteenth century. The removal happened since the point of view of cemeteries has changed. Although in the past, they were valuable places because of having connections to all the families in the city, now there is a belief that the dead bring death.

The third principle is “the *heterotopia* is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible.”⁷ Theatres and cinemas bring us different levels of spaces on a rectangle stage or scene. Persian gardens also represent different parts of the world and the carpets are *heterotopias* too, which are the reproduction of the Persian gardens.

The fourth principle is that *heterotopias* are linked to heterochronies. They are the slices of the time in which time never stops; it is transitory and temporary. In museums and libraries, time never stops; they are the places for archives and storage. These static places hold continuous and uncertain time accumulation. On the contrary, there are places in which the time is most flowing, temporary, transitory and unsecured. Fairgrounds are this kind of places related to heterochronies.

The fifth principle is that *heterotopias* need isolation. They are different from public spaces because accessing to these *heterotopias* is not free. These kinds of sites are some religious and hygienic places that are used for purification like Muslim hammams and Scandinavian saunas or military buildings of prisons. We can enter to these places, but we are not allowed to the whole place since they are also isolated *heterotopias*.

The last principle of *heterotopias* is that they are functionally related to all the spaces they last. Besides, this relation develops between two different poles. One of the poles creates an illusion, and the other creates another real place, a compensation place, which is well arranged, organizational space with strict rules. Brothels and colonies are the two poles of these *heterotopias*.

2. Placelessness

Edward Relph is a geographer who concerns the importance of critical observation. Therefore, he examines four basic geographical concepts - region, landscape, space and place - that are the context and topics of geographic experience and from a different angle.⁸ Relph wrote his book *Place*

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ "Edward Relph." http://geography.ruhosting.nl/geography/index.php?title=Edward_Relph.

and Placelessness (1976) in order to attend to the development of environmental understanding. He uses the phenomenological study to describe the experiences of the lived-world and try to interest people who feel place identity, different landscapes, or whose concern is the erosion of different places. Edward Relph first explains the concept of place. He uses Martin Heidegger's declaration, "'place' places man in such a way that it reveals the external bounds of his existence and at the same time the depths of his freedom and reality."⁹ From this declaration, that is stated "to be human is to live in a world that is filled with significant places: to be human is to have and to know *your* place."¹⁰ He also mentions that place is the complexity and deepness of the world practice of a person to which people are tied emotionally and psychologically, so that it contains both collective and individual identity.

Relph continues with the relationship between space and place and tries to define space, yet he says it is hard to describe and analyse the space directly; it is also intangible and amorphous.¹¹ In The Essence of Place chapter of the book, Relph explains the meaning of place according to the relationships established with the place. Location is where places are located. The landscape is the physical form of the place, and it can be described. Time changes the character of the place like the changes in our attitudes. The community has memory in a place, "people are their place and a place is its people."¹² The

⁹ Heidegger, Martin. "An Ontological Consideration of Place." Translated by William Kluback and Jean T. Wilde. Chap. 3 In *The Question of Being*, 18-26. New York: Twayne Publishers Inc., 1958, 19.

¹⁰ Relph, Edward. *Place and Placelessness*. London: Pion Limited, 1976, 3.

¹¹ According to Relph, space cannot be defined and analysed in a direct way because of being shapeless and intangible and he defines six spaces as primitive, perceptual, existential, architectural, cognitive and abstract. Primitive space is based on immediate needs and practises which is structured unselfconsciously during the infant period and it is relevant with the senses. Perceptual space has the human being as centre that is related to emotions directly "and it therefore has an excellent system of directions which change with the movement of the human body" Edward Relph, *Place and Placelessness*(London: Pion Limited, 1976),10. Existential space is characterized by culture that creates significant forms and patterns unselfconsciously and it is continually reproduced by human activities. Existential space has two sub-spaces; sacred space and geographical space. Sacred space is the space of religion while geographical space has a place in human experience. Geographical space has its own character; it is unique with its own name. Relph notes that geographical space of countryside or town is not only an experience but also a creation space by building and he refers to Heidegger's dwelling idea that the essence of existence is dwelling. Architectural space is an attempt to space creation and unselfconscious spatial experiences. Cognitive space is the space identification of spatial organisation, it has dimensions, geometry and it is homogenous. Abstract space is the reflection of human imagination, which is logical relations space.

¹² Relph, Edward. *Place and Placelessness*. London: Pion Limited, 1976, 34.

experiences and unique situations we have about a place make that place a private place and we define it with specific significances. The rootedness of a place is the attachment and familiarity feeling of that place and it is safe. Home is a place where our identity is founded. Relph lastly defines the drudgery of a place that comes from too much satisfaction of nostalgia – the feeling that demonstrates attachment – and it is like a feeling of imprisonment and causes passion for escaping.

In order to make the meaning of *placelessness* clear, Relph continues with a sense of place and authenticity. It is the sense of place, which is capable of noticing place distinctions and different identities of a place. It can be both authentic and genuine or inauthentic and artificial. He notes that an authentic sense of place is related to existentialism and being, that is to say, Dasein. It is belonging to the place and being inside of it as a member of the community or as an individual. Besides, he makes a definition of an authentic person, an authentic person is thus one who is sincere in all he does while being involved unselfconsciously in an immediate and communal relationship with the meanings of the world, or while selfconsciously facing up to the realities of his existence and making genuine decisions about how he can or cannot change his situation.¹³

The most profound attachment to a place is unconscious (and maybe subconscious), which is safe and secure, sympathetic, and it is the pure feeling of the place like home. The following attachment, which is also unconscious and authentic, is collective and cultural instead of personal experience; it is the holy practice of a sacred place and the recognition of the home district. The attachment level that is not deep is authentic and self-conscious. It is a quick attachment; being in a place but not attending it.

When it comes to *placelessness*, Relph first speaks about inauthenticity. Inauthenticity is the everyday life behaviour that is imposed on the community and accepted by everyone; it is an object world of conjectural time and space. Inauthenticity is another order than authenticity; it is the others' authoritarianism, which is unconscious. The self-conscious inauthenticity is the conventional way of presence in industrialized and mass civilizations that is an objective and artificial world without the feeling of engagement.

While the sense of place is authentic, in inauthenticity, there is no sense of place, no awareness, and no significations. "Relph suggests that, in general, *placelessness* arises from kitsch—an uncritical acceptance of mass values, or technique—the overriding concern with efficiency as an end in itself."¹⁴ As

¹³ Ibid, 64.

¹⁴ Seamon, David, and Jacob Sowers. "Place and Placelessness, Edward Relph." *Key Texts in Human Geography* (2008): 43-51, 4.

Abraham Moles¹⁵ defines “kitsch is a way of being, a major part of everyday life in all affluent societies where many people can afford the trivial, the showy, and the ersatz, but present in all societies to some extent.” The technique is a different form of planning according to the mass value and kitsch. After defining *placelessness*, Relph classifies the placeless landscapes:

Table 1. Classification of Placeless Landscapes According to Relph

<p>A. Other-directedness in places Landscape made for tourists Entertainment districts Commercial strips Disneyfield places Museumised places Futurist places</p>	<p>D. Place destruction (Abbau) Impersonal destruction in war (e.g., Hiroshima, villages in Vietnam) Destruction by excavation, burial Destruction by expropriation and redevelopment by outsiders (e.g., urban expansion)</p>
<p>B. Uniformity and standardization in places Instant new towns and suburbs Industrial, commercial developments New roads and airports, etc. International styles in design & architecture</p>	<p>E. Impermanence & instability of places Places undergoing continuous redevelopment (e.g., many central business districts) Abandoned places</p>
<p>C. Formlessness and lack of human scale and order in places Subtopias Gigantism (skyscrapers, megalopoli) Individual features unrelated to cultural or physical setting</p>	

In the Table 1, Relph classifies the placeless landscapes according to their usage as other-directedness in places, uniformity and standardization in places, formlessness and lack of human scale and order in places, place destruction, impermanence and instability of places. In the other-directedness class, he exemplifies unreal and temporary places. People consume these places to have a pleasant time and to be away from reality for a while. In the world of today, there are new types of these unreal places as virtual spaces, places experienced with VR and AR etc. The examples of the concepts of uniformity and standardization in the second class refer to the places that have their own rules. Hotel chains, military zones etc. are in this class. Formlessness and lack of human scale and order in places are exemplified with subtopias, skyscrapers etc. Nowadays, shopping malls are similar to these places because of being giant. There is a world in every shopping centre; people are tiny in these excessive worlds. Place destruction, impermanence,

¹⁵ Cited in Relph, Edward. *Place and Placelessness*. London: Pion Limited, 1976, 82.

and instability of places classes can be taken as one group. Even though their contents seem different, they refer to similar places. Destructed places are also abandoned places if they are not redeveloped. Besides, destructed places after natural disasters can be a part of this classification. It is necessary to include another type of place that has derived in recent years. Because of increasing wars, refugee camps, where a large number of refugees have resettled, form a new type of recovery places. These camps, which started as temporary shelters, have become permanent settlements since the refugees are unable to return to their countries and they have lived in these settlements for many years. In addition, these camps have idiosyncratic features.

3. Non-place

Marc Augé is a French anthropologist who is concerned of relations, history and identity. In his book *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity* (1995), Augé speaks about supermodernity, by which he argues *non-place* is produced. Although he does not mention that supermodernity is the result of late capitalism, it is understood from his emphasis on transformations in the production form. "Supermodernity is characterized by excess, a charged surplus in the three domains philosophical and, more particularly, anthropological thought has come to rely on as its cornerstones: time, space, the individual."¹⁶ Individuals are always and never at home, in the supermodernity world.

Augé uses the differentiation between space and place in order to explain *non-place*, through the distinction of place and *non-place*. According to him, place occurs through words, whereas space comprises of the frequency of places. It is more conceptual than the place, which mostly refers to an event, a myth, a history. It is similar to the area, temporary expansion, or a length between two points. Space is an intelligible area and things have a kind of sense in this particular area. Space is a machine to serve its observer in order to create meaning. *Non-place*¹⁷ and place are opposite, place is never erased and *non-place* is never completed. This opposition comes from the one between place and space. Today, space & place and place & *non-place* interlace and *non-place* can never be without place. Two realities are integral but different, and *non-place* entitles them: spaces are related to certain ends and to

¹⁶ Buchanan, Ian. "Non-Places: Space in the Age of Supermodernity." *Social Semiotics* 9, no. 3 (1999): 393-98, 393.

¹⁷ "The non-place is the opposite of utopia: it exists, and it does contain any organic society" Marc Augé, *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*, trans. John Howe(London, New York: Verso, 1995)., 111-112.

the connections of individuals experienced with these spaces. *Non-place* user is related to it contractually. The way to use a *non-place* is the more or less evident signs of it.

Non-place is produced by supermodernity. "If a place can be defined as relational, historical and concerned with identity, then a space which cannot be defined as relational, or historical, or concerned with identity will be a *non-place*."¹⁸ Augé mentions the view of Michel de Certeau that *non-place* is the place which does not have a positive quality and which is absent from itself. *Non-places* make people feel at home, modern and essential through anonymous space, to which the user cannot be attached and cannot own. It would be good to exemplify the issue of Starbucks here. As a global brand, Starbucks has more than 29.000 stores worldwide¹⁹, and all of them have similar designs. The idea here is to make people feel the same aura in all shops, so that they can feel at home. During a trip, we see a Starbucks shop that seems familiar, and just for a while, we feel at home, but also we do not feel at home because it is neither a place nor a *non-place*.

The space of *non-place* creates neither singular identity nor relations, only solitude, and similitude".²⁰ *Non-places* forces its user to prove that he is innocent by showing identity, which is the stamp of space of consumption. The individual is eased of his considerations and experiences only what a passenger, customer, or driver does. He is away from the surrounding movement temporarily. "Anthropological place is formed by individual identities, through complicities of language, local references, the unformulated rules of living know-how; *non-place* creates the shared identity of passengers, customers, or Sunday drivers."²¹ The space of a traveller may be the first example of *non-place*. The anonymity of hotel chains, service stations, big stores and motorways make a foreigner feel at home; this is the paradox of *non-place*. "Such generic spaces as airports, hotels, train stations, and so on are, in Augé's view, non-relational, unhistorical, and unconcerned with identity."²² Because the time passes through, the units of time measure *non-places*.

¹⁸ Augé, Marc. *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. Translated by John Howe. London, New York: Verso, 1995, 77-78.

¹⁹ See <https://www.statista.com/statistics/218366/number-of-international-and-us-starbucks-stores/> for more information.

²⁰ Augé, Marc. *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. Translated by John Howe. London, New York: Verso, 1995, 103.

²¹ *Ibid*, 101.

²² Buchanan, Ian. "Non-Places: Space in the Age of Supermodernity." *Social Semiotics* 9, no. 3 (1999): 393-98, 395.

4. Junkspace

Rem Koolhaas is an architect and architectural theorist. In his article *Junkspace* (2002), Rem Koolhaas speaks about the places that he calls *Junkspace*. He defines a new kind of space that unites airports, shopping centres and hotels, which we face all over the world. He explains this space as continuous, seamless, transitory and superficial. This new space – *Junkspace* – is the output of modernization. “The built ... product of modernization is not modern architecture but *Junkspace*. *Junkspace* is what remains after modernization has run its course, or, more precisely, what coagulates while modernization is in progress, its fallout”.²³ He thinks that twentieth-century extinguished architecture.

Koolhaas speaks of nearly everything in the contemporary world. He mentions that technology, building and mechanical systems (as air conditioning unites the building), materials, massive structures, consumerism, traffic, language etc. causes *Junkspace*. It is also the result of globalization, “globalization turns language into *Junkspace*.”²⁴ *Junkspace* is never-ending; it is always open. Because of not being grasped, *Junkspace* is not remembered, not imaginable. Everything can be experienced at the same time in *Junkspace*; destitution and excessiveness, the old and the new, dynamic and settled. It can be chaotic and sterile, indefinite and definite, purposeless and intentional. As Negro mentions,

This is *junkspace* seen from outside: a disequilibrium and rupture multiplied on the indefinite space of the metropolis. But this is also where the multiplication of obstacles, borders, lines of fracture and walls can no longer be regarded as simply blocks dropped down by power or as swamps that one gets stuck in: they are interfaces that polarize relations.²⁵

“... *Junkspace* is authorless, yet surprisingly authoritarian”.²⁶ Although it seems to unite, *Junkspace* smashes. The communities created by *Junkspace* are out of the aggregation of opportunistic interests instead of shared interests. *Junkspace* is superficial; it is held together by skin.

It is nourished from continuance and utilises discoveries for eternal constructions. Design develops *Junkspace*, but it kills design. The vertical design has replaced with horizontal, transparency with the shell. The life of the spaces is prone to be short. The perspective is no longer used and the calculation precludes design. Materials and joints support transiency. The

²³ Koolhaas, Rem. "Junkspace." *Obsolescence* 100 (2002): 175-90, 175.

²⁴ *Ibid*, 186.

²⁵ Negri, Antonio. "On Rem Koolhaas." *Radical Philosophy* 154 (2009): 48-50, 49.

²⁶ Koolhaas, Rem. "Junkspace." *Obsolescence* 100 (2002): 175-90, 185.

construction techniques of ancient times are revived, the symmetry is preserved for showing respect. Standardization and modularity are widespread; with the small and same modules, unique buildings are constructed. Megastructure is *Junkspace* and it is a subsystem.

Anything “re” done becomes *Junkspace*. “Anything stretched –limousines, body parts, planes- turns into *Junkspace*, its original concept abused. Restore, rearrange, reassemble, revamp, renovate, revise, recover, redesign, return...redo, respect, rent: verbs that start with re-produce *Junkspace*.”²⁷ *Junkspace* enlarges with the economy. Every *Junkspace* has a connection; it is consumed actively. One part of the population generates new space and the other part spends the wasted space. One part pollutes for production and the other is for consumption. “Duty-free is *Junkspace*; *Junkspace* is duty-free space. Where culture was thinnest, will it be the first to run out? Is emptiness local? Do wide open spaces demand wide open *Junkspace*?”²⁸ *Junkspace* is not free because of costing money, it becomes conditional and the end of every conditional space turns into *Junkspace*. Highway and traffic are *Junkspace*. Public space is the area of tenderised fascism that is hidden in signals, objects etc. All prototypes of *Junkspace* are urban. The office is the urban home featured by *Junkspace*. Museums are also *Junkspace*, which are self-righteous; they make “bad” space “good.”

“*Junkspace* is postexistential; it makes you uncertain where you are, obscures where you go, undoes where you were. Who do you think you are? Who do you want to be?”²⁹ *Junkspace* is drained and it drains. *Junkspace* knows all the feelings of people, knows everything about people. The final question of Koolhaas is if *Junkspace* invades the body through cell phones, cosmetics, botox injections, liposuction etc. and if each of us is a mini-construction site.

5. Comparison

First, before comparing the terms of Foucault, Relph, Augé, and Koolhaas, it would be good to have a short look at their views. Foucault’s *heterotopias* are other spaces. “A space cannot be declared as *heterotopia* as such, but rather is a *heterotopia* from the point of view of another space. Every space is delimited and is subjected to rules, rites, and norms and can, therefore, be considered as *heterotopia* from the point of view of another space”.³⁰ There is a common thing

²⁷ Ibid, 183.

²⁸ Ibid, 188.

²⁹ Ibid, 182.

³⁰ # FOUCAULT /// Episode 7: Questioning the Heterotopology. (2015, December 18). Retrieved from <https://thefunambulist.net/architectural-projects/foucault-episode-7-questioning-the-heterotopology>

of these other spaces – *heterotopias* that they refer to the places, which we contact temporarily. During this experience, we do not feel belonging; it is because this experience is temporary and sometimes it is obligatory.

The explanations of Relph show that we experience the place unconsciously, subconsciously or self-consciously. Despite the different consciousness levels, authenticity is the concrete thing during the experience of place. The idea of *placelessness* is away from belonging and does not contain authenticity, and it is a different order. It occurs with industrialization and mass communities. According to Değirmenci³¹, Relph claims that with mass production, with the society that is becoming fluid and with the inauthentic (disneyfield) imitated places, we are getting to live in a placeless world.

According to Augé, *non-place* is without identity and relation. *Non-place* is real but which is transitory and mistrustful, so that it makes its user to verify his/her identity. As Buchanan³² mentioned, “*non-places* result from transformations in the mode of production, and if we are to specify them properly, that is where we must look to find their true conditions of existence.” When the *non-place* concept is examined, it is very similar to the concept of *placelessness*. These places are temporary, anonymous and inauthentic and they do not contain an attachment.

The spaces that are created after modernism are all *Junkspaces*. It is the environment around us; therefore, it is always interior. *Junkspace* is temporary and consumed quickly because of changing continuously. Because of this, it is never imprinted in our memories. *Junkspace* contains dichotomies; it makes people have the opposite feelings at the same time. In addition, it contains technological developments (e.g., vertical designs, calculation, and standardization). *Junkspace* is every novelty.

According to the views, Table 2. is arranged in order to make the relations visible between the terms.

Table 2. Comparison of the terms

Feature \ Keyword	Heterotopia (M. Foucault)	Placelessness (E. Relph)	Non-Place (M. Augé)	Junkspace (R. Koolhaas)
Authentic	X	X	X	X

³¹ Değirmenci, Koray. "Kentsel Mekanda 'Yerin' Ya Da Otantik Olanın Yeniden İnşası." In *Değişim Sosyolojisi: Dünyada Ve Türkiye'de Toplumsal Değişme*, edited by Ufuk Özcan and Ertan Eğribel, 277-91. İstanbul: Kitabevi Yayınları, 2012.

³² Buchanan, Ian. "Non-Places: Space in the Age of Supermodernity." *Social Semiotics* 9, no. 3 (1999): 393-98, 397.

Belonging	X	X	X	X
Changeable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Consumed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Different Order	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Every Day Use	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mass Production Result	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Real	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Standardized	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Temporary	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

It can be seen from the table that there are similarities and discrepancies between the terms. The features/keywords are chosen from the definitions of the authors and they are tried to be adapted to every single term. All the terms refer to the sites, which are real, temporary, inauthentic, not belonging, changeable and consumed. While Foucault does not mention that *heterotopias* are in daily use and the output of the mass production, other terms are the opposite. In addition, through mass production, *placelessness* and *Junkspace* are standardized sites.

Moreover, although heterotopia, placelessness and non-place are different orders, Junkspace is the existing order. Even though the table shows detailed similarities and discrepancies, Junkspace is different from the others in general. Since the others are specific sites, whereas Junkspace is everywhere, it is the leftover of modernization after its mission completed. After the comparison on the table, there are some grey space visuals below to compare the terms through them.

Table 3. Examples of Grey Spaces

<p>Hotel: It is a real temporary site, which is not authentic. Individuals do not feel belonging to it. It is the output of mass production. There is a standardized life in it. Following the properties, it can be said that a hotel is a <i>heterotopia</i>, a <i>Junkspace</i>, a <i>non-place</i>, and it is <i>placeless</i>. Therefore, it refers to all the terms.</p>	
---	--

	<p>Figure 1. A hotel chain³³</p>
<p>Shopping mall: Shopping malls are the most standardized areas and they are specific sites for consumption. They are the megastructures that mentioned in <i>Junkspace</i>. They contain shops, restaurants, supermarkets, children's areas, cinemas; thus, the user of a mall can experience many things. However, this experience is always temporary. They are inauthentic and because they are transitory, the users do not feel belonging. It can be said that shopping mall refers to all the terms.</p>	 <p>Figure 2. A shopping mall³⁴</p>
<p>Cemetery: The cemetery has its own identity and it is related to everyone. The use of the cemetery is temporal. It is not a daily used site. Since it is not a modernization leftover, it cannot be classified as a <i>Junkspace</i>. In addition, because of being relational, we cannot identify it as a <i>non-place</i>. However, it is <i>placeless</i> and it is an existing <i>heterotopia</i>.</p>	 <p>Figure 3. A cemetery³⁵</p>
<p>Military zone: The constituted attachment to a military zone is temporarily. Some people can feel belonging to the site, whereas others do not. Thus, this makes the site place to some and <i>non-place</i> or <i>placeless</i> to others. By being a ruled area, it is a compensation <i>heterotopia</i>. If we consider it with the modernization process, it is not a <i>Junkspace</i>.</p>	 <p>Figure 4. A military zone³⁶</p>
<p>Amusement park: The amusement park is one of the temporary sites. It is a physically experienced area; however, it is unreal. Although it is heterochrony, according to Foucault, it is arguable if it is a <i>heterotopia</i> or not. Being a consumption site with its character away from belonging, the amusement park is a <i>non-place</i> and <i>placelessness</i>. It is a <i>Junkspace</i> because of its features.</p>	 <p>Figure 5. An amusement park³⁷</p>

³³ Retrieved from <https://www.go4hotels.com/hotel/united-arab-emirates/dubai/le-royal-meridien-beach-resort-spa>

³⁴ Retrieved from <https://tr.pinterest.com/pin/693413673851753491/>

³⁵ Retrieved from https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Tyne_Cot_Cemetery.jpg

³⁶ Retrieved from <https://strikehold.wordpress.com/2010/01/29/british-training-for-the-new-model-afghan-national-army/ana-training-camp/>

³⁷ Retrieved from <https://tr.pinterest.com/pin/155092780902781272/?lp=true>

Home district:

The word home contains belonging. When it comes to home district, it is authentic; it is not temporary. Furthermore, it is not changeable and not consumed, etc.

Shortly, the home district refers to none of the terms of *heterotopia*, *placelessness*, *non-place*, or *Junkspace*.



Figure 6. A home district³⁸

Conclusion

The meaning of place has always been an important issue. Sociologists, architects, planners have tried to explain the importance of place and clarify the uncertain sites that are temporary, transitory, lack of belonging. This article attempted to analyse the terms of Michel Foucault, Edward Relph, Marc Augé and Rem Koolhaas that were created to define the uncertain sites and have taken place in the literature. The terms *Heterotopia*, *Placelessness*, *Non-place* and *Junkspace* are the creations of the purpose to define the sites, which we cannot classify as a place or a space. The aim was to see the differences and similarities between these terms that define the ambiguous sites. During the research, in order to refer all these terms, *Grey Spaces* term is created.

The term *heterotopia* defines some real spaces, which has a different order through six principles, whereas *placelessness* refers to inauthenticity depending on mass production. *Non-place* is also a result of production, which is lack of identity and relation and *Junkspace*, is what is left when modernization is over. The comparison between the terms shows that although *heterotopia*, *placelessness* and *non-place* refer to similar sites, *Junkspace* is more different from them by referring to everywhere. However, the sites that all the terms refer to are inauthentic, temporary, real, consumed and changeable and they are lack of the feeling of belonging. Besides, mass production makes *placeless* sites and *Junkspaces* standardized areas. Moreover, while *heterotopia*, *placelessness* and *non-place* refer to a different order, *Junkspace* refers to an existing order.

It seems that the places we live in have features like mentioned above. Because of this, neither can we associate ourselves to a place, nor can we live with constant identities. Living in uncertain areas constitutes a significant part of our everyday life and considering that we generate ourselves through our daily life practices, like production and consumption, we can generate ourselves as these places.

³⁸ Retrieved from <https://vincemichael.com/work/historic-districts/>

The places that do not contribute the sense of belonging, attachment, identity or authenticity are remarkable parts of the global era. Moreover, they are in a change in this changing world. Therefore, the terms *heterotopia*, *placelessness*, *non-place* and *Junkspace* are not up-to-date considering the dates they were created (*heterotopia* – 1967, *placelessness* – 1976, *non-place* – 1995, *Junkspace* – 2002). The most current of them is *Junkspace*, which refers almost everywhere in the contemporary world. Besides, some examples of these terms do not take place in this era while new kinds of sites has arisen (for example virtual spaces experienced through VR glasses). The most outstanding feature of the global era is the disappearance of borders. Each day, the boundaries between countries, spaces and lives disappear even more and things become more fluid. In this fluidity, everything (people, lifestyles etc.) is intertwined and transitional like the colour grey. As the grey people of this fluid era, we live in *Grey Spaces*.

References

- "British Training for the New Model Afghan National Army." <https://strikehold.wordpress.com/2010/01/29/british-training-for-the-new-model-afghan-national-army/ana-training-camp/>.
- "Edward Relph." http://geography.ruhosting.nl/geography/index.php?title=Edward_Relph.
- "Grey." Oxford Dictionaries Online, <https://www.lexico.com/definition/grey>.
- "Historic Districts." <https://vincemichael.com/work/historic-districts/>.
- "Le Royal Meridien Beach Resort & Spa." <https://www.go4hotels.com/hotel/united-arab-emirates/dubai/le-royal-meridien-beach-resort-spa>.
- "Liquid Modernity." <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803100108465>.
- "Michigan's Adventure ". <https://tr.pinterest.com/pin/155092780902781272/?lp=true>.
- "Number of International and U.S. Starbucks Stores from 2005 to 2019." <https://www.statista.com/statistics/218366/number-of-international-and-us-starbucks-stores/>.
- "South City Mall in Kolkata, India ". <https://tr.pinterest.com/pin/693413673851753491/>.
- "Tyne Cot Cemetery." https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Tyne_Cot_Cemetery.jpg.
- Augé, Marc. *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. Translated by John Howe. London, New York: Verso, 1995.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2000.
- Buchanan, Ian. "Non-Places: Space in the Age of Supermodernity." *Social Semiotics* 9, no. 3 (1999): 393-98.
- Değirmenci, Koray. "Kentsel Mekanda 'Yerin' Ya Da Otantik Olanın Yeniden İnşası." In *Değişim Sosyolojisi: Dünyada Ve Türkiye'de Toplumsal Değişme*, edited by Ufuk Özcan and Ertan Eğribel, 277-91. İstanbul: Kitabevi Yayınları, 2012.
- Foucault, Michel. "Des Espace Autres (of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias)." *Architecture /Mouvement/ Continuité* (1984).
- Heidegger, Martin. "An Ontological Consideration of Place." Translated by William Kluback and Jean T. Wilde. Chap. 3 In *The Question of Being*, 18-26. New York: Twayne Publishers Inc., 1958.
- Johnson, Peter. "The Ship: Navigating the Myths, Metaphors and Realities of Foucault's Heterotopia Par Excellence." <http://www.heterotopiastudies.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/The-ship-navigating-the-myths-metaphors-and-realities-of-Foucaults-heterotopia-par-excellence-pdf.pdf>.
- Koolhaas, Rem. "Junkspace." *Obsolescence* 100 (2002): 175-90.
- Muş Özmen, Nihan. "A Critical Prospect into the Working Spaces for Immaterial Labour." Abdullah Gül University, 2019.
- Negri, Antonio. "On Rem Koolhaas." *Radical Philosophy* 154 (2009): 48-50.
- Relph, Edward. *Place and Placelessness*. London: Pion Limited, 1976.
- Seamon, David, and Jacob Sowers. "Place and Placelessness, Edward Relph." *Key Texts in Human Geography* (2008): 43-51.
- Topinka, Robert J. "Foucault, Borges, Heterotopia: Producing Knowledge in Other Spaces." *Foucault Studies* 9 (2010): 54-70.