

6. Conclusion:

Specters of the Shopping Mall

“Westgate is back, shoppers said with their shillings.”¹

Spectacular and contemporary architectural symbols of modernity—whether skyscrapers or shopping malls—that have been scarred by terrorist attacks or that are considered likely targets are infused with a curious mix of exhilaration and fear. Affected venues are defiantly reconstructed or injected with renewed fervor and people are encouraged to visit or revisit these spaces as a way to defy terrorist ideologies. In the hope of returning to these everyday places of work and leisure a semblance of the normal, people are persuaded to enter these specter-filled city central sites, but they do so in the knowledge of the history of violence that has befallen these spaces and are troubled by the possibility of future attacks. These public venues “become places ‘in terror,’” and the surveillance apparatus and security services deployed to protect them do “not alleviate this terror in place, but rather re-assert it.”² While such fears may be overcome with time, “terror is inscribed upon places” and “produces and reflects a kind of cultural neurosis.”³ The constant reminders of past and potential violence are issued by both terrorists aiming to instill public fears, by authorities striving to win the war on terror, and by private interests attempting to profit from the security industry.⁴

Westgate Mall has now been “reconstructed using government funds as a symbol of the resilience of Kenya’s capitalist path.”⁵ This is testament to how shopping malls, and the act of shopping, continue to be politicized, and how consumer cultures are being actively promoted through the combined efforts of government and private interests. The new Westgate Mall cannot afford another terrorist attack and so economic and ideological differentiation and exclusion policies will be more forcibly enacted, further feeding many foundational problems and exacerbating the grievances

voiced against such private developments. As expected, the reconstructed Westgate Mall has invested heavily in a more robust security architecture by installing “x-ray machines, explosive detectors and bullet-proof guard towers,”⁶ and by complying and collaborating with international anti-terrorism standards and organizations.⁷ In the aftermath of the attacks, “IRG, the Israeli security company hired in 2014, insists that with its overhaul, Westgate is the safest mall in Nairobi today. Managing Director Haim Cohen’s team of ex-Israeli commandos has trained the mall’s security personnel assiduously.”⁸ This new security-minded environment of the shopping mall requires “a geography of fortifications and enclosures; increasing demand for spatial and social insulation; and reliance on technologies of security, control, and surveillance.”⁹ While these increased security measures may work towards mitigating against future terrorist attacks, they simultaneously work towards the exclusion of many other kinds of activities and people considered undesirable to the commercial world of the shopping mall.

In order for the military-industrial complex to continue being profitable, terrorism is a constant threat and is perpetuated as such. In this regard, terrorism is good for business and keeps the security industry buoyed as it continues to construct ever more impregnable structures that require constant improvement by both security agents and security technologies. In an ultimate form of exchange that is exemplary of market forces, the fear of future attacks encourages people to trade their civil liberties for increasingly pervasive forms of security, and all the panoptic invasions these entail. Investing in the security mindset promotes both a culture of vulnerability as well as “a belief that personal security can be purchased; that with the right accessories, [people] can make themselves impervious to foreign threats.”¹⁰

Since al-Shabaab’s 2013 Westgate Mall attack, the number of private security guards in Kenya has swelled “and there are now about 300,000 employed by some 429 private security firms—vastly outnumbering Kenya’s police force of 60,000.”¹¹ These security features have been extended from the shopping mall into other areas of public life, and the Kenyan government is working with telecommunications company Safaricom “to lay out a national surveillance programme, including the installation of tamper-proof CCTV cameras in most major streets in Nairobi and Mombasa. While such projects might trigger an outcry about privacy, in Kenya reaction has largely been muted, driven in part by shock over al-Shabaab’s

tactics.”¹² Terror and the war on terror provoke a state of permanent fear among international publics, each achieving its specific objects by capitalizing on the same discourse. Promoted through the constant media focus, people encounter a normalized and entrenched daily narrative “that is inextricably tied to the spectacle of terrorism and the move toward a state of emergency.”¹³

As the dust settles over Westgate Mall, other large-scale developments are being constructed within the ever expanding influence of capitalist acquisition to offer far more than Westgate ever did in terms of commodities, entertainment, services, and security. One of these, “Migaa—a 20-minute drive from the rubble of the Westgate shopping centre in Nairobi, Kenya—is a new development complete with a private hospital, conference centre, ‘shop till you drop’ mall facilities and a 200-acre executive golf course.”¹⁴ In addition are a variety of other mixed-use complexes springing up all over Nairobi, including Garden City and The HUB.¹⁵ A few miles down the road from Westgate Mall, the Two Rivers Development is billed as “the largest lifestyle centre within Sub Saharan Africa, outside of South Africa,”¹⁶ and features “\$10m in security technology, which has become a major concern for shoppers following the 2013 Westgate mall attack.”¹⁷ The new incarnations rising from Westgate Mall’s ashes are self-enclosed mega developments guarded ever more closely by an all pervasive—and invasive—security apparatus.

Privatizing Public Space

In a series of hybrid private-public partnerships, and by instituting their own private security apparatus, corporate private spaces are no longer under the control of, and in many ways no longer answerable to, local authorities. In many cases, “by resorting to private methods of order maintenance rather than relying on assistance from the police, property owners... ensure that policing strategies within their territories complement their profit-maximisation objectives.”¹⁸ Privatized spaces, from shopping malls and mixed-use complexes have “been removed from the hands of the local authority, and hence the public domain.”¹⁹ While the commercial property itself is often privately funded and financed, the public services around it in terms of public transport hubs and surrounding roads are often government- or publicly-funded. Once people cross the private property threshold of the shopping mall, they become consumers governed by the rules

and regulations of the mall. Contemporary shopping malls are architecturally designed to create a reality that operates according to the logic of capitalism—one that can sideline the practicalities of the outside world.

Paradoxically, shopping malls are insular worlds that deliberately distance themselves from prevailing economic, political, and social challenges, even as they respond to the dominant anti-terror discourse in order to strengthen their security apparatus. The critical analysis of shopping malls serves to highlight the increasingly fractured meaning of the “political.” While malls do not tolerate disruptive forms of political behavior, they revel in other overtly “political” displays of patriotism, especially during times of crisis and as a response to terrorist activity. The active politicization of shopping enacted by governments and businesses is despite the fact that the typical shopping mall expressly prohibits any form of challenging political activities like protests and worker strikes. The mall is simultaneously politicized and depoliticized depending on the prevailing discourse. Within the world of the shopping mall, both terrorist strikes and labor strikes are equally prohibited. Thus, within the space of the shopping mall, the very notion of the “political” is being rearticulated by private interests: to spend money is framed as political, but to protest low wages is a subversive breach of mall regulations.

Most shopping malls have a strict policy of barring any form of overt political behavior despite the fact that, in some cases, malls may provide government services such as the “City Hall in the Mall” office in Florida’s Coral Springs mall, which provides passport services and fingerprinting.²⁰ In the case of the Mall of America, “although parts were designed to mimic Main Street and it benefited from public financing when built,”²¹ it was officially designated as private property in the 1999 Wicklund case when animal-rights activists protesting the sale of fur-coat were declared trespassers.²² In 2014, this designation was challenged by around 3,000 “Black Lives Matter” protestors who targeted the Mall of America for protest and disrupted the busy Christmas shopping period to highlight racial injustice.²³ The organizers of the protest argued that the mall occupied an ambiguous space between public and private, giving people the right to protest there.

People are likely to regard a mall as a public space if they are obliged to visit these arenas to engage in a variety of necessary daily activities such as government services, health checks, and postal services. The strategic veering between public and private activities and facilities only serves to

make further opaque the relationship between government and private interests and to further complicate the public's relationship to shopping malls. The mall provides a space for social life, and the satisfaction of daily needs, but within a very narrowly defined sense of community. Its gravitational pull is fashioned from its own unique form of community engagement predicated on commercial rather than social or political ideals. As shopping malls purport to offer everything under one roof, the conflict between private and public is accentuated.²⁴ While the mall promises *the* world, it delivers *a* world—one that is shaped and dictated by specific market forces at the expense of other social needs.

Social Contract vs. Commercial Contract

Along with the reconstruction of Westgate Mall in the aftermath of al-Shabaab's attack, there have been simultaneous calls for the demolition of the neighboring Deep Sea slum in order to rid the city center of the visual pollution of poverty and to clear the way for a new road project termed the "missing link,"²⁵ a name that symbolically highlights its evolutionary imperative in the context of a modernizing Kenya. The development is funded by the European Union—an entity that has distanced itself from any human rights issues resulting from the project, with representatives from the EU stating "that their role was limited to financing and supervising the road construction and that responsibility for any eviction and resettlement lay with the Kenyan government."²⁶ For such modernization projects to be realized there is a basic violence, actual and symbolic, that must be enacted. Such acts of "creative destruction" are argued to be necessary to fulfill a nation's economic visions of urban expansion in which reforms are "accelerated in order to create a better environment for doing business."²⁷

In their attempts to modernize and fit into a new liberalized global economy, developing nations are undergoing a series of urban growth schemes that are highly profitable for some, while they are decidedly dismissive of others—especially those who are unable to share in the new economic ideology. The poor and the disenfranchised figure little in these grand economic plans. As urban planners and corporate enterprises capitalize on middle-class fears of urban crime, cities are being reoriented according to the dictates of the security industry, with increasingly enclosed and gated urban complexes comprised of "mixed-use" facilities

complete with shopping malls, offices, hotels, and recreation centers. As such complexes are increasing in number and size they are being connected by private walkways and roads linking these islands of tranquility at the same time as they are being separated from more chaotic urban areas, further eroding the notion of public space, and increasing hostilities against them.²⁸ In this sense, the new shopping malls do not pretend to represent public spaces; “these privately owned emporia encourage discreet forms of economic exclusion and social regimentation. As entertainment and tourist landscapes, they are open only to those who can pay.”²⁹ Increased private takeover of public spaces and resources has become especially active in the aftermath of terrorist activity and in the name of security.

In many instances, governments in developing countries are only too happy to be released from the responsibility—and with it the accountability—of providing for their citizenries and are eager to pass on any developmental and infrastructure requirements to private interests.³⁰ If a government is unable “to provide the requisite infrastructure for a growing population, it is no surprise that private developers have stepped in.”³¹ With the liberalization of markets, crucial urban infrastructures and government functions are then necessarily privatized to come under the purview of profit-making corporations. The result, in many cases, is that people become “progressively unable to question corporate influence, challenge public officials, or engage in political dissent.”³² With the reformulation of the government’s social contract into a private economic contract, public services, like transportation and sanitation, once considered the responsibility of the state, are only provided for those who can afford to pay for them. Because many people pay high fees in order to live in gated communities, they expect that the privately managed housing estates will furnish them with a range of basic services, such as street maintenance and garbage collection. In these private spaces, “paying high fees, in effect taxes, in their local communities, members of these communities are apt to vote against new taxes that support the needs of the larger society.”³³

As national interests become privatized under corporate control, these must abide by whatever particular corporate laws govern space and behavior, including particular types of taxation and legislation.³⁴ The government’s relinquishing of responsibility and “the partial retreat of public authorities from the provision of collective consumption has left the people’s everyday necessities to either the whim of private capital, the reach of the NGOs, or the mercy of charitable institutions.”³⁵ Since the idea of

“development” is often heavily skewed towards “economic” development rather than any other form of social development, preferential treatment is given to investors, and various funds previously aimed at aid have instead been injected into the capitalist infrastructure. In Kenya, for example, “millions of pounds of British aid money to tackle poverty overseas has been invested in builders of gated communities, shopping centres and luxury property in poor countries” such as the CDC, formerly the Commonwealth Development Corporation.³⁶ Projects include such developments as Nairobi’s Garden City, which will be home to east Africa’s largest shopping mall.³⁷ Even as the rhetoric of corporate social responsibility revolves around the power of enterprise to solve poverty issues, businesses blame governments for the conditions of the poor, arguing that “stronger government intervention is required.”³⁸ As the government moves aside for corporations to take over provisions in the wealthier neighborhoods, slums and other impoverished districts of developing countries are neglected by both private *and* government interests.

The poor are often expected to fend for themselves, and many do so by organizing “self-help” schemes and engaging in informal markets or illicit activities. However, “by criminalizing every attempt by the poor...to use public space for survival purposes, law-enforcement agencies have abolished the last informal safety-net separating misery from catastrophe.”³⁹ The development vacuum left by corporate and government disinterest is quickly filled by terrorist organizations, who attempt to gain legitimacy through provision of some basic services such as ad hoc healthcare, sanitation, and education schemes—the hallmarks of communal governance.⁴⁰ Within Somalia, although largely disorganized and inconsistent, al-Shabaab has established “a range of administrative bodies that are far more effective than those of the Somali National Government and its predecessors.”⁴¹ Within this socioeconomic context, and since a link can be established “between urban poverty and terrorism, the best strategy to limit the power of militant groups to seduce recruits is to fight poverty.”⁴² The question of who should help alleviate conditions for the poor is tossed back and forth between the government, civil society organizations, and the market.

Escape from the Mall

The structures of malls are increasingly fortified by a panoptic security apparatus in order to keep the money flowing within the walls of the

mall, and in order to keep out the undesirable and disruptive elements of modern society.⁴³ Increasingly, the contemporary shopping mall “epitomises this carceral city,”⁴⁴ and especially in places considered to be dangerous—unsurprisingly often found in many developing nations where there is a sharp divide between affluence and impoverishment—shopping malls ward off external threats by employing a deliberately threatening security apparatus that is intentionally visible, and theatrically exhibits security sensors and metal detectors at entrances, and guards brandishing batons, and guns in some cases. In order to guard against violence, shopping malls must themselves exhibit the outward signifiers of violence. In poorer neighborhoods, shopping malls are designed with security in mind from their conceptual stages, and according to the logic of the panopticon.⁴⁵ In this sense, the shopping mall and the prison share a common bond in many aspects of their design, and especially in the ideology of their architecture as a disciplining force.⁴⁶

Similarities between the prison and the shopping mall are exemplified by how easily one can be morphed into the other with little reconstructive design necessary for the conversion. The Headquarters shopping center in San Diego, for example, was developed “to capitalize on the former headquarters of the San Diego Police Department.”⁴⁷ The mall still retains “a prominent 68-foot tall watch tower,” and original “fortress-like design.”⁴⁸ When the building still housed the police department, it was already moving towards an all-encompassing mall-like concept, and so required only minor modification into its current form. Before its conversion into a shopping mall, the “state-of-the-art facility brought all police operations together under one roof; administration, courts, jails, law library, crime lab, exercise areas, vehicle maintenance, and even a pistol range. In later years the headquarters even had a four-lane bowling alley, utilizing jail inmates as pinsetters.”⁴⁹ Today, the mall’s website reminds visitors to “explore our fully restored 8 cell jail block which houses historic photos and police memorabilia. Also, don’t forget to snap a photo at our lineup wall. Jail cell block is located in between Kitson and Madison San Diego,”⁵⁰ two of the retail stores in the mall.

Similarly, the Uruguayan Punta Carretas Penitentiary, once a notorious emblem of the historical atrocities and political grievances of a military dictatorship, exemplifies the expert rehabilitation of a prison into a shopping mall. The prison, originally built in 1895 to incarcerate mostly political prisoners was transformed into a shopping mall in 1994 with

few modifications to its main architectural and panoptic elements.⁵¹ Like Westgate Mall, and the socioeconomic pitfalls that surround it, Punta Carretas “is located in one of Montevideo’s most coveted residential locations.”⁵² The rising real estate cost of the area was key to the government’s decision to sell the land to developers, which ultimately rested on the fact that the prison was not a profit-making enterprise.

Not only was Punta Carretas Penitentiary unprofitable, the prison was unsuccessful at incarcerating inmates: in 1971, there was a mass outbreak of 111 prisoners, earning the escape a Guinness World Record.⁵³ Of these, 106 were political prisoners, members of the urban guerrilla group, Tupamaros, “notorious for Robin Hood-esque economic redistribution stunts.”⁵⁴ Many of these ex-prisoners are still living in the area and are encouraged, through the persuasive gravitational pull of the mall, to visit the 215 stores replacing their former cells.⁵⁵ While the prisoners may have escaped the penal institution, they are increasingly engulfed by the corporate capitalist institution of the shopping mall overtaking the neighborhood.

In a deliberate act of erasing Punta Carretas’s past, “there are no tour guides or plaques to inform the 1.2 million visitors each month of the mall’s turbulent past.”⁵⁶ Its developer, Mario J. Garbarino, noted: “We prefer not to identify ourselves with the prison, although we did maintain some of its architectural elements.” The developer’s elision of history is a deliberate choice in order to “associate the mall with freedom.”⁵⁷ The word “freedom” in this instance is one associated with the “right” to shop. The developer continues by noting: “We have turned a prison into a space of complete freedom”—provided, of course, one buys into this particular phantasmagorical notion of freedom promoted through the shopping mall, through consumption, and through erasure of a traumatic past.⁵⁸ While the physical abuse of detainees in the building may be a thing of the past, arguably, the psychological conditioning and the carceral effect have only been enhanced through the premeditated structure—and stricture—of the captivating and panoptic shopping mall environment.

Similarly, the newly reconstructed Westgate Mall, in its promotion of an ahistorical and ageographic space, is built upon the ruins of its former scarred self, and knowingly erases its troubled history of al-Shabaab’s terrorist violence. Since there is still no definitive government report on the details of al-Shabaab’s 2013 Westgate Mall attack, Patrick Gathara, a satirical cartoonist for Kenya’s *The Daily Nation* newspaper notes that “by

rebuilding the mall, we are covering over everything that we don't know... It's a symbol of our continued and deliberate ignorance."⁵⁹ This act of elision has been extended into Westgate Mall's marketing efforts with no mention of the terrorist attack in any of its social media accounts or public profiles. Even as Westgate Mall refrains from mentioning the atrocities, the memory of the attack is instilled in the new security apparatus constructed within the mall and the surrounding areas. Urban spaces scarred by terrorist attacks "both represent and avoid this trauma, enabling a play of remembering and forgetting,"⁶⁰ depending on how useful the memory is to fulfilling a particular political or commercial agenda. Thus, al-Shabaab's attacks are remembered when it comes to extra enforcement of security, but people are persuaded to forget when the mall attempts to encourage people to shop within it. The atemporal and ageographic qualities of Westgate Mall enact a deliberate "amnesia without which the smooth advancement of its business would be impossible. If the traces of history were too evident and went beyond their decorative function, the mall would experience a conflict of functions and meanings: The mall's semiotic machinery has to be that provided by its project alone."⁶¹

All around the newly built Westgate Mall banners drop from the ceiling instructing customers to "Experience *Lifestyle*,"⁶² and this mantra is echoed by authorities as well as the media. During the 2015 opening ceremony of the reconstructed Westgate Mall, Inspector General of Police Joseph Boinett declared to a cluster of reporters that the terrorists "will not mess up our way of life."⁶³ Which particular way of life was he referring to, considering Kenya's mutli-ethnic and multi-class society? The kind of lifestyle offered through the mall is one that can only be afforded by a minority of wealthy elite. After talking to the reporters, the Inspector General "went on a shopping trip in Nakumatt's entertainment store. He bought copies of George W. Bush's *Decision Points* and Malcom Gladwell's *Outliers*."⁶⁴ The Inspector General's choice of literature was strategic and symbolic—one book to promote the war on terror, and the other to promote a capitalist ethos. By promoting shopping malls, authorities, city planners, and private interests are promoting the notion of "modernity" as a type of urban lifestyle being created and sold in these commercial venues.

Chimeras of Consumption

In countries where the mall is a relatively recent phenomenon, the lifecycle of shopping centers has only just begun. However, even as shopping malls are breaking new ground all over developing countries that have eagerly adopted a neoliberal ideology to become part of the global economy, these commercial venues are experiencing a decline in other areas of the world. Even though megamalls such as the Mall of America and the West Edmonton Mall continue to thrive out of sheer force of spectacle, the concept of the shopping mall in many Western contexts is undergoing a conceptual transformation. While Victor Gruen based his original design of the shopping mall on the ideals of “the Greek agora,”⁶⁵ and had high hopes of forging enhanced civic connections in the sprawling suburbs of the United States, he became critical of the orchestrated and artificial modern formulations of these venues. He witnessed how “social change, cultural drift, economic developments, and commercial dynamics gradually eroded the original basis on which the mall was founded and this had implications for the architectural delight and community factor of malls, two of the pillars of his project.”⁶⁶ After years living and working in the United States, Gruen returned to his native Austria—from which he had escaped during Nazi occupation—disappointed with what his vision had become.⁶⁷

There are a variety of factors conspiring to transform the concept of the shopping mall, and in the United States, where the number of shopping malls grew voraciously in the 1980s and 1990s to dominate the landscapes of most city centers and suburbs, the current outlook is that “anywhere from 10 to 20 percent of malls are expected to fail in the next ten years.”⁶⁸ As these venues become inscribed by fear of terrorist attacks, other spaces open up as safe, convenient, and efficient—and online. In the Western context, where organized urban and digital infrastructures allow for increased ease of virtual shopping, online stores are being promoted as secure alternatives—ones that contain a theoretically unlimited surplus of goods and services to rival the spectacular nature of any physical shopping mall.⁶⁹ As fast, efficient, nimble, and versatile, the paradigm of online shopping has rendered the idea of the shopping mall a relic of a cumbersome capitalism assembled through the needs of an old-fashioned industrial revolution. Online shopping is the ultimate triumph of a global corporate consumer culture in which shoppers, like those who practice

most forms of faith, “bring the creed home, and practise it there.”⁷⁰ While the traditional mall works hard at achieving a sense of wonder and entertainment, the online shopping experience is a spectacle in and of itself. Physical goods are reduced to a referent of themselves, and are purchased largely on the basis of their image qualities—spectacles of consumption that are further distanced from production processes and the many power structures and injustices therein.⁷¹

In order to fully engage in a culture of consumption, it is necessary to cultivate a “commodity fetishism—that is, the tendency to abstract material goods and the pleasures they promise from the human and environmental costs of production.”⁷² This dissonance creates a space of elision so one does not have to acknowledge or concede one’s own implication in how personal purchasing choices affect people in other parts of the world. This is a dissonance that is facilitated through “outsourcing” accountability in the same way that multinational corporate strategies are characterized by transferring risk, and culpability, outward upon an “other,” whether it is the subcontractor or the informal trader.⁷³ By shifting the problem elsewhere, both corporate and social entities can absolve themselves of blame, both legally and perceptually.

This chimera of consumerism does not mean, however, that dominant systems cannot be changed. Indeed, the system of corporate capitalist production can be most affected by, and disciplined through, the very creature it brought into being: conspicuous consumption. If we acknowledge that “consumption and production are inexorably linked,”⁷⁴ and that one has direct effects on the other, then it follows that by changing personal consumption patterns, no matter how small or insignificant these might seem in the grand scheme, this will have knock-on effects upon the wider global corporate capitalist system. Although “economic power is deployed by dominant global actors, analysts of globalizing processes have largely overlooked how quotidian acts such as consumer demand across the globe influence economic relations, however asymmetrical those relationships may be.”⁷⁵

Similarly, the relationship between corporate capitalist gains and the promotion of the terrorism discourse, as well as the relationship between terrorism practice and daily disenfranchisement, need to be made more explicit. In this context, “the debate over terrorism cannot be isolated from a larger, comprehensive understanding of the diverse threats to democracy taking place under the regime of neoliberalism.”⁷⁶ Through “consump-

tion consciousness,” there can be a more effective demand for corporate accountability. It is through education of market practices, and how they affect societies, that unequal and unfair systems of wealth accumulation and power can be shifted. Herein lies the meaning of the “agora:” a marketplace where both commodities and knowledge are circulated, creating an informed public that neither worships, nor is ashamed of its consumption practices. The accumulation by dispossession practiced by many neoliberal schemes, although overpowering and dominant, have faced much resistance. These resistances need to enact dignified and measured responses in order to guard against the more extreme forms of contestations against corporate expansion such as terrorist retaliations and attacks such as those against Westgate Mall.

This study has illustrated how contemporary capitalism and contemporary terrorism inhabit the same social, political, and financial world, separated largely by a discourse that seeks to represent them as antithetical practices. This discursive formation, which suggests capitalism and terrorism occupy opposite poles on an ethical spectrum, increasingly cannot paper over the reality that these concepts inhabit, occasionally inhibit, but most often complement each other. By examining the shopping mall, with an emphasis on Westgate as a point of convergence for many of these contemporary complexities, this study localizes a variety of different global exchanges, geographies, ideologies, and consumption practices. The Westgate Mall case study, much like the contemporary shopping mall experience, offers “everything under one roof,”⁷⁷ including elements of a global corporate capitalism, as well as the various contestations—both meaningfully constructive and devastatingly destructive—leveled against it. In its desire to create a world in miniature, the mall inexorably bears the seeds of its own unraveling.

The original architects of the archetype of the mall thought “that by putting everything under one roof, the retailer and the developer gained, for the first time, complete control over their environment.”⁷⁸ The shopping mall, despite its many attempts, cannot exist in isolation. Just as the mall has direct or indirect effects on the immediate and global environments, the outside world will also necessarily find ways of invading the shopping mall. Although behavior in shopping malls is highly scripted through mall atmospherics and design, and even as shopping malls attempt to control their engineered environments in a securitized and systematized manner, there are always moments of rupture that pierce

through the mall's atmosphere, disturbing its illusion.⁷⁹ For all of the mall's attempts at controlling the environment, it could do little to stop terrorism from entering the confines of this capitalist stronghold. Despite the mall's preoccupation with surveillance and control, and its endeavors to create a systematized and predictable world, there will always be a breach that disturbs its carefully crafted spectacle. The contemporary shopping mall promises to provide a spectacle, and, in the case of Westgate, it was the site of one of the greatest spectacles ever seen in a shopping mall—only this spectacle was not of its own design.