



Delft University of Technology

Interiority

Pimlott, Mark

Publication date
2023

Document Version
Final published version

Published in
Cities of the Room

Citation (APA)

Pimlott, M. (2023). Interiority. In N. Choe (Ed.), *Cities of the Room* (Vol. 4, pp. 161-181). Seoul Museum of Art.

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Green Open Access added to TU Delft Institutional Repository

'You share, we take care!' - Taverne project

<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/you-share-we-take-care>

Otherwise as indicated in the copyright section: the publisher is the copyright holder of this work and the author uses the Dutch legislation to make this work public.

방으로 간 도시들
Cities in the Room

목차 Contents

5	최나옥	방으로 간 도시들
14	임동근	보이지 않는 도시의 풍경
22	정다영	«방의 도시»에서 «방으로 간 도시들»
29	마크 핼롯	인테리어와 내면성
43	김홍중	미디어스케이프와 모바일 성찰성
62	권태현	방에서 만드는 미술, 방이 만드는 미술
68	전민지	방, 벙커, 군도: 전시 디자이너의 (공간) 표류기
81	김희천	뚜리또
85	정재경	공/터
89	최윤	방
92	한선우	세 개의 방: 미니룸, 라푼젤의 탑, 그리고 침수된 어느 낡은 지하실에 대하여
99		전시 도면 Floorplan
100		전시 사진 Photos
134	Nowk Choe	Cities in the Room
144	Dongkun Yim	The Landscape of the Invisible City
153	Dahyoung Chung	From <i>City of the Bang</i> to <i>Cities in the Room</i>
161	Mark Pimlott	Interiority
183	Hong-Jung Kim	Mediascape and Mobile Reflexivity
204	Taehyun Kwon	Art from the Room, Art by the Room
210	Minji Chun	Room, Bunker, Archipelago: Wandering Space of Exhibition Designers
225	Heecheon Kim	Turrito
230	Jaekyung Jung	Empty/Realm
234	Yun Choi	Bang
237	Sun Woo	Three Rooms: “Mini-room,” Rapunzel’s Tower, and an Old, Flooded Bunker
243		참여자 소개 Participants

본 전시와 출판물은 서울시립미술관 <2023
신진미술인 지원 프로그램>의 일환으로
진행되었습니다.

이 책에 수록된 글과 사진에 대한 저작권은 각
저작권자에게 있으며, 저작권자의 동의 없이
무단으로 사용할 수 없습니다.

This exhibition and publication is supported
by Seoul Museum of Art as part of Emerging
Artists & Curators 2023 Program.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication
may be reproduced or utilized in any form or
by any means without the prior permission of
the copyright holder.

Interiority¹

Interiority and the condition of interior

In the English language, the word “interiority” denotes “inner character”², and infers a condition of inwardness and individual contemplation. It pertains to the individual, who in withdrawing from the world to enter a world of one’s own, achieves a kind of freedom. I wish to address this kind of freedom in relation to another order of interior, one of urban, territorial and even global scale that is subject to the effects of ideology and its agreements: a *condition of interior*, in which interiority may offer an emancipatory respite. The retrieval of the experience or perception of “freedom” within this interior, which touches upon the room and the space of the city alike is an urgent matter, particularly in response or resistance to the prevalent ideology of neoliberalism. A sense of the means through which this might be attempted is a matter of urgency for designers and architects of the interior.

In April 2016, Richard Sennett gave a lecture on the matter of Interiors and Interiority at Harvard University Graduate School

- 1 This text is originally published in *Interiority* (Universitas Indonesia: Depok, 2018) titled as *Interiority and the Conditions of Interior*.
- 2 Oxford English Dictionary: Interiority: inner character: “the profound interiority of faith”



of Design³. He began by describing the standard account of the development of the interior—and the notion of the interior—as we are familiar with it. According to this account, before modernity, affairs pertaining to the interior were not considered especially distinct from those of the world outside, and that a notion of privacy germane to the interior was not really developed until the middle of the eighteenth century, when differentiated rooms appeared whose natures were distinct from public space. The interior as an increasingly specialised realm at once offered a retreat from the world for the self, and a place in which subjectivity could flourish. The company of one’s intimates would allow the individual to feel free to express oneself. This was reflected in one’s dress, which differed between the public and private realms: clothing specific to one’s place in society or work would be worn in public, and one would be able to comport oneself in another way to familiars in the protected and private realm of the interior. These conditions produced an atmosphere—in Sennett’s words—of “openness, frankness and sharing” that constituted interiority.

The nineteenth-century European novel produced evidence that the interior could also be said to be a realm of the imagination and revelation; a realm of allusion, illusion, and in some notable instances, such as Joris-Karl Huysmann’s fictional creation, the character Des Esseintes⁴ in his novel *À Rebours*

3 Richard Sennett, *Interiors and Interiority*, lecture at Harvard Graduate School of Design, 2016/04/22, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hVPjQhfJfKo>

4 The main character, Des Esseintes, is a dandy: bored, self-indulgent, and cruel. The house he makes for himself, and constantly refurbishes, reflects his ever-shifting preoccupations and tastes. Interiors are decorated strange colours, surfaces, patterns and effects; very rare books supply intellectual weight; plants

(1884), a realm of fantasy and excess. The book’s protagonist was at a remove from the world, and so created his own world, with its own codes: the interior represented a constantly unfolding attempt at (self-) realisation that produced a condition of interior that was both extreme and exclusive.

In his lecture, Sennett described interiority through the thoughts of Georg Simmel’s essay *The Metropolis and Mental Life* (1903).⁵ Simmel had proposed that it was the street rather than the home or the community that produced subjectivity within the individual. Simmel presented the metropolitan citizen as an agonist who appears in the street and responds to its space of excessive stimulation with externally blasé behaviour, all the while being affected by that space. The street and exposure to others thus produced feelings and thoughts: subjectivity, individuality, and interiority. Simmel described the metropolitan subject as capable of observing complex external conditions and harbouring quite distinct thoughts simultaneously, and this without the interference of others or the engagement demanded by the domestic interior and its familiars. In the street, one could be detached from others, and develop a reflective position; and, through being able to observe external conditions without interaction or direct involvement, one could experience a kind of freedom.

that evoke states of mind and body (such as exotic flowers that stink like death); and metaphors for his own indolence and decadence abound, including a tortoise whose shell has encrusted with jewels, moving across the floor slowly (and so burdened, soon dies).

5 Georg Simmel, *The Metropolis and Mental Life*, *Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities*, Richard Sennett, ed. (Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969): 47–60

In contrast, the interior bound to the family or the small familiar community—what is described as the domestic interior—typically does not sustain this kind of freedom; indeed, it has characteristically suppressed it. The commonplace experience of young people moving from village or suburb to the city, in which freedom of movement, association and action translates to personal freedom, illustrates this.⁶ Familial and spatial intimacy, and other structures and strictures of the domestic interior construct a condition of interior through prescribed codes of behaviour to which an individual is subject. In the street, however, one is able to act and feel and move about as one's true self while within oneself, among many others, and experience, simultaneously, inwardness and freedom. This interiority and its freedom act as defences to the condition of interior produced by the domestic setting and the metropolitan setting alike. Sennett's lecture is important for us because it helps us to establish terms. Here, interiority is—whether associated with the familiar, domestic interior or the unyielding metropolis—located in the individual: it is a condition, however, produced by the environment. Here, I wish to broaden the definition what the interior can be, and outline a condition of interior that is extensive, pervasive, and insists on repetitive tropes and agreement. I have written about this before in relation to interiorisation at the scale of the North American continent—

6 In his lecture, Richard Sennett speaks about his own research in Muslim cities, and Cairo in particular; and of his conversations with women regarding wearing the burqa in public. He was told by many women that when they wear their burqa in the street, they feel free in their anonymity, temporarily liberated from the structures and strictures of the home placed upon them by their relatives, children and husbands.

the continental interior—and described the means and devices colonisation as producing a condition of interiority.⁷ In retrospect, I regard the term I used—interiority—as inaccurate: rather, the processes and means of colonisation produced a condition of interior. These processes may be seen to be continuous, in that the devices through which *laissez-faire* capitalism operated, and which were represented in the dispersed urban environment, were extensions of those processes of colonisation that preceded them; and that a similar extension may be seen in the projective operations, devices and expressions of global capitalism or neoliberalism, which similarly produce a condition of interior, or what Peter Sloterdijk has called “The World Interior of Capital”.⁸

Interiority, as experienced by the individual, seems to suggest one means of resisting the condition of interior. The kinds of freedom produced by interiority reside in the possibilities for reflection that are produced by the environment. The creation of reflective distance as a reaction to the exaggerated stimuli of the metropolis is central to the work of writers and photographers who have observed, recast and reinterpreted the city in forms that are significant to them, following their deliberate but subjective attentions. In his *Arcades Project* (1927–1940), Walter Benjamin interpreted the interbellum metropolis of Paris through an inquiry into its creation in nineteenth-century modernity, through the scenes, artefacts and fictions of its neglected

7 Mark Pimlott, *Without and Within: Essays on Territory and the Interior* (Rotterdam: Episode, 2007)

8 Peter Sloterdijk, transl. Wieland Hoban, *In the World Interior of Capital* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013). Originally published as *Im Weltinnenraum des Kapitals* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 2005)

arcades, or passages.⁹ Guy Debord reconfigured the same city on the basis of *montages* of fragments of experience, or unités d’ambiance, in his *Guide psychogéographique de Paris* (1957).¹⁰ Recently, Ian Sinclair has described London through the device of walking, reconfiguring the city through subjective readings of its scenes and streets in books such as *Lights Out for the Territory* (2003), and *The Last London* (2017).¹¹ The writer and filmmaker Patrick Keiller, who, through his protagonist “Robinson”, also contemplated “The problem of London”,¹² calls this mode of re-configuration “radical subjectivity”,¹³ a process through which the city assumes features that are meaningful for those individuals who interpret them. In these interpretations, the city does not appear as something other than itself, but as a bearer of myriad embedded narratives and histories that are significant, and which the individual makes their own. Psycho-geography is also the domain of topographic photographers who attend to the world as it manifests itself or appears at a particular, representative moment which, through the making

- 9 Howard Eiland, Kevin McLaughlin (translation of Walter Benjamin, *Das Passagen-Werk*, ed. Rolf Tiedemann, 1982) *The Arcades Project: Walter Benjamin* (Cambridge MA/ London: Belnap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999)
- 10 Guy Debord, collage, *Guide psychogéographique de Paris: discours sur les passions de l’amour* (1957)
- 11 Ian Sinclair, *Lights Out for the Territory* (London: Penguin, 2003); *The Last London* (London: Oneworld, 2017)
- 12 Patrick Keiller, *London* (UK: BFI Production/ Koninck Studios, 1994)
- 13 Patrick Keiller, *The View from the Train: Cities and Other Landscapes* (London: Verso, 2014)

of an image, re-presents that moment of perception of the world.¹⁴ The renowned American photographer Stephen Shore discovered that: “the camera was the technical means of showing what the world looks like at a moment of heightened awareness. It is that awareness, of really looking at the everyday world with clear and focused attention, that I’m interested in”.¹⁵ In Shore’s work, the photograph becomes the register of a moment or condition through which the world reveals itself, and which produces instances of profound interiority in the photographer and viewer. In contemplation of these subjective interpretations, itineraries, and images, the city—presently metropolitan, global and neoliberal, despite all local specificity—is shown to be a locus for highly charged readings and associations which it prompts through its myriad and interdependent manifestations: topographies, architectures, interiors, and others. It is clear that possibilities for individual reflection and interiority abound within the apparently rigid agendas set by the city and its environments; and that the interiority the city produces within its citizens suggests possibilities for resistance to its shaping of individual and mass experience. Here, the term “city” pertains to the dispersed and diffuse total urbanised environment, formed by power relations and their residue, the effects of capital, and currently shaped by the effects of neoliberalism. Interiority,

- 14 Stephen Shore, *Biological Landscape: The Photography of Stephen Shore 1969–79*, New York: International Centre of Photography, 11 May–9 September 2007; *American Beauty: The Work of Stephen Shore* (DVD, 2006)
- 15 Stephen Shore, *American Surfaces* (1972)(London: Phaidon, 2008); *Uncommon Places* (1982)(London: Thames & Hudson, 2004); William Eggleston, John Szarkowski, *William Eggleston’s Guide* (1976)(New York, Museum of Modern Art, 2002)

as specific to the experience of the individual, is difficult to accommodate as a programme for those who must think about the making of the city and its interior; however, we must attend to its possibility because of the freedoms it enables. To do so, we, as designers and architects of the interior, must make places—and particularly public interiors—of specific character, materiality, atmosphere and evidence of relations, through which people may be more conscious of themselves and others, the world and their place in it.

Before returning to examples of how such places have been made in the past or might be achieved in the future, it is important to show instances of the development of the condition of interior on a territorial scale, as a basis for understanding the contemporary ubiquity or omnipresence of this condition, and the dimension of our task, our obligation; and to help identify possibilities for the production of environments of genuine richness and freedom.

The condition of interior

The production of a condition of interior would seem to have been one of the necessary objectives of colonising empires throughout history, to aid the control of territories of others and the subjugation or elimination indigenous populations, and the expropriation of their resources. The creation of a condition of interior is evident in the case of Roman military outpost settlements, such as *Timgad*, now in Algeria (100CE), which set apart a place in the world, cut boundaries in the earth to render the settlement distinct from the world, and, using a grid, laid out space within those boundaries to create a representative

order—of politics, worship and behaviour—for life therein.¹⁶ the Roman settlement was an interior cut out of the space of the world, and a condition of interior prevailed within its walls, which would then be deployed without. The procedures, rituals and measures that attended the Roman settlement could be implemented anywhere. The establishment of such settlements in far-flung places was important for the process of colonisation undertaken by the Roman Empire throughout the Mediterranean, Asia Minor, and northern Europe. As outposts, the settlements placed a claim upon the territory around, enforced by military presence, and administrative means thereafter. Their square form, defined walls with entry points at the ends of the cardinal routes of planning, the *cardo* and *decumanus*, and the distribution of forum, monuments, temples, theatres, baths and ordinary buildings therein, all constituted the representation of Roman civic and administrative order and Roman ideology. There were two layers to the condition of interior created by the Romans: one pertaining to the settlement itself, and another to the territory beyond the settlements' walls, which was subject to systematised legislation, agriculture, and connective networks.¹⁷

The settlement as the basic element of the Roman colonial system was an idealised construction that represented Roman organisation and method, rather than a reflection of how Rome was actually organised or made.¹⁸ As the Roman settlement

16 Joseph Rykwert, *The Idea of a Town: The Anthropology of Urban Form in Rome, Italy and the Ancient World* (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976)

17 Andrea Branzi, *Weak and Diffuse Modernity: The World of Projects at the Beginning of the 21st Century* (Milan: Skira, 2006)

18 Daniel J. Gargola, *The Shape of the Roman Order: The Republic and Its Spaces* (Chapel Hill NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2017)

was at first a military camp, so too were the colonial outposts of European colonial enterprises, established from the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries, around the Mediterranean, in continental Africa, the Americas, the West Indies, Asia Minor, Southeast Asia, the East Indies the Far East and Oceania. You will be familiar with the form of these from Batavia to Savannah: the British, Dutch, Spanish, Portuguese, French, and latterly the Germans, Italians and Japanese all had imperial ambitions which had trade and militarism—with genocide or slavery—working in consort. Bases would be established that were fortified against both indigenous populations and competitors. Within these, a condition was created that combined pragmatism and idealism and projected notions of order emanating from those Empires’ hearts, or from their agents, such as, in the case of the Netherlands and Batavia and Indonesia, the East India Company. With varying measures and means, the lands under new “masters” submitted to new orders, new systems, and a narrow range of purpose, concerned with the extraction of resources, the enforcement or inducement of local populations to service that extraction, and the maintenance of order to sustain that service. Long-term involvements were tied to the wealth of resources in the colony, including the labour of the local population. For all of this to work, the colonial ruling cadre needed to maintain control and a condition of interior had to be sustained, one that for pragmatic reasons, frequently mixed representational and organisational tropes of both the local population and the colonial occupiers.

A particularly powerful instance of this is embodied in the projective acts that supported the colonisation of the United States and the American West. These acts combined the interests of capital, industry, government and military power; created new origin myths that sustained these interests; and yielded new spatial conditions that emerged in the environment

as it was planned and built.¹⁹ The American example provided a pattern for planning and architecture that transpired to be perfectly suited to laissez-faire capitalism, and to easy dissemination to other distant environments primed for its reception. This “American space”, and in particular, its way of treating the public interior, has been and continues to be pervasive, worldwide. It is familiar in forms such as the shopping mall²⁰ and the continuous interior, what Rem Koolhaas has characterised as “Junkspace”.²¹ The American model, originating in the strategies for interiorising the American West, has been used to generate total environments for the organisation of society around commercial imperatives, driven by small groups of business interest and their investors. The American space proceeded on the basis of projective strategies from the time of the establishment of British colonies: it, along with everything within it, was intended to be possessed, from the east coast (upon which the British, French and Spanish had arrived) to the west, as far as it would go, the continental territory, as yet unknown, divided like slices of cake.²²

It was initiated by Thomas Jefferson’s *Land Ordinance* (1785), a projective system that served multiple purposes. A grid, both abstract and operative, was designed for the survey of land and its division thereafter, determining property

19 Mark Pimlott, *Without and Within: Essays on Territory and the Interior* (Rotterdam: Episode, 2007)

20 *Variations on a Theme Park: The New American City and the End of Public Space*, Michael Sorkin, ed., (New York: Noonday Press, 1992)

21 Rem Koolhaas, *Junkspace*, in Nobuyuki Yoshida [ed.], Rem Koolhaas, *OMA@work: Architecture and Urbanism*, May 2000 Special Issue (Tokyo, A+U Publishing, 2000)

22 Catherine Maumi, *Thomas Jefferson et le projet du Nouveau Monde* (Paris: Éditions de la Villette, 2007)

boundaries from the scale of territories to those of townships and individual properties, the layout and relations within those townships, and the measures and dimensions of materials to build them. This was a serious development in the history of colonisation: specificity was removed from its method of process,²³ and so, too, the notion of resistance. An abstract system was conceptualised and enshrined in legislation, which then operated in the manner of a machine. This system was deployed indifferently over topographies and others who were unseen and unknown. Difficult terrains were subsumed by the grid; others were disregarded. The idea of a tabula rasa was thus established, which required the elimination of indigenous populations, both to command natural resources and to lay claim on a purified territory for American (white, European) settlers. The displacement of the other was achieved through military force and various claims on their domains: those of industry who claimed natural resources, and those of settlers who were encourage to claim and inhabit land and render it productive. The Homestead Act of 1865 offered land cleared of indigenous populations to those who would make it useful, thus tying the “American space” to notions of possession through labour, and “defence” against the other. Therein lies the present-day attachment to gun ownership, its concomitant antagonism toward the other and claims on individual property and liberty: the other being any of either the defeated, the enslaved, the foreigner, or the government. The physical characteristics of the continental territory were transfigured into a repertory of mythical

23 Leonardo Benevolo, transl. Judith Landry, *The Architecture of the Renaissance* volume I (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978)

imagery, and so the grid—at once abstract and physical—gathered representations into its network. At one level, this was consistent with the displacement, replacement and assumption of the indigenous other and the place of the other; on another, it was essential to the creation of representational “figures” through which the condition of interior could be identified and continually renewed. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the American space was cast as a God-given “garden” for white, European settlement—central to the attendant ideology of Manifest Destiny—whose latent imagery authenticated its occupation and notions of individual realisation through labour that achieved that occupation. Thereafter, the logic of the grid was coupled with the mechanics of laissez-faire development, and the repertory of mythical imagery was—and continues to be—deployed to legitimate the ongoing project of urbanisation.

That logic and the representational effects it has gathered are visible in American urban development from the nineteenth century to the present day, which has seen the entire continental (and conceptual) territory subjected to a diffuse urbanism and a condition of interior, which can be recognised in the layout of cities, the sprawl of suburbs, the distribution of motorway networks, the layouts of shopping malls, casinos, airports, hotels, offices; and, in exported forms so many of us are familiar with, the images of those scenes as depicted (as ideal tropes) in advertising, television and film. This condition was critically illustrated by the Florentine “critical” groups of architects, Superstudio and Archizoom, whose propositions for a *Continuous Monument* and *No-Stop City*, respectively, were total environments that were projected over existing conditions monumentally and indifferently, and that absorbed all forms of human activity, with the grid serving as their operative,

non-representational vehicles.²⁴ Certainly, the legacy of this American space—that of a continuous condition of interior—has come to be recognised in urban developments and constructed interior environments far away from the territory of the United States, and in southeast Asia in particular, which, based on principles of laissez-faire capitalism and neoliberalism, follow the American precedent both in their manner of appearance and in the perceived agency of individuals within them. They propose conditions in which prescribed behaviour is required of the visitor; and yet they project, despite this, the notion of individual freedom. As these environments proliferate worldwide, they seem to constitute a normative condition; in other words, they suggest that they are normal, and public, and so they represent the notion of freedom of individuals (rather than captive consumers) through the paradoxical advocacy of the freedom of consumption and its promise of the fulfilment of self-realisation. Of course, this freedom stands at a considerable distance to the freedom we have referred to in relation to interiority as experienced by an individual in the metropolis. What might make that kind of freedom possible?

Even in nineteenth-century metropolitan Paris, shaped by the immense efforts of Baron Georges-Eugène Haussmann, individual interiority and its freedoms were possible, produced by the nature of its construction. Haussmann had transformed the city into a total environment, one that embodied and represented its orders of organisation. It was devised as an enormous

machine, a set of contiguous administrative arrondissements divided and connected by new boulevards, avenues, streets, above-ground and underground infrastructures, buildings, street furniture and appearances: a catalogue of codified equipment. Within its buildings, social strata were accommodated in regular and repeated arrangements; on its streets, a unified treatment of all elements connected with sanitation, comfort and publicity were integrated with planting, pavements and roads. A sewage system evacuated the waste of the whole, an underground subway allowed rapid mass transit across the entire construction. The streets themselves were broad and connected in such a way to ease the congestion of traffic, and the movement of police, fire and military vehicles. And yet, despite the completeness and pervasiveness of this machine-environment, it offered anonymity as a gift to the individual: the machine could be used by the individual, who was free to use it to their purpose. The contemporary paintings of Gustave Caillebotte (1848–1894) show individuals, either in the street, on balconies or in windows, posed at the threshold of the city’s metropolitan scenes, scenes which they seem empowered to possess. In other paintings, they are shown in groups, in the street or at work, almost as though in the service of a grand project: the metropolis, its scenes and its myriad institutions. It was quite possible for individuals to be overwhelmed or alienated by the metropolis, as is clear in the work of other painters of the city, who felt obliged to be witnesses to modern life; and in the experiences of those adversely affected—akin to shell-shock—by the metropolis’s abundant disorienting stimuli, such as the multitudes, movement, and

24 *Super Superstudio*, Andreas Angelidakis, Vittorio Pizzigoni, Valter Scelsi, eds. (Milan: Padiglione d’arte contemporanea/ Silvana Editorial, 2015); *Exit Utopia: Architectural Provocations 1956–1976*. Martin van Schaik, Otakar Mácel, eds., (Munich: Prestel, 2005); Andrea Branzi, op.cit.

electric light.²⁵

Richard Sennett's citing of Georg Simmel suggests that the metropolis and its effects can produce the individual's turn to inwardness. However, we are also aware of many negative consequences concomitant with the effects of the metropolis, which are exclusive, and demand the engagement of an individual who is addressed as a representative of any one of myriad "market groups". One must note the illusory character of these effects and the engagement they infer, from publicity and their spectacle to the pervasiveness of connective technologies that suggest personal command over one's life and relations. There are many who live and work outside the narratives of these effects and structures, who are forced to be in their service as an underclass,²⁶ and who invisibly sustain the neoliberal project of a condition of interior. In response to the metropolis of the present, Sennett's use of Simmel is centred not so much on redressing the effects of its phantasmagoria but on the desirability of human engagement with others in the street; on seeing others and being seen by others, as individuals appearing in public, or, in his teacher Hannah Arendt's words, in the space of appearance.²⁷ Sennett is concerned with notions of value that emerge despite the oppressive narratives of the metropolis, and with efforts that can be made to generate situations in which awareness of

- 25 Susan Buck-Morss, *Aesthetics and Anaesthetics: Walter Benjamin's Artwork Essay Reconsidered*, Rosalind E. Krauss [et al.] October: *The Second Decade*, 1986–1996 (Cambridge MA, MIT Press, 1997); Joachim Schlör, transl. Pierre Gottfried Imhof and Daffydd Rees Roberts, *Nights in the Big City* (London, Reaktion Books, 1998)
- 26 Ben Judah, *This is London: Life and Death in the World City* (London: Picador, 2016)
- 27 Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (second edition) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958)

people, contact between them and their potential interaction can occur. In such situations, interiority and its associated freedoms are produced, as is a consciousness of self among others, who appears among them and is engaged with them. It is this interiority that is valuable and is offered as an antidote to the neoliberalism's (or authoritarian regimes') coercive and anaesthetising condition of interior, its systemisation of the urbanised environment and its infrastructures (which is everywhere) to shape behaviour towards predictable patterns, performances, preferences and outcomes and its apparent adaptiveness to individual desires through omnipresent "smart" technology.

The implication of the value given to this order of interiority, for designers and architects of the interior, is attention to the public interior—as that space, interpreted as public regardless of its ownership, that illustrates the values of a society and its ideas about citizens' relations to each other, to the various agents of power and to the world—and the making of spaces of appearance. The public interior can be designed to resist its deployment as an instrument and its reduction to a kind of scaffolding for coercive spectacle. Rather, it can become—as it has been, historically—a stage²⁸ for people, upon which they can appear,²⁹ move, act, associate, and become conscious of themselves and their place in the world as individuals, as selves, as others, as selves among other selves, together and

- 28 Sebastiano Serlio, *Regole generale di architettura* (libro II) (1545), *Scena Satirica; Scena Comica; Scena Tragica*
- 29 Hannah Arendt, op.cit.; George Baird, *The space of appearance* (1992), *Metropolitan Mutations: The Architecture of Emerging Public Spaces*, Detlef Mertens, ed. (Little, Brown and Co.: Toronto 1989): 135–152

distinct, in public. In such an interior, people—as individuals, among other individuals—can be afforded pleasures of experience and consciousness and the freedom of personal interiority and anonymity; they can read and interpret allusions and representations through which they might occupy other imaginative realms, unbound by power relations; they can occupy real environments that evoke ideas and themes that at once reinforce experience of the present, reconcile the present with the past, and excite the imagination. Such attentions to the making of the public interior are essential to the making of material culture, and a place in the world for all individuals, all citizens.

There are several exemplary instances where such places have been made, that resonate as possible models: they are drawn from various historical periods, different countries and different social conditions; some are literal interiors, while some suggest interiors: places proposed as focused experiences. These include *Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens* (1650s-1859), in which people from different parts of society could meet, while walking and partaking of entertainments, frequently in disguise, which served as a model for Cedric Price's *Fun Palace project* (1960–1964); the spaces of grands magasins, such as *Au Bon Marché* or *Galeries Lafayette*, where people of different social classes, from shop-girls to ladies from the Opéra, could be in contact in a collective palace for consumption and pleasure³⁰ where the prices of all objects were shown; the ruins of the *Palast der Republik* in Berlin (1976; 1998–2006),³¹ where citizens

30 Emile Zola, *Au Bonheur des dames* (1883)

31 Andreas Ulrich, *Palast der Republik: Ein Rückblick/ A Retrospective* (Munich:

could see and participate in cultural events of many kinds in a megastructure shorn of its ideological representations; the public space and the main gallery of *MASP*, or *São Paulo Museum of Modern Art*, designed by Lina Bo Bardi, which served as a giant shelter for human life and action, from circuses to concerts to demonstrations to exhibitions, and whose gallery of pictures proposed human relations between the works of art and their viewers; Lina Bo Bardi's *Teatro Oficina* (1984) in Sao Paulo, almost a corridor or street, with galleries made of scaffolding almost touching the stage that ran its length, a part of it “missing”, effectively a greenhouse with trees, affording the view of an adjacent (and currently threatened) park; Bo Bardi's *SESC-Fabrica Pompeia* (1978–86),³² a complex of factories radically converted for local people to read, relax, meet, be together and make culture in interiors, streets, boardwalks, pools, cafés and sports halls; *De Meerpal* (1967) in Dronten, a glazed shed designed by Frank van Klingeren for people to meet, play, take classes, watch television collectively, watch plays, shop in markets, look at art, and make politics;³³ Pontus Hultén's curated visions of culture and spaces for the public who make culture,³⁴ first at the *Moderna Museet*, then the *Kulturhuset* (1976), in Stockholm, designed by Peter Celsing, where people could read, and watch, and talk and listen, and look over the city, and immediately thereafter at the *Centre Pompidou* (1977)

Prestel Verlag, 2006)

32 Lina Bo Bardi, *SESC-Fabrica da Pompéia* (Lisbon: Blau, 1996)

33 Marina van den Bergen, Piet Vollaard, *Hinder en ontklontering: Architectuur en maatschappij in het werk van Frank van Klingeren* (Rotterdam: Uitgeverij 010, 2003)

34 Christoph Grafe, *People's Palaces: Architecture, Culture and Democracy in Post-war Western Europe* (Amsterdam: Architectura & Natura, 2014)

in Paris, designed by Renzo Piano and Richard Rogers as a set of stacked fields open to public gathering, learning, living and culture-making connected to the city; the auditoria and lobbies of the *National Theatre* (1976) in London designed by Denys Lasdun, as platforms for people to gather to watch and listen to each other and to plays, and to watch their city in fact as they emerge from the fictions woven within; the spaces of Lacaton and Vassal's renovation of *Palais de Tokyo* (2001) in Paris, offered as ruins amongst which people might play as they contemplate each other and new art; and the sheltered place under the great roof of the *Markthal/Stadshal* (2010) in Gent, designed by Robbrecht en Daem with Marie-José Van Hee,³⁵ which gathers everyone together in a big room, one that is open to the city all around them, which keeps them warm with two great fireplaces embedded in the structure supporting the roof. Like all the examples offered here, the *Markthal/Stadshal* is a place in the world for each individual who shelters under its roof. There, one can be oneself (and turn to one's own thoughts) among others, in a place that represents an idea about the city—the city's idea of what it wants to be—a place whose narrative concerns relations between people rather than power, a place that is in the world and that suggests that that world is both the possession and their responsibility of the people within; a place of real material and spatial qualities with allusions to other places and other times, one that permits reflection and interiority, and is at once a shelter and a home, a place of the city and within the city, both of the present and the past, a public interior rather than a condition

of interior, and so, like the previous examples and exemplars, a model.

35 Iwona Blazwick, Marc Dubois, William Mann, *Paul Robbrecht, Robbrecht en Daem: 2G no. 56* (Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili, 2010)