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The spectacular form of interior architecture under the new conditions of urban space

Pierluigi Salvadeo

Architecture nowadays aims to be gazed upon rather than to function as a tool with which to address the real world. It focuses all attention on its own superficial appearance, offering a novel idea of spectacle as the reflection of the different way people live now. What we are faced with is something whose ongoing reality is less concrete, more visual, which makes room for a theatrical aspect in which architecture tends to identify itself with backdrops and facades. This evolution in architecture, which makes the human agent subordinate to the backdrop and the construction to the image, gives a considerably enhanced value to the quest for self-referential display as spectacle.

'Consumption' and 'image' seem to be the concepts that best summarize the present state of contemporary society, whose living space is constantly becoming less a matter of reality and more one of imagery or imagination: less and less stable, more and more transitory. What is unreal but representational—the illuminated or image-decorated surface, the sketched design, the model—is replacing the traditional concept of 'building', and architecture seems to be becoming a matter of installations and stage sets. We are presented with a particular spatial aesthetics, the aesthetics of the provisional, of the media, advertising and spectacle—more generally, the aesthetics of communication. The city, with its architectural features and its indoor and outdoor spaces, is no longer calibrated in terms of its three-dimensional voids and solids: its very identity is more and more often a matter of the two-dimensional presentation of messages and images. This suggests a new concept of space.¹

The quality of this new form of space is not immediately evident: its real complexity is inward and virtual. It is something more mental than volumetric, more temporal than spatial, something that challenges us to consider a new system of relationships in its entirety, involving issues of time, energy, land use, networking and so on. This gives rise to an unprecedented kind of mapping, the description of a composite structure which dispenses with any special or fixed viewpoint. The terms of urban representation have been altered: instead of being
shown the city’s inhabited spaces, we are increasingly often obliged to try to imagine them, or at least to grasp them, by means of motley and sometimes contradictory scraps of information that require constantly updated viewpoints. This kind of space—less functional, more scenographic—can be accessed from more than one direction: it is multiethnic, multidisciplinary, occasional, casual, episodic, unsystematic, reversible and lacking in ballast; it follows a new, broader system of links and references. It is a self-referential space made up of scenographic architectures (or architectural set designs) which have overtaken and replaced the reassuring but now outmoded idea of a building’s functionality.

When Guy Debord wrote *La Société du spectacle* in the late 1960s, the world had not yet reached that spectacular phantasmagoria of forms and images which we find quite ordinary nowadays. Debord’s new aesthetics were those of the capitalist society then taking shape, the society of consumption and mechanization, which was discovering a new conception of reality in the media, advertising and spectacular entertainment and was finding its point of maximum expression in that conception’s corollary, the image. Things’ value in use (i.e. their physical consumption) became less important than their value in exchange (or potency in circulation), and it is this that now represents their true value. What matters most of all in an object, accordingly, is its potential as a commodity—the symbolic outweighs the material; the abstraction represents trumps the physical reality. Spectacle takes its place within this new reality in which that which is produced is stripped of its original value and reduced to its exchange value alone. The true essence of things is now their abstraction as spectacle; they are no longer bought just to be consumed, but primarily for what they symbolize or represent.

*La Société du spectacle* was written in 1967. When we reread it today it speaks to us of our own times, for the idea of ‘spectacle’ seems a near-perfect representation of the real load-bearing skeletal core of today’s society of consumption and image. With remarkable intuition, Guy Debord foresaw the overwhelming dematerialization of modern society, in which spectacle transforms the world into a parallel—but equally authentic—reality. The Indian anthropologist Arjun Appadurai, one of the most expert contemporary commentators on globalization and its cultural aspects, takes the view that advertising nowadays creates what could be described as a sort of ‘imagined nostalgia’: a ‘nostalgia for things that never were’.

‘Imagined nostalgia’ is an inversion of our fantasy’s temporal order: usually we fantasize forwards, imagining what might happen in the future; but this is a nostalgia for the present, induced by a proliferation of advertising messages in their manifold forms of expression, as if the present were already on the point of vanishing. We consumers seem to live in a back-to-the-future atmosphere, where the present is already periodized. Such notions lead Appadurai to argue that the new techniques of mass marketing actually construct time, even though it is thought of as lost, absent or remote. Accordingly, whereas Guy Debord discovered the idea of a spectacular reality in
advertising and the media, Arjun Appadurai now finds the same idea of spectacle in much the same terms, but amplified by an implosive and retrospective construction of time. This concept of the space-time of real life is entirely consistent with the space-time of the spectacle.

The conditions of urban space have changed, and so has the idea of habitation: its traditional static connotation of being housed somewhere, of having a home, has been lost. The very idea of place is becoming a changeable concept, its identity no longer established once and for all. In these circumstances of mutability, then, ‘where we live’ is no longer just in a place called ‘home’, but in way stations and excursions, for we are always in movement; generic travellers, as it were, who can live in no single place, but in many. This new way of thinking takes hybridization as a given, and the individual merges with the space he or she inhabits simply by appearing there. There is a different perspective on what it means to live somewhere: the pattern that is clearly discernible is that of a wandering life lived by a theoretical inhabitant of no fixed abode.

The Dadaists in their day created the first urban ‘ready-mades’ by going on walks around the dullest and most utterly ordinary places in their cities, a direct and dynamic action in the city’s real space that trumped the futurists’ static representations of motion and made the transition to an authentic adoption of movement itself as ‘home’. After the Dadaists came the surrealists, who also used the city for dynamic performances, but in their case the aim was, by walking around, to reach a state of unknowing, to lose their bearings, as it were, and so lose control, leading apparently to a hypnotic and ‘surreal’ condition. Their saunterings put them in touch with the more unconscious aspects of their urban geography, and the space through which they wandered was not the city landscape so much as the human mind. As in their artistic productions, they were looking not to the visible world of the actual city, but rather to the landscapes of the unconscious.

In the early 1950s, the International Situationists also used to roam the city’s least-known districts: they called it ‘urban drifting’ (dérive), and it was a means whereby individuals could experiment with new forms of behaviour in their lives: ‘A living moment, concretely and deliberately engineered through the collective organization of a shared ambiance and the random play of events.’

The practice of urban drifting consisted of getting lost in a city, giving rise to ‘situations’ of unmediated consumption, living the present moment. The Situationists’ ‘psychogeographic maps’ were accordingly an invitation to lose oneself in the city, and such wanderings opened up new territories for investigation, new itineraries, and above all new spaces in which to live. The theory behind this ‘drifting’ was the development of what would be a scientific method in its own right: a method of investigation and at the same time a source of design ideas. Psychogeography, as studied by the Situationists, recognized and investigated the psychic effects of urban surroundings on individuals and their resulting behaviour. This inevitably led to experimentation with new forms of behaviour in the individual’s real life.
The Situationists regarded this procedure, at once investigatory, critical and generative of ideas, as a new collective art form, an artistic endeavour by a group and, indeed, the only one that was acceptable in that it alone could annihilate the individual element in the traditional work of art, which they saw as pointless or even downright harmful to society and civilization. Drifting, according to Guy Debord, made it possible to acknowledge and celebrate ‘constructive play’ that went beyond the conventional notions of travelling or strolling to reveal an aspect of awareness of reality that matched the idea of a wandering abode. Starting as a method of investigation and a way of interpreting space, drifting becomes a criterion for its construction, and moving around becomes a form of architectonic composition in its own right, an architecture of experiential space.

The idea of a wandering that can trace out new ways of living in cities subsequently led Constant Nieuwenhuys to conceive of his New Babylon as the ideal site for wandering abodes: a city of nomads, whose inhabitants would not be constrained by any sedentary ties but free to wander at will over the terrain, as space would be organized under a new dispensation to be available to everyone. New Babylon spreads throughout the world, rolling out like a horizontal Tower of Babel to follow the nomadic wanderings of its inhabitants, whose movements would thus turn into architecture and whose travels would create their space. Constant’s ideas are resurfacing today, as Jeremy Rifkin records modern society’s abolition of ‘jobs’ constrained within the limited space characteristic of industrial society as traditionally conceived. It is the accelerating pace of automation that is bringing about the worker-less factory and forcing a rethink that can picture a new social economy capable of providing occupation for the considerable numbers of people driven out of work; but this is not the only space being colonized by the intelligent machine: higher up the corporate hierarchy, the managers, too, together with their various complicated tasks, are being replaced along with the assembly-line workers.

Under these new conditions, time tends to take over the function of space, and the actual ownership of an asset is destined to be steadily replaced by access to it—or to the service or cultural experience associated with it. This is the so-called ‘experience economy’, in which asset use is determined by the intangible network, making the symbolic or spectacular aspect an important feature even of the asset itself. The old concept of a market based on ownership is disappearing, as ideas, concepts, images and experiences become the fundamental elements of value. The result is a new way of using space and a different mode of inhabiting the surface of the Earth. Ownership no longer ties our lives down; our dwelling space is ordered in creative ways that are untrammelled by the usual ordinary constraints: a new society inhabits space in a freer, more open manner, as a society of wanderers who can insert themselves at any point alike in the network’s immaterial spaces, as in the constructed spaces of the city. Our mode of habitation changes from sedentary to itinerant and is no longer place dependent; we follow a new and more extensive system of landmarks. This is how Jeremy Rifkin puts it:
Global travel and tourism, theme cities and parks, destination entertainment centres, wellness, fashion and cuisine, professional sports and games, gambling, music, film, television, the virtual worlds of cyberspace and electronically mediated entertainment of every kind are fast becoming the centre of a new hyper-capitalism that trades to access cultural experiences.  

Our framework of orientation is increasingly a mobile one, even if it still coincides in a curious way with the fixed installations of our cities. Space fragments and swells in all directions alike, and our capacity to recognize it depends more and more on receiving messages via communications. ‘Where I live’ no longer has just one meaning: I can live in many places at once, and the space I inhabit is not only physical space, but also the immaterial, virtual space of the network, my access to which is merely provisional. Space is giving way to time as an almost material factor, the primary factor for measuring all we do.

Every day we find ourselves faced with a sort of spatial multitasking in which the simultaneity of our actions and the places we live in modify the time available to us. The Visual Networking Index is the result of research recently conducted by Cisco Systems into how many things we can now do simultaneously each day.  

It defines a ‘digital day’ as the day lived by people whose time is spent doing many things at once: they surf the Internet while listening to music, sending an e-mail, answering the telephone and so on. Cisco Systems’ research found that our 24-hour days have now swelled to 36 hours’ worth and by 2013 will actually have doubled to 48 hours.

The fact that time and space no longer coincide, that time runs at a different pace from that used in the perception of space, has an undeniable aspect of spectacle. It is, in fact, the space-time of spectacle which is floating free from that of real life. Life as spectacle has accordingly become one of the modern modes of habitation; the wandering abode comprises time just as much as space. Furthermore, it comprises every activity, from the nearest at hand to the most remote, from work to leisure. It is our postindustrial society’s creative mode of habitation, capable of forever finding new ways of occupying space—ways that may sometimes be improper, but are always innovative.

This new mode of habitation matches the evolving aspect of the modern city, as Richard Florida argues: his ‘Creative City’ is one that is not only more open, multiethnic and multicultural, but also can sustain interaction among its diversities at a profound level and make changeableness a generative force.  

The classical sense of habitation is lost, and accordingly a creative class arises to match this creative city, a class capable of inventing new ways in which to use the city and its various spaces, and new modes of inhabiting them.

Contemporary society is made up of new inhabitants who make use of the city and its architecture in a creative way that defies fixed categories, often altering such uses and adapting buildings to whatever kind of purpose the occupier wishes. The global city’s buildings and spaces set up a form of
physical network, and this physical network now combines with the virtual one to allow free circulation of ideas and things, of tangible and intangible goods. This globalized all-purpose network shows even more glaringly the difference between what is in the network and what is excluded from it, between what facilitates the free circulation of goods and ideas and what still belongs to a more partial way of thinking.

According to Marc Augé, the global network is that which is controllable, while the local represents that which remains outside the network and is accordingly less readily monitored or controlled.\(^{11}\) That which is local—and consequently partial, small-scale and private—is now on the outside: outside the network, outside the system. It has become external and is therefore free and could potentially rebuild a new urban system, a new and broader planning system. The network, on the other hand, is on the inside once more: it is the ‘indoors’, and within it we find the same firms, the same trademarks, the same things we still use to recognize who and where we are. The new ‘outdoors’, then, is the complex system of the small scale, sprawling spatially. This is a complete inversion of values, a revolution in the concept of ‘indoors’: a widely dispersed interior, which comprises other locations in space while remaining similar to itself in form. In this view, the notion of the inhabited interior spreads far beyond its ordinary boundaries.

Some of the historical and social factors which help explain how the concept of living in a place came to be broadened in this way may be found in the widespread dereliction of industrial districts that began during the 1970s. During those years, as robot technology spread through the factories, many industrial spaces gradually came to be abandoned. Conditions favoured the rise of a new, small-scale, geographically dispersed form of enterprise which, as Andrea Branzi has argued, has begun to invent new creative occupations for itself and new ways of using the city’s spaces.\(^ {12}\) This is the effect of what has been called ‘the third industrial revolution’, in which a restless and sometimes irrational mass of people use the architectures of the city in a creative way that defies fixed categories: they work at home, in the car or in the train; they live in warehouses, make universities out of disused factories, banks out of churches and so on. The postindustrial city generates itself in a process of continuous reassignment of its indoor spaces, and for this purpose requires an atomized system of artefacts suited to the new needs of a society whose main characteristic is its lack of precise contours, which is always ready for something different, new or provisional. The dynamic, flexible condition of this new fluid society takes material form in spaces which often have little functional identity but can be adapted to whatever kind of function people choose to give them.\(^ {13}\) Lacking any real means of marking such spaces’ identities, people find refuge in a new system of products, the all-permeating system of movable objects and furnishings. The postindustrial city arises out of a process of continuous reuse of its interior spaces, and this takes place through the use of subsystems and what we might call a kind of kit of parts for a living space, which can
exert an influence beyond its own borders. In this way, interior design moves beyond the boundaries of furnishing as a discipline and turns into a system capable of controlling the overall functioning of the city: a sort of new urban planning—and an unprecedented responsibility for interior architecture. The design of occupied space is increasingly unconstrained, and the boundary between reality and its representation is becoming blurred. Instead of constructing a space, we can more and more often try imagining, describing or performing it, as in a story or a stage set. The boundaries between the virtual and the real are less and less solid; even their essential natures are less distinguishable, increasingly uncertain and more open to negotiation. As Guy Debord had already glimpsed as early as the 1950s, spectacle has now become the contemporary city’s predominant aspect and the real guiding principle of city life. With the idea of ‘spectacle’ comes changes in the concepts of place and identity: we are losing our sense of ‘the built environment’; the notion of ‘the local context’ is being powerfully eroded, for we are becoming more and more used to being context independent. Space itself has been eroded; city places are less and less local—just the physical meeting places of cultural diversities, sites whose identity seems to consist of no more than their very lack of identity.

We may now speak of new kinds of space, spaces characterized by a powerful scenographic element, places of dramaturgy conceived as sets in their own right, idealized spectacle venues, urban stages not set in any particular place but representative only of themselves, all attention focused on the wholly abstract place they are designed as. Unlike traditional stage sets with their close relationship to a theatrical narrative, these places set a scene as a given space supplied with particular characteristics by the drama performed in it. Their narrative function discarded, these independent sets define a new kind of metropolitan realism; they embody a theatrical mix of media, spectacle and reality where installation, scenery and illusion are mingled, actor and onlooker change places and fiction is superimposed on reality and vice versa. Architecture seems to be giving way to set design, which plays a greater and greater part in expressing the relationship between space and function. Lived-in space, set design and urban planning are being brought into a new relationship under a new system of logical connection.

In 2003–2004, an installation at Tate Modern in London reproduced natural time in a thoroughgoing atmospheric experience. The Weather Project by the Danish artist Olafur Eliasson used a sun of single-wavelength lamps positioned high up at the back of the gallery’s vast Turbine Hall, together with a mirror to duplicate its effect and disco fog generators to transform it into a surreal place that superseded the idea of imitating nature and enlisted a new conception of nature itself. The entire space was wrapped in a steadily replenished mist that recreated the idea of a watery vapour: the effect was a surreal feeling of suspension. It is as though we were seeing a sensational sunset for the first time; visitors lay down flat, on the ground or on the ramps of the Tate, as if they were at the beach; they looked upward and noticed
their own reflections in the mirrored ceiling. In this way, the spectators became part of the museum, part of the spectacle, and bathed in this surrogate sunlight, this scrap of artificial nature. It was a true stage set, independent of any functional requirement; the space it represented was not an analogue of any other. It was not meant to represent other spaces, nor indeed anything other than itself. It was a self-fulfilling theatrical space.

It is Olafur Eliasson’s belief that nature does not exist in and of itself, but is wholly bound up with the way in which we observe it (see Fig. 17.1). The same kind of subjectivity allows the Dutch sound artist Edwin van der Heide to create artificial scenes that accurately match the sounds that come out of deafening loudspeakers. In his Laser Sound Project, lasers are hooked up to the sound emissions, and wall-like sheets of light materialize, demarcating environments that feel like actual rooms. In this way, the sound makes its presence felt within acoustic space and leads the visitor to interact with it in a total-immersion experience. Laser Sound Project involves affect rather than technology; the space it generates puts the beholder in touch with his or her feelings and subjective perceptions. We are in the presence of an abstract space that is as autonomous and self-referential as the music that generates it (see Fig. 17.2).

It should be pointed out, however, that this identification between music and space is not a twenty-first-century invention. There were those, almost a hundred years earlier, who looked to musical rhythm as an avenue into some thorough investigations of the relationships between architectural space and the space of the stage set. One of these was Adolphe Appia, an early craftsman of the new staging that emerged in reaction to the naturalistic theatre of the nineteenth century. His fundamental principles were that the stage set had its own artistic autonomy, that sets should not be required to be objectively lifelike and that the purpose of set design as an art could not be mere imitation, but on the contrary the expression of an ideal. Appia maintained that sets should not be based on the idea of imitating nature, but on their own inherent artistic qualities as something purely sui generis and abstract.

Adolphe Appia believed that through rhythmical movement we are united with our surrounding space by means of music: such movement allows us to rediscover the
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essential point where body and spirit come together. He found his stimulus in eurhythmics for the creation of the drawings we know as his Rhythmic Spaces. The Rhythmic Spaces are ideal settings for spectacle and consist of three-dimensional, workable sets. The scenes are not set in any particular place: they portray only themselves; and the attention is wholly focused on the quest to create spectacle following its own logic and values. They are architectural spaces which do not follow plot cues or stage directions and do not belong to given situations but instead refer to the abstraction of music, evoking other spaces and other situations. Unlike traditional set designs which are always at the service of theatrical narration, Appia’s Rhythmic Spaces present the setting as a given, something that exists prior to the action and accordingly has its own autonomous spatial and cultural connotations, its own dramaturgy quite apart from any narrative form (see Fig. 17.3). Like a veil hung between the virtual world of subjective perceptions and the objective world of real space, the scene merges with the real world to make a new space in which people live and move. The traditional relationship of dependence between form and function has
been taken off its hinges, and more complex and heterogeneous relations are the order of the day.

The case of Las Vegas is particularly revealing, as Robert Venturi describes it in his celebrated work *Learning from Las Vegas*: a great billboard, its 'anti-spatial' architecture a matter of advertising. One famous example is the design of the interiors of the buildings on Freemont Street, where the fruit machines are installed to look like the buildings' pillars. Nowadays, however, Las Vegas has undergone a further transformation, even better than virtual reality. In Las Vegas, there is no need to try to believe one is somewhere else; for, in fact, anyone who is in Las Vegas is indeed in another place, or rather in many other places. We may speak of a theatricalization of architecture in which it becomes not only an ideal site for spectacle, but also the actual spectacle itself. As well as the simple 1960s two-dimensional neon signs on the casino facades, we now have new luminous inserts and mega-screens, while the buildings' interiors have been transformed into remote, exotic places such as savannahs, deserts, glaciers and so on. Venturi recognizes that today's Las Vegas is

---

*Fig. 17.3. Adolphe Appia, Spazi Ritmici, Scherzo, 1909/1910. Photograph: Pierluigi Salvadeo.*
different from what it was when he wrote his famous book. The city has been Disneyfied and is changing from a strip designed to be driven along in a car into a Disneyland, a series of stage sets for strolling through, in which the public participate interactively and feel themselves actors on a constantly changing stage (see Fig. 17.4). Such interactive narratives are not linear ones like a film plot; they are hyper-narratives, stories in which it becomes possible to make leaps—logical or illogical—from one system of plot segments to another.

That is the case with Studio Azzurro’s ‘luci d’inganni’ (deceptive lights), in which the domestic space is reinterpreted virtually using light as the main material. Studio Azzurro itself calls this kind of experience a ‘Video-environment’ (or ‘Video-room’), indicating that its research explores the borders of the real, the virtual and the theatrical. The ‘Video-cabinet’, with its content of objects shown life-size, seeks to move beyond the realm of represented objects to engage in a dialogue with the real object, which is in front of the image or beside it. Studio Azzurro
contends that video does much more than report a thing; it allows whatever is left unclear or in suspense to be filled in by the spectator’s imagination and in this way lets that imagination help complete the space (see Fig. 17.5).

To conclude, one might sum up by saying that architecture has taken on the job of representation which has traditionally belonged to the stage set; that architecture has been theatricalized, becoming not only the ideal site of spectacle, but in fact the spectacle itself. The hyper-structured (mutually referential) internal complexity of these two disciplines (architecture and set design) is crumbling in the face of powerful and aggressive pressures from other aspects of today’s world. In their mutual exchanges, set design and architecture can nowadays be seen to be following a common trajectory. A sort of polyglot multivalency is to be found in the areas occupied by each, which is clearly an effect of modernity: living space is becoming space for display or representation, and display space is turning into living space.

Notes

2. G. Debord, La Società Dello Spettacolo (Baldini & Castoldi, 2001 [1967]).
4. On the subject of itinerant living as an art form and as a primary terrain-transforming act see F. Carelli, Walkscapes, Camminare come Pratica Estetica (Giulio Einaudi, 2006).
9. Cisco, founded in San Jose (California) in 1984, is one of the leading manufacturers of networking devices.
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