

Astrit Salihu

University of Prishtina, Faculty of Philosophy, Rr. NënaTerezë, p.n., XK-10000 Prishtina
astrit.salihu@uni-pr.edu

Thinking Being Through Architecture

Peter Sloterdijk in Dialogue with the Architecture

Abstract

We find in Peter Sloterdijk's approach a unique interpretation of architecture, which constructs a fresh perspective in the current architectural discourse, in that Sloterdijk returns to architecture's importance by placing it in the broader contexts of how we shape our lives through viewing it as "spatial effect" and spatial production. Outside the approaches of current architectural discourse (which, after rethinking architecture's role and function in the wake of criticism against modernity, has resigned to increasingly express the softened tonalities of finding contingent or idiosyncratic aesthetic expressions), Sloterdijk captures the moments of architecture's practical implementation as intimately involved in creating and shaping the dynamic and mobile spaces in which they accommodate our existence. Being outside of the ideologizing schemes of a missionizing architecture, Sloterdijk gives back architecture its role by exactly seeing it through its essential prism, not only in the effects of spatial production but also the processual explication of dwelling by technological means. Here, we see how architecture intertwines with the ontological axis and how the human essence is bound inseparably with architecture.

Keywords

Being-in-the-world, spatialisation of existence, architecture, insulation, dwelling, Peter Sloterdijk, Martin Heidegger

1. Introduction

This paper intercepts Peter Sloterdijk's thinking about the problem of architecture and how his project of spheres signifies what he called a "Spatialisation of Existence". Sloterdijk is well aware of the new contexts created in architecture and through his project on spheres, these new developments can be broken down into certain architectonic¹ reconfigurations. The most notable contributions of Sloterdijk's thinking can be found, perhaps more than anywhere else, in his treatment of architecture. His spherology as expressed metaphorically through bubbles, globes, foams, and what he calls "mental images" or "mental figures", are nowhere as meaningfully expressed as in architecture. It is no coincidence, therefore, that the adequate expression of his views on modernity and its trends is best encapsulated through the architectonic structure or building, such as Joseph Paxton's *The Crystal Palace*. Similar to Foucault, who, in a pure geometric and architectural structure – such as Jeremy Bentham's *Panopticon* – saw the "diagram" and the model

1

The term *architectonic* is also used in theoretical philosophy, for example by Immanuel Kant, who speaks of "architectonics of pure reason". *Architectonic* in this paper is neither used within the registers of Kant's critical

philosophy nor in the dictum of "transcendental philosophy". The use of the term within this paper has the vernacular character found in the discourse of architecture.

which in a compact form encapsulated the trends of modernity to “the production of homogeneous effects of power”,² Sloterdijk also unravels important contemporary aspects through models and architectonic structures, mainly via the production of spaces not reduced to producing homogenous effects of power, but in producing a kind of greenhouse effect with the necessary layers of existence as well as other heterogeneous and heterarchical effects of life through the transcriptions of multiple architectural spaces as projected in modernity. Whereas for Foucault the *Panopticon* is a technology of power, for Sloterdijk *The Crystal Palace* is a

“... cultural technology, or more still—a principle of spatial formation and spatial atmosphere control whose development ran through the entire twentieth century and became a global question of life forms at the dawn of the twenty-first.”³

We find in Sloterdijk’s approach a unique interpretation of architecture, which constructs a fresh perspective in the current architectural discourse, in that he brings to architecture its importance by placing it in the broader contexts of how we shape our lives through viewing it as “spatial effect” and spatial production. No matter how onerous his thoughts on architecture are, they nevertheless offer us a clearer and more in-depth assessment of the role of architecture. Outside the approaches of current architectural discourse which, after rethinking its role and function in the wake of criticism against modernity, which has resigned to increasingly express the softened tonalities of finding contingent or idiosyncratic aesthetic expressions, Sloterdijk captures the moments of architecture’s practical implementation, which is further involved in creating and shaping the dynamic and mobile spaces in which they accommodate our existence. The dimensionalisation of architecture as a response to modernity’s orthodox onslaught, within the discourse of architecture, has almost completely overshadowed the relevant aspects of architecture as the necessary mediation in shaping ourselves through the creation of spaces, as well as the processual explication of dwelling within the design of a diversified spatial order.

One of the initiatives that have influenced architectonic discourse the most is phenomenology, which insists on returning the lost impulses of an existential aspect. According to phenomenologists,⁴ the current forms of dwelling, which resemble assembled and cellular vessels, as practical and immunising housing constructions, do not correspond with the original needs of the human being and with what they referred to as authentic housing. However, viewing the context of technological advancement through the post-phenomenological approach, architecture becomes a highly important indicator in reformulating the classical ontological register. The production and formation of spaces that are everywhere supported by technological means, is not seen as a practice with side effects. The production of spaces is not a secondary phenomenon that can eventually come to be viewed through the prism of arbitrary definitions for certain spaces. To Sloterdijk this approach is complemented by onto-anthropological aspects that see the human being inseparable from space, but also as a “spatial effect”. Spatial production, therefore, is essentially “spatial construction for anthropogenesis”.⁵ The creating of the human being is inseparably bound with the creation of spaces and it is only via the spatialisation of existence that we may reach a proper understanding of human creation. Sloterdijk and his thinking bring forth new impulses when imagining architecture, by which architecture becomes now placed in a context of a mediator beyond the possibility of being human. Being outside of the ideologising

schemes of missionising architecture,⁶ Sloterdijk returns architecture's role by exactly seeing it through its essential prism, in the effect of spatial production, but also the processual explication of dwelling by technological means. We see here how architecture intertwines with the ontological axis and how the human essence is bound inseparably with architecture. Therefore, when Bruno Latour assesses that "Sloterdijk is a thinker of architecture",⁷ it has nothing to do with any reduction of his philosophical thinking but rather he summarises Sloterdijk's spherological conception, where architecture mediates and practices its production and shaping the *in* of being-in-the-world. According to Sloterdijk, this is so because architects

"... have a special attitude to interpret the being-in-the-world. For them, being-in-the-world means being in the building. [...] Architects interpret this proposition as the most mysterious – *in* – in its own way."⁸

The mysterious halo that surrounds the *in*-proposition in phenomenological discourse, translates also into architecture as the architectonic gesture that produces and makes possible the *in* of being-in-the-world. Sloterdijk comes to this view through Paul Valéry, who captures the moment of immersion through his architectonic work *Eupalinos oul'architecte*. Although being aware of the totalitarian connotations of his viewpoint, Sloterdijk nevertheless adopts them by viewing the relevant aspects of being-in-the-world

2
Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan, Pantheon Books, New York 1977, p. 202.

3
Peter Sloterdijk, *Foams. Spheres Volume III. Plural Spherology*, trans. Wieland Hoban, Semiotext(e), New York 2016, p. 323.

4
The phenomenological turn views the understanding of space within the premises of beingness. This poetic interpretation of dwelling envisions the design of houses in a dreamlike geometry. The architect is cast aside and his self-concept as masters of space is shaken. This interpretation is closely related to names such as Martin Heidegger, Gaston Bachelard, and Christian Norberg-Schulz. I have presented a more detailed study of this turn in the philosophy of architecture in my book. See: Astrit Salihu, *Lexim Filozofik i Arkitekturës, Shoqata e Filozofëve të Kosovës, Prishtinë 2018* [Eng.: Astrit Salihu, *Philosophical Reading of Architecture*], especially in the following chapters: "Bachelard dhe Eksplorimi Poetiki Hapësirës" [Eng.: "Bachelard and Poetical Exploration of Space"], and "Norberg-Schulz dhe Rrënja Ekzistenciale në Arkitekturë" [Eng.: "Norberg-Schulz and the Existential Root of Architecture"].

5
Peter Sloterdijk, *The Aesthetic Imperative. Writings on Art*, trans. Karen Margolis, Polity Press, Cambridge 2017, p. 141.

6
The concept of "missionizing of architecture" is related to modern architectural practices and discourses to give architecture a task. This task in modernity was the role that architectural effects have in the construction of society, for the first time architecture would think society. This is also the reason that the various currents of modern architecture have inscribed a kind of missionary impulse in relation to social and cultural changes. Regardless of the stylistic changes in modernist architecture, we find a common root such as: utopian content, revolutionary impulses and missionary intonation. This intonation can best be found in Le Corbusier, whose program offered us the alternative between architecture and revolution. This "missionising" intonation in the modernist architectural discourse is related to the Enlightenment program with the idea of progress and emancipation. For more see: Le Corbusier, *Towards an Architecture*, trans. John Goodman, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles 2007.

7
Bruno Latour, "Spaces of Controversies. An Interview with Bruno Latour", led by Rania Ghosn – El Hadi Jazairy, Stephen Ramos, *New Geographies* (2008), pp. 123–135, here p. 124.

8
Peter Sloterdijk, *The Aesthetic Imperative. Writing on Art*, trans. Karen Margolis, Polity Press, Cambridge 2017, p. 159.

through architectonic paradigms.⁹ The maximalist presupposition of Hans Hollein in 1968 that “Alles ist Architektur” (“Everything is architecture”) is almost brought to life, except that now a generally spherological conceptual examination of the creation of spaces in which we are included and find ourselves is inevitably mediated by architecture.

2. Architecture as Ecstasy Compensation

It is worth noting that Sloterdijk’s thinking about architecture and dwelling is not a coincidence, for it is only through them that we reach a more in-depth understanding of reality, where the human being is shown historically in line with spatial formations and the spaces in which he dwells, as well as the complex reality in which he is. Without looking to the issue of the historical aspect of how human being shapes their reality, we will focus here mainly on Sloterdijk within the context of modernity, in which he views architecture and dwelling as parts of a necessary protective undertaking of human beings, as a crucial evolution of the organisation of life which conforms with the developments in modernity as the utmost achievements of a process of shaping the morphological formations in the production of spaces. In the current context, within the multitude of synchronic spaces where the human being is accommodated, we find the tendency to shelter within necessary compensating spaces after the loss of the traditional theological and cosmological cover – by substituting “*symbolic immune systems*” with “*technical immune systems*”,¹⁰ as direct architectonic effects. In the process of progressive cosmological decentralism of the Enlightenment, the human being was cast out to an immeasurable and non-human externality, where all the illusive covers of tranquillity and warmth of cosmic centrism have been dissolved. Sloterdijk assesses that:

“... to oppose the cosmic frost infiltrating the human sphere through the open windows of Enlightenment, modern humanity makes use of deliberate greenhouse effect: it attempts to balance out its shelllessness in space, following the shattering of the celestial domes, through an artificial civilizational world.”¹¹

Perhaps such a presupposition from Sloterdijk determines his understanding of the increasingly complex contemporary trends of constructing compensating and protective structures via transforming “psycho-cosmological restlessness into offensive constructivism”.¹² Finding themselves in the infinite openness of space, terrified of the immeasurability that loses all human parameters, the modern humans

“... protect themselves from the terror of the bottomless, of the infinitely expanded space, through the utopian yet pragmatic erection of a global greenhouse intended to offer modern living in the open.”¹³

Sloterdijk sees this also as global defrost politics, as a constituent part of thermopolitics. Finding himself in cold and infinite space, the human being is continuously searching for the warmth of inclusion as a protective structural compensation.

“Thus an inquiry into our location is more productive than ever, as it examines the place that humans create to have somewhere they can appear as those who they are. Here, following a venerable tradition, this place bears the name ‘spheres’.”¹⁴

The human being is always enclosed in protective spaces, from metaphorical edifices to those material ones, as protective technical structuring that supports his ecstatic Being. For this reason, Sloterdijk states that spheres

“... are immune-systemically effective space creations for ecstatic beings.”¹⁵

The human being is enveloped and placed in spheres which makes him be always in the

“... in an outside that carries inner worlds.”¹⁶

Given the spherological conception of Being, we realise that it is impossible to understand the shaping and the making of the human outside of the spheres in which they are contained. In his *Spheres* project, in all three volumes, Sloterdijk encapsulates all stages of human manifestation: from the microspherological plane of intimate spheres called *Bubbles* (in the intrauterine plane, then in the psychodynamic unphysical space of the relationship between mother and child), the macrospherological one called *Globes* (that expresses all the theocosmic substitutions that have given it its monospheric centering conception), and proceeding to plural spherology, *Foams* (where our lives are manifest as multi-local, multi-perspectivistic, and heterarchical). Sloterdijk’s undertaking is wholly determined by the traditional modes of conceiving the concept of being-in-the-world. This grand undertaking would constitute in the completion of thinking about Being, supplementing what Heidegger started in *Sein und Zeit* with a topological treatment that eventually could have been titled *Sein und Raum* (initially this was the suggested title of the work *Spheres*, but to escape the formulations based on old ontologies, Sloterdijk had decided on something “more contemporary”).¹⁷ Sloterdijk, with his trilogy, fully partakes in the now determined direction of our era as an “epoch of space”¹⁸ and focuses on its special creative and non-statical aspects. The context of Sloterdijk’s thought includes the view that being and space are seen as inseparable in their inseparableness. This includes the thoughts of Heidegger and Foucault, who focused on thinking about Being and Space. We can understand the distinction of Sloterdijk’s thinking from that of Heidegger’s by appropriating Foucault’s approach, who always remarks that he is “obsessed”

9
“We are, we move, we live inside the work of man! We are caught and mastered within the proportions he has chosen. We cannot escape him.” – In this thought which captures our immersion is directly expressed the effect of inclusion in the produced and productive space of man. From this Valéry’s quote Sloterdijk derives his title in the chapter on architecture, *Indoors*, on *Spheres III*: “Where We Live, Move and Have Our Being”.

10
P. Sloterdijk, *The Aesthetic Imperative*, p. 148.

11
Peter Sloterdijk, *Bubbles. Spheres Volume I. Microspherology*, trans. Wieland Hoban, Semiotext(e), New York 2011, p. 24.

12
Ibid.

13
Ibid., p. 24–25.

14
Ibid., p. 28.

15
Ibid.

16
Ibid., p. 27.

17
P. Sloterdijk, *The Aesthetic Imperative*, p. 141.

18
Michel Foucault, “Of Other Spaces”, trans. Jay Miskowiec, *Diacritics* 16 (1986) 1, pp. 22–27, here p. 22, doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/464648>.

with space. In one particular thought of Foucault, we can find the path of Sloterdijk's thinking about space, which he pushes forward in affirming this Spatial Turn. Foucault wrote that a long time ago:

"... space was treated as the dead, the fixed, the undialectical, the immobile. Time, on the contrary, was richness, fecundity, life, dialectic."¹⁹

Sloterdijk appropriates Foucault's standpoint word by word when he expresses his orientation and determination of the spatial character of Being. His conception of Being is interrelated with the topological characteristic of producing and shaping spaces, i.e., with the "in" in its being-in-the-world. "The spatialization of existence"²⁰ lastly shows itself as a possibility of a new conception of Being. For this reason, he states:

"Until recently, there was a voluntary well to the vocabulary of theory in the late spatial blindness [...] that temporal problems were seen as progressive and cool, the questions of space were thought to be old-fashioned and conservative, a matter for old men and shabby imperialists."²¹

Sloterdijk openly expresses his opposition towards Heidegger's approach to time and orients his thinking towards spatial approaches as determining the understanding of the human being within the generative flow of dynamic spaces. The Spatial Turn as such creates different contexts for formulating questions, which in the case of the concept of being-in-the-world, unavoidably touches its axis in the "in" and "world" — where this latter one dissolves fully in the monospheric conception of traditional metaphysics to move forward to the spherical plurality as an "agglomerations of bubbles"²² from which the foams are comprised as mental pictures or figures of actuality. Through this displacement towards spatial thinking, the question raised towards the conception of Being-in-the-World, would be:

"Where are we when we are in the world?"²³

Such a question compels us to rethink being-in-the-world, but at the same time also calls for answers that must fill the void of the openness in which we are thrown.²⁴ Therefore, in raising this question, we necessarily confront Heidegger's approach and thinking of Being-in-the-World and *Dasein*. In the concept of *Dasein*, we must especially consider the topological aspect of "Da". That "Da" of *Dasein* is not sufficient for understanding the human being as being here-and-there. No matter how relevant or determinant of human being the topological understanding of *Dasein* is, it remains insufficient for exhausting the supporting structural aspects that make Being possible. This "Da" of *Dasein*, according to Sloterdijk, is inadequately a support of anthropogenesis to make it possible for the human being to be a human being. Leaning only in the void's openness, we cannot reach a deeper understanding of human reality, the reality in which the human being dwells, through which he is and can be. Sloterdijk, therefore, states that:

"The construction of casings for life generates a series of uterus repetitions in outside environments."²⁵

In no way should the human being, the possibility of their manifestation, their Being, be dependent on their Being-in-the-World; because Sloterdijk links Being-in-the-World with the openness, which he views as "pure terror of being held out into the indeterminate". We could find such bold statements only in Sloterdijk's onto-anthropological readings of Heidegger's perspective. For this reason, Sloterdijk sees Being-in-the-World as Being-in-the-Sphere. The

spherological Being of the human being is simultaneously reflected in his general conception of architecture and dwelling as a spatial practice of compensating for the necessary accommodation of the human being. The reason for this is that Spheres are an “intermediate openness”²⁶ between complete environmental closure and the terrorizing openness of Being, or as Sloterdijk puts it:

“The spherical [...] it allows its inhabitants to be simultaneously localized in the dimension of nearness and in the monstrous immensity of world-openness and world-outwardness. It establishes the primordial spatial ‘structure’ of dwelling-relations.”²⁷

Human being and being human in the anthropological sense are inseparable. Therefore, Sloterdijk thinks that we must start from an onto-anthropological analysis of hominisation. This onto-anthropological description also includes the description of houses:

“Houses are isolated enclosures that provide their inhabitants with the advantage of securing themselves and reproducing in an internal space, by setting themselves off against a non-interior.”²⁸

This is the first step understanding the house in the broader sense of the term – as the house which has not yet shown itself in the “architectonic meaning”.²⁹ Furthermore, this only supports the importance of the concept of housing and also dwelling for the emergence of human, the anthropogenesis of human. Thus human can be described as an “*autogenic effect*” who, through the uninterrupted action of creating and producing spaces, produces themselves.

19

Michel Foucault, “Questions on Geography”, in: Michel Foucault, Colin Gordon (ed.), *Knowledge/Power. Selected Interviews & Other Writings 1972–1977*, trans. Colin Gordon et al., Pantheon Books, New York 1980, pp. 63–78, here p. 70.

20

Peter Sloterdijk, “Against Gravity: Bettina Funcke talks with Peter Sloterdijk”, *Book forum* (February/March 2005), pp. 27–29. Available at: <http://www.bettinafuncke.com/conversation/pdf/bookforum2.pdf> (accessed on 1 November 2022).

21

Ibid.

22

P. Sloterdijk, *Foams. Spheres Volume III. Plural Spherology*, p. 45, 52.

23

P. Sloterdijk, *The Aesthetic Imperative*, p. 27.

24

About Heidegger’s phenomenological approach towards dwelling and the consequences of his thought. You can find them in more depth elaborated in my paper on Heidegger, Being and Dwelling (Astrit Salihi, “Heidegger ili mišljenje arhitekture kroz bitak” [“Heidegger or Thinking Architecture

Through Being”], *Filozofska istraživanja* 38 (2018) 3, pp. 637–650, doi: <https://doi.org/10.21464/fi38313>).

25

P. Sloterdijk, *The Aesthetic Imperative*, p. 147.

26

Peter Sloterdijk, “The Domestication of Being: Clarification of Clearing”, in: Peter Sloterdijk, *Not Saved. Essays After Heidegger*, trans. Ian Alexander More – Christopher Turner, Polity Press, Cambridge 2017, pp. 89–148, here p. 110.

27

Ibid.

28

Ibid., p.110.

29

Peter Sloterdijk also writes that “dwelling is older than the house and that en-housing [Gehäuse] is older than the human being”. – P. Sloterdijk, “The Domestication of Being”, p. 110. It means that housing and dwelling are the source conditions of human existence and that only on this premise the way is opened for an essential mediation of architecture in the human being, because on this premise can be thought the real and concrete construction of houses in the architectural sense.

In his *Poetics of Space*, Gaston Bachelard reflects deeply about Being-in-the-World, starting from spaces that he calls “topophilic”, where he elucidates the intimacy of the human being in dwelling spaces, which also is very instructive in this case. No matter how much Sloterdijk thinks he has moved away from Bachelard’s views, his traces of influence are still visible. Regardless of how deeply Sloterdijk contemplated the intimate spheres (even down to the prenatal state in his gynecological sketches in which being in the Sphere is like being inside the placenta), it needs pointing out that the need for understanding the intimate experiences which become apparent through the primary functions of dwelling are also found in Bachelard’s work *Poetics of Space*. The experience of being “cast into the world”³⁰ is a secondary experience for Bachelard, which comes only after experiences the intimate space or intimacy. Through thinking of the house (home) as “the human being’s first world”³¹ Bachelard thinks that Being-in-the-World or Being-cast-in-the-World is a “secondary metaphysics”³² According to Bachelard, the drama of Being-cast-in-the-World starts with being thrown out of the house, i.e., outside the intimate spaces of dwelling, where the human being is protected and saved from the threats of the outside world. Sloterdijk states the same when he writes that the

“... history of ‘the human being’ must be understood as the silent drama of its formations of space.”³³

Bachelard, in his topoanalysis, proceeds from that which he considers essential in understanding the human topos, i.e., the treatment of topophilic spaces, which are all interwoven with the integrating forces in identifying space with warmth. Bachelard thought that:

“Before he is ‘cast into the world’, as claimed by certain hasty metaphysics, man is laid in the cradle of the house [...]. Life begins well, it begins enclosed, protected, all warm in the bosom of the ‘house.’”³⁴

With the house as a primary dwelling, Bachelard offers a way of thinking about the essential experience that is related to the essential function of the dwelling. We see that all these phenomenological approaches, which start with Heidegger and are complemented by Bachelard, are presupposed in Sloterdijk’s thinking, which, through his spherological treatment of space, are substantially fulfilled with advanced elements from the contemporary context in which human beings are included in his dwelling. Such an autoreferential phenomenological approach of dwelling must exclude much that would allow for a deeper conceptualisation, both of dwellings and of architecture.

What are the contents that affirm a self-sufficient understanding of architecture and dwelling in Sloterdijk? What does architecture achieve, and how much can it support the complex tendencies of current societies? Or can these tendencies be seen outside of architectural transcriptions and without architectural support?

Simply asking these questions makes us think of Sloterdijk as quite pretentious if we juxtapose his viewpoints in current architectural debates, i.e., in current architectural discourse. The reason for that could be the present forms of developing a dwelling, which contemporary architecture affirms, which interplay not only with the practice of fulfilling the needs of shelters, what not only sets aside thinking about dwelling in a Heideggerian sense but also makes dwelling explicit, meaning that it develops by accommodating the needs of a modern individual in conformity with dynamic and expansive trends. Reality

is so complex a context that it is irreducible in concepts like the World or Being-in-the-world. The concept of the Being-in-the-world, stripped of the phenomenological reduction,³⁵ cannot be determined substantially and thus expresses nothing more than the event of finding – more threatening than affirming being human. According to Sloterdijk, something like this happens as a consequence of a Heideggerian understanding of the notion of existence which he views as *ecstatic*. Despite how much they intonate a grand reality, these concepts, in their mutual exchange, do not reveal anything more than only a claim to finding an authentic human reality. Moreover, in these concepts, we find only an abyss in which human beings get lost. Therefore, Sloterdijk states that:

“... existence for me doesn’t quite mean, as it does for Heidegger, that man is extended in the world. Heidegger of course translates the Latin verb *existere* by the Greek word *extasis* by association. And this *ecstatic* (standing-out) in Heidegger leads to the openness of the world, but also to the loneliness of the cosmic night in which man can lose him- or herself.”³⁶

Being ecstatic, being outside (cast out), in the external without any purpose, reveals more than a threatening drama of the unbearable and unconceivable Being-cast-in-the-world. For Sloterdijk, understanding Being-in-the-world as ecstatic means at the same time being held in the nothingness of the outside.

“From that moment on, the ‘inside’ does not have the sense of a container but of ecstasy instead. It follows that we no longer really know where we are when we are in-the-world.”³⁷

Being-in-the-world as being cast into an immeasurable openness is more of an abstract topological representation of being, which leaves the human being without the internal with which he is at all times in the external. The produced and shaped internal is that which gives architecture its significance, which lies in making it easy to bear the threatening openness. He states that:

“We must strongly emphasize this aspect today against the current romanticism of openness.”³⁸

30

Gaston Bachelard, *The Poetics of Space*, trans. Maria Jolas, Bacon Press, Boston 1994, p. 7.

31

Ibid.

32

Ibid.

33

P. Sloterdijk, “The Domestication of Being”, p. 99.

34

G. Bachelard, *The Poetics of Space*, p. 7.

35

Here the formulation “phenomenological reduction” describes the impossibility of phenomenological interpretation to cope with the newly created contexts in architecture. However, this does not aim to take away phenomenology’s achievements for making man’s dwelling from abstract and geometrically empty into a “poetical dwelling”. This poetical approach towards architecture is found in

the interpretations of Martin Heidegger, Gaston Bachelard, and Christian Norberg-Schulz. Peter Sloterdijk, on the contrary, through the spatialization of existence and his post-phenomenological perspective, sees man not as thrown into the indeterminacy of openness but into forms of dwellings such as apartments and so on.

36

Peter Sloterdijk, “The Space of Global Capitalism and its Imaginary Imperialism. An Interview with Peter Sloterdijk”, in: Willem Schinkel *et al.* (eds.), *In Medias Res. Peter Sloterdijk’s Spherological Poetics of Being*, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam 2011, pp. 185–194, here p. 185, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9789048514502-011>.

37

P. Sloterdijk, *The Aesthetic Imperative*, p. 160.

38

Ibid., p. 161–162.

Architecture is what constructs the spatial system and “resistance to unbearable ecstasy”.³⁹

3. The Effect of Insulation and the Cellular Dwelling

Resisting openness presupposes an insulation process, the process of creating inner spaces. Insulation is an inseparable process from the being’s being, which is at all times in search of compensating modes of the source of lost layers. Insulation may be said to express a necessary process of the source’s need for shelter, that it comes from it, or as Bachelard would have expressed it: “absoluteness of shelter”. Insulation is inseparable from the forming of internal spaces or, as Sloterdijk writes:

“The insulation effect is the formal premise of all creation of inner space.”⁴⁰

Through the process of insulation, we reveal our important aspect of dwelling in which we realize our closedness against the openness, of that which is open and threatening externally. The process of insulation, though it is primarily given with dwelling, we see it developed to its extremes, especially in modernity and in the current developments, which affirm the self-sufficient tendencies in being insular. In modernity, we see insulation manifested in constructive offensive modes that displace the human being on a lifeworld that stands outside of traditional phenomenological conceptions. Grounded in the affirmation of constructive and dynamic conceptions of space (in contrary to the classical monospheric metaphysics), dwelling is not only a here and there in “life-world”; it cannot be included within the concept of a universal home for the world and the universe. The consoling metaphysical premises of meaningfully unify beings no longer belong to settlements. Because dwelling and settlements acquire extreme constructive insular character, or as Sloterdijk writes:

“Even if we do not always project houses and apartments into the vacuum, they must henceforth be formulated as explicitly as if they were the closest relatives of the space capsule.”⁴¹

The explication of dwelling in modernity hereon reveals operational aspects of being insular. Sloterdijk achieves this aspect of treating dwelling through approaching aspects of insulation, starting from the creating of islands, coming from “register of the found to that of the made”, that Sloterdijk will call *nesopoietic* (*he nesos* in Greek: *island*).⁴² Therefore:

“Rather, worlds appear in the plural and have an insular structure. In some ways, islands are extracts from worlds that are inhabited and they can be used as world models.”⁴³

Understanding the insulation-creation of islands in Sloterdijk’s spherological context has considerable proportions within which can also be contextualised as “world models in the world”,⁴⁴ where the plurality of worlds compounds “archipelagos”.

Modernity, or its “synopsis”, is creation or island-making, which itself is a topological projection of being. In the insulation process, e.g., island formation, we have both an isolation process and one of network, which makes up the axis of actual dwelling and architectural conception of modernity. In the Californian architectonic formulation of Morphosis around the year 1970, according to Sloterdijk, the “*topological principle*” of the actual orientations was found: Connected Isolation. Modernity has penetrated deep in the axis of being-in-the-world and dwelling, in whose shaping and designing is

conducted the need to co-isolate the modern individual as a “*primary activity*”. For this reason, Sloterdijk writes that:

“The process of modernity directs its explicatory violence also at the basic condition of being-in-the-world, namely habitation, which must now be considered the originally isolating activity of humans [...]”⁷⁴⁵

This activity of isolating humans is crystallised in the formation or construction of islands, which Sloterdijk classifies as follows: absolute islands (“that have the character of boats, planes, and space stations”), then climate islands (“namely greenhouses, in which the exceptional atmotopic situation of the natural island is replaced by a technical imitation of the greenhouse effect”), and also anthropogenic islands (in which we have “dynamic self-insulation system” that has “incubator effect”).⁴⁶ This micronised classification offers us certain findings through which the present dwelling is formed and through which the existence of modern inhabitants is currently realised, which is the dynamic creation of insular spaces within which the personal life of modern human is spent. The dramatic strain that the isolated person on the island offers us, as exemplified through the character of Robinson Crusoe, now acquires unstrained character in the tendency to realise his dwelling in the insular form, which, as Sloterdijk also describes:

“Robinson’s involuntary landing on the empty isle had turned into a voluntary exile.”⁷⁴⁷

The flux of insular technical constructions, starting from cosmic capsules and astronomical projections as extensions of island shaping, technically shaped islands within which human existence is realised, are unavoidably penetrating within the being-in-the-world experience of modern human beings. Because from now our being-in-the-world is unfixated, mobile, and liberated from places. Moreover, the oppositeness of insular island-formation with traditional dwelling is revealed. This is so because, as Sloterdijk states:

“Building islands is the inversion of habitation: it is no longer a matter of erecting a building in an environment, but rather of installing an environment in the building. In the architecture inside the vacuum, the life-preserving is an integral implant in the life-negating.”⁷⁴⁸

The technical shaping of dwelling islands, the designing of spaces, climatization, tele-mobility, etc., make up a more flexible structure from the primary structure of the being-in-the-world. As an ontological consequence, they entirely undo our primordial experience of being-in-the-world as expressed by Heidegger. The astronautic model of building space stations of cosmic capsules with all the necessary aspects of developing life or the artificial creation

39
Ibid., p. 161.

40
P. Sloterdijk, “The Domestication of Being”,
p. 111.

41
P. Sloterdijk, *Foams*, p. 469.

42
Ibid., p. 258.

43
P. Sloterdijk, *Aesthetic Imperative*, pp.
149–150.

44
P. Sloterdijk, *Foams*, p. 289.

45
Ibid., p. 294.

46
Ibid.

47
Ibid., p. 297.

48
Ibid., p. 308.

of *lifeworld* now entirely dissolved the paradigms of our representations of being. Astronautics through their unstoppable discoveries confirms the possibility of another Being-in-the-World, that does not match that of the phenomenology. The description of the current context of opening up possibilities of dwelling, but also the growingly explicit realization, escape old ontological conceptions. The new experiences of dwelling cannot be described via the classical ontological registers.

“In this respect, space travel amounts to an ontological alphabetization: what follows from it is that the elements of being-in-the-world can, and must, be written. Being-in-the-world on board is reframed as a sojourn in a prosthetic lifeworld- which the prosthetic potential of the ‘lifeworld’ itself constituting the true adventure of space travel, or of station building.”⁴⁹

The adventure of customising the living world is simultaneously a new Odyssean adventure about a dwelling that is acquiring novel traits of construction outside traditional norms. This adventure shakes the foundation of the certainty about the connection of dwelling with the place. Despite Heidegger’s attempt to see being-in-the-world as dwelling in the inseparability of the place, the actual dwelling constructions of the production of living spaces only reinforce the argument for the loss of the place’s stability. Viewed from the architectural context, Heidegger’s spirit of place within phenomenological conceptions differs radically from Sloterdijk’s understanding of it. He asserts that:

“Under the relevant circumstances, a place is a quantum of built-around and conditioned air, a locale of handed-down and updated atmosphere, a node of harbored relationships, a crossing in a network of data flows, an address for entrepreneurial initiatives, a niche for self-relationships, a base camp for expeditions into the world of work and experiences, a location for business dealings, a regenerative zone, a guarantee of the subjective night. The further explication advances, the more the building of residences resembles the installation of space stations.”⁵⁰

Within this prosaic formulation of place, we already spot the meaning that it has. The human is more operationalized in the practical parameters that shape and design our daily lives. This cuts the cord between place and dwelling, which conversely, for phenomenology is self-evident. Based on these two exclusionary approaches, Sloterdijk also highlights the general orientation of the dwelling trends that are liberated from place. He sees the different and opposite orientations in the stateless hermeneutics of Martin Heidegger and Vilém Flusser in the understanding of stateless dwelling. He sees in Flusser the “demystification of the home as such”⁵¹ for the reason that it is “more still, for an aggressive concept of existence in the fathomless”.⁵² Flusser sees this relation as an interesting inversion, where the dwelling remains a permanent human need, regardless of where the dwelling is realised, in which the home loses the sacred aura of necessary belonging. In the construction of Flusser’s house in Robion in Provence, Sloterdijk sees the general reorientation of the sense of dwelling as opposed to Heidegger. Flusser’s settlement in the village of Robion is now becoming a new and different model of housing. Furthermore, he writes that:

“Flusser’s Provençal village Robion has a good chance of going down in the history of ideas as counterpoint to Todtnauberg because it won deserved honor as a model village for the explication of the sojourn through the new logic of domesticity.”⁵³

According to Sloterdijk, this has a great effect on the dwelling turn; that it is no longer in the “function of the home” and that the home is only a “side effect of dwelling”.⁵⁴ The Robion effect is among the most explicative effects

that we can find from the habitable world, which inevitable changes in astronautics, yet ripped even towards the mystifying axis of the connection of dwelling with place. Dwelling takes place on multilocal premises and in a semi-nomadic form, emancipated from the heaviness of the necessary gravity in home; new experiences in the hyper-technological context only reinforce this tendency. After all, in the current general mobility, the development of modern transport conditions, unstoppable traffic, by themselves appear as completely different architectural forms, these spatial organizations that are in accordance with current needs of inclusion in a more dynamic network. From Sloterdijk's point of view they are seen both as architectural and existential alternatives to "post-Neolithic habitus of dwelling"⁵⁵ or what he describes as:

"... alternatives that were finally able to illuminate the eternal half-darkness of sedentarism."⁵⁶

In the created post-sedentarism context, dwelling is an expression of the efforts to grasp these alternatives and to find new forms of completing existence in spaces filled with the means of supporting life. Thereby Sloterdijk assesses that:

"... analytical 'revolution' that constitutes the central nervous system of modernity also affected the architectural shells of the human sphere and, by establishing an alphabet of forms, created a new art of synthesis, a modern grammar of spatial production and an altered situation of existing in the artificial milieu."⁵⁷

In the current context of modernity, dwelling takes on complementary supporting forms based on which the individual satisfies his existential needs. The process of insulation in which we find the creation of islands, especially anthropogenic ones, which express a "self-insulating dynamic system"⁵⁸ that is both utero-mimetic or, in other words, similar to incubation systems and incubators, will necessarily determine the formation of our dwelling which is at the same time a formation of our Being. After all,

"Modern apartment culture can be derived from this general island theory because an apartment will only function if it is convincing as a minimal complete island for an individual."⁵⁹

Dwelling no longer expresses any universal principle of associating the world order with the way of life of modern humans.

"The media-supported house-dweller of modernity replaced the vague psychosemantic protection systems of religious metaphysics with their specialized, legally and climatically highly insulated dwelling-cells (and also with anonymous solidary systems)."⁶⁰

49
Ibid., pp. 309–310.

50
Ibid., p. 470.

51
Ibid., p. 484.

52
Ibid.

53
Ibid., p. 485.

54
Ibid.

55
Ibid., p. 472.

56
Ibid.

57
Ibid., p. 468.

58
P. Sloterdijk, *Aesthetic Imperative*, p. 150.

59
Ibid.

60
P. Sloterdijk, *Foams*, p. 504.

This is because a dwelling that is realised in apartments today constitutes of immunosystems and is a “immune-spatial self-extension of the human being”.⁶¹ In modern human dwelling, all topophilic projections already merge into “a theory of the sojourn in a eutonic space”.⁶² This is a benefit of differentiated dwelling, outside of any existential experience of space based on religious and metaphysical meanings. The modern apartment fulfils and accommodates the modern individuals growing needs of self-care and self-fulfilment;

“The dwelling of the modern person is the body extension that provides a specific representation of their habitualized self-concern and backgrounded defensiveness.”⁶³

It becomes a necessary cradle for the self-cultivation and self-sufficiency of the modern individual that does not coincide at all with the mythical referentiality of the consoling belonging to the warmth of the home. The central hyperbole of classical metaphysics, namely the assertion that the cosmos is a house, became obsolete with the transition to explicit dwelling. Therefore, even the most thorough explication of modernity leads to the cellular gain as a way of realising the dwelling of modern individuals. In explicating the constituent elements involved in the design of the modern dwelling, in apartments, we arrive at the point of the engineering model as the definition of the “dwelling machine”. The technical frigidity of such a definition of apartments by Le Corbusier, for Sloterdijk, comes as a result of the explication of the dwelling. This formulation summarises the way of dwelling in accordance with modern mobility requirements. Therefore, Sloterdijk claims that this formulation of the apartment as a dwelling machine

“... collects the technical models corresponding to the state of the art in the manners of being-with oneself, time administration, habitus development, climate design, immunization, ignorance management, self-completion and co-isolation.”⁶⁴

Such a degree of explication about dwelling, that of being-by-itself, involves the modern individual in advanced technologies of accommodation, besides not being able to compare with the traditional dwelling sentiments, they moreover express the tendency of individual self-fulfilment within the designed spaces of dwelling. Sloterdijk considers the apartment among the highest achievements of modernity. This is because the apartment is an “architectural and topological analogue of the individualism of modern society”.⁶⁵ The cult of the flexible individual of modernity creates a space of self-sufficient cultivation within the apartment, i.e., within an egosphere where he completes the need for self-fulfilment. These spaces integrate and impregnate efficient structured techniques in meeting the hedonistic demands of the modern individual. Those spaces that on the one hand implicate the modelling according to the ascetic life of medieval monks, on the other hand, explicate the hedonistic life of the modern individual. As Sloterdijk writes:

“Just as ascetic extra-worldly individualism materialized in the monks’ cells, contemporary apartment culture with all its egotechnical devices supports intramundane hedonistic individualism.”⁶⁶

The cult of the individual, from the view of medieval ascetic self-fulfilment, in the context of technological developments, is complemented by the content of hitherto unknown dimensions of hedonistic self-fulfilment. Therefore, the being-in-itself of the modern individual and the forms of the spaces of modern architectural complexes constitute an integral whole and cannot be seen outside their complementary effects. Perhaps they also constitute a kind of

complex foaming relief of the current architectural forms, as on the principle of cell co-isolation where we have spatial divisions with shared walls. Through the principle of co-isolation, individuals practice immunity in the egosphere of their apartments. Co-isolation does not respond to any solitary intonation, but rather with all technological and telecommunication supports is self-fulfilment within complete dwelling units. The apartment as a dwelling unit, even though

“It ensures that the cell, even though it reliably performs its defensive functions as an insulator, an immune system and a supplier of comfort and distance, still remains a space with world-content.”⁶⁷

4. Dwelling in the Republic of Space

In the present architectural and spatial reality, we find an equilibrium in the multiplicity of interacting spaces from those of incubation to those of collection (incubators as “individuated complex units” and collectors as “cooperative ensembles”⁶⁸ where the apartment and the stadium become the form in which architecture summarize our reality). According to Sloterdijk, these are modern identifying forms of spatial organization in which the human being is currently involved. He elaborates on human’s involvement in the production of space, as we already mentioned above, starting with Valéry and with the moment of immersion that we find in architecture. This is an all-encompassing totalitarian moment in which we are right now. However, even within these forms of involvement, Sloterdijk sees the equilibrium in the human needs to produce spaces of accommodation for special needs in the microspheres of its Being, which gives this totalitarian aspect amalgamous traits for the necessity to affirm individuality within their cellular dwelling. This essential need is best expressed in what we call interior architecture. Therefore, Sloterdijk writes that:

“How far the necessity of this activity has spread into general awareness is demonstrated by the vast literature about interior fittings that has by now reached even the bookshops in railway stations – the countless publications about living in style, about adaptive use of old buildings, about luxurious kitchens and decorative images, air-conditioning, lighting design, the design of holiday homes and furniture. Taken together, they reveal how widely the message of embedment in self-selected micro-milieus, as the therapeutic maxim of the second half of the twentieth century, has reached the public.”⁶⁹

The interior architecture manifests this necessary tendency for equilibrium. Sloterdijk sees architecture as including not only anthropological terms but also its political function. Architecture as the *art of immersion*, as Sloterdijk

61
Ibid., p. 503.

62
Ibid., p. 499.

63
Ibid., p. 504.

64
Ibid., p. 508.

65
Ibid., pp. 529–530.

66
Ibid., p. 548.

67
Ibid., p. 555.

68
Ibid., p. 567.

69
Peter Sloterdijk, “Architecture as an art of immersion (2006)”, *Interstices* 12 (2011), trans. Anna Christina Engels-Schwarzpaul, pp. 105–110, here p. 108, doi: <https://doi.org/10.24135/ijara.v0i0.417>.

describes it, with its totalitarian connotations of human inclusion, also enables escaping of the fusion of the individual into “false collectivist” totalities. The importance of dwelling in its current form should also be examined from the important aspect of the democratisation of being-by-itself into fulfilling isolation. The 21st-century individuals, in the practice of immunity isolation, as Sloterdijk puts it:

“... prefer to assemble those elements from home improvement centers which help them build immunity against totalitarian forms of immersion. To them, it seems immediately evident that they must weave the fabric for their happiness in smaller, more private dimensions. From this perspective, the building supply centers are the real surety of democracy. They house the popular support of everyday anti-totalitarianism.”⁷⁰

The endeavours to criticise the views of Sloterdijk on co-isolation as an exclusionary practice of the Other only stem from a superficial argument;⁷¹ because an extremely important aspect of the current beingness is formed by the inevitable principles of constructing the individuality of present societies. Architecture here only gains the importance of designing current reality. Sloterdijk’s conception of architecture and dwelling seems to advance the architectural discourse and leads to its extreme consequences, but, at the same time, offers us an understanding of what is happening in actuality, and what is expected to happen as a result of these formations and products of uninterrupted space designs that accommodate modern individuals.

Only on the basis of profound reformulations of Heidegger’s thoughts could such conceptions of architecture and dwelling be achieved. The reformulation of Heidegger’s approach to architecture, and more specifically to dwelling, should not be seen as minimising his initiative. Through that approach, we realised a crucial moment of our conception of Being, and for dwelling as such. Nevertheless, Sloterdijk, through his delineations and concretisations takes Heidegger’s thought to complex contexts in which our Being is involved. This crucial moment in Sloterdijk’s thought is best described by Bruno Latour, who claims that:

“Peter asks his master Heidegger the rather mischievous questions: ‘When you say Dasein is thrown into the world, where is it thrown? What’s the temperature there, the color of the walls, the material that has been chosen, the technology for disposing of refuse, the cost of the air-conditioning, and so on? [...] Suddenly we realize that it is the ‘profound question’ of Being that has been too superficially considered: Dasein has no clothes, no habitat, no biology, no hormones, no atmosphere around it, no medication, no viable transportation system even to reach his Hütte in the Black Forest. Dasein is thrown into the world but is so naked that it doesn’t stand much chance of survival’.”⁷²

The designing aspects of the human existence in dwelling containers completely reformulates the Heideggerian concept of dwelling, already radically changes its exclusively existential character to take it to a more operationalized form of encapsulation, incubation, and immunosphere, to a more self-selected micro milieu. After all, *Dasein* does not have an “autarkic” character but is rather a “spatial design”.⁷³ Therefore it is evident that Sloterdijk develops his view in the frame of “Heidegger against Heidegger”, or as Eduardo Mendieta claims, taking his view of technology towards a “hypertechnological age”. Sloterdijk seems to bring Heidegger’s opinion back to the current context when Mendieta claims that:

“If Gadamer urbanized Heidegger, Sloterdijk has modernized him.”⁷⁴

What Heidegger's modernisation means is perhaps best illustrated by Bruno Latour's treatment of the concept of design. There we will see what Heidegger's modernisation indicates (when it is contextualised in the actuality intertwined with the design of immunological spaces) the technologies for sustaining life and the artificial utensils of supporting human beings in their Being. Thrownness, as we pointed out earlier, is not to be thrown out into any openness in which we find ourselves alone and naked. Such an understanding of human's thrownness, as Latour argues, would be "like trying to kick a cosmonaut into outer space without a spacesuit",⁷⁵ because

"... we are enveloped, entangled, surrounded; we are never outside without having recreated another more artificial, more fragile, more engineered envelope."⁷⁶

Human being is permanently involved in something and they must always be in something. Sloterdijk calls these envelopes in which we are involved and surrounded by spheres. Being-in-the-sphere, therefore, constitutes an insightful reformulation of all of Heidegger's ontological concepts, and takes us into the completely real contexts of the technoscientific developments of the actuality in which we are involved. In this context, architecture and dwelling outside the narrow conceptions as construction practices, in the spherical plane attain the determining character for being-in-the-world as being-in-the-sphere, or herein as being-in-the-designed spaces. Modernism for Sloterdijk, as Bruno Latour claims,

"... is no longer a concept. It is a place, a design, a style."⁷⁷

Hence, we can also see how Heidegger's concept of *Dasein* already takes on completely different connotations that Henk Oosterling sums up in his

70
Ibid., p. 108.

71
The attempts to reduce the reading of Sloterdijk through the lens of exclusion or as the thinking that "provides the ontological support to the xenophobic critiques of immigration [...]", is derived from the context of his work Spheres. On the contrary, his spherology about being offers a suitable conceptual tool for understanding and explaining the tendency for migration, especially as exemplified through the idea of thermotopia which seems the most suitable terms for describing the Western thermopolitics, which, as a higher material achievement for living can be considered analogous to the greenhouses, incubators and spheres. For this criticism see: Thomas Sutherland, "Peter Sloterdijk and the 'Security Architecture of Existence': Immunity, Autochthony, and Ontological nativism", *Theory, Culture & Society* 36 (2019) 7–8, pp. 193–214, here p. 193, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276419839119>.

72
Bruno Latour, "Spheres and networks. Two ways to reinterpret globalization", *Harvard Design Magazine* 30 (2009) 1, pp. 138–144, here p. 140.

73
Willem Schinkel, Liesbeth Noordeggraaf-Eelens, "Peter Sloterdijk's Spherological Acrobatics: An Exercise in Introduction", in: W. Schinkel *et al.* (eds.), *In Medias Res*, pp. 7–28, here p. 12, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9789048514502-001>.

74
Eduardo Mendieta, "A Letter on Überhumanismus: Beyond Posthumanism and Transhumanism", in: Stuart Elden (ed.), *Sloterdijk Now*, Polity Press, Cambridge 2012, pp. 58–76, here p. 59.

75
Bruno Latour, "A Cautious Prometheus? A Few Steps Toward a Philosophy of Design (with Special Attention to Peter Sloterdijk)", in: W. Schinkel *et al.* (eds.), *Medias Res*, pp. 151–164, here p. 158, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9789048514502-009>.

76
Ibid.

77
Ibid., p. 159.

statement “Dasein is Design”. Peter Sloterdijk enables us to identify the general reorientations of all the conceptions of classical ontology. It is not a coincidence that Sloterdijk’s views have had numerous reactions from humanists and modernists precisely because of his clear findings regarding the concept of Being under technical prosthetics, which has inevitably formulated a new concept of architecture and dwelling. Supported by technological and telecommunication equipment the designed spaces of Being completely change the character of the dwelling. Only through the prism of modern humanistic thought can we see such a formulation of architecture and dwelling as a threat to the human being. Even in this attainment of dwelling, they see thrilling apocalyptic tonalities about what is happening to the human being, to Being, to dwelling. However, it is not without reason that Bruno Latour sees all the attacks and disagreements coming from Jürgen Habermas and his disciples as part of a “old modernist humanist” point of view. Regarding that, he asserts:

“For a good old modernist humanist, when someone begins to talk about life support, about the necessary conditions to ‘cultivate human beings’, about the air-conditioning to have them breathe safely, this is tantamount to a plea for an Orwellian world, for eugenism.”⁷⁸

In Sloterdijk’s claims we find none of these threats; in his claims, we have only the echo of an increasingly facilitating actuality for the human beings. Human life is developing in inclusive complexity and cannot be subjected to the unifying simplifications of classical metaphysics. Because, as Sloterdijk writes in the introduction to his work third volume of *Sphere, Foams*:

“Life articulates itself on nested simultaneous stages; it produces and devours itself in interconnected workshops. What is decisive here, however, is that it always produces the space in which it is and which is in it in the first place. Just as Bruno Latour has spoken of a ‘parliament of things’, I will make use of the foam metaphor to examine a republic of spaces.”⁷⁹

Dwelling as he describes it, is “where we are, move and have our being”, and it has nothing to do with the mystical identifying meanings of Being. It expresses a slightly interactive, co-isolating Being in the Republic of Space.

Astrit Salihu

Mišljenje bivstvovanja kroz arhitekturu

Peter Sloterdijk u dijalogu s arhitekturom

Sažetak

U pristupu Petera Sloterdijka nalazimo jedinstvenu interpretaciju arhitekture, koja konstruira svježju perspektivu u trenutnom diskursu arhitekture, tako što se Sloterdijk vraća važnosti arhitekture stavljajući je u širi kontekst načina na koji oblikujemo svoje živote promatrajući je kao »prostorni učinak« i prostornu proizvodnju. Izvan pristupa aktualnog arhitektonskog diskursa (koji je, nakon ponovnog promišljanja uloge i funkcije arhitekture u jeku kritike protiv modernosti, podlegao sve većem izražavanju omekšanih tonaliteta pronalaženja kontingentnih ili idiosinkratičnih estetskih izraza), Sloterdijk bilježi trenutke praktične primjene arhitekture kao intimno uključeni u stvaranje i oblikovanje dinamičkih i pokretnih prostora u kojima smještaju naše opstojanje. Nalazeći se izvan ideologizirajućih shema misionarske arhitekture, Sloterdijk arhitekturi vraća njezinu ulogu gledajući je upravo kroz njezinu bitnu prizmu, ne samo u učincima prostorne proizvodnje nego i procesualne eksplikacije stanovanja tehničkim sredstvima.

78

Ibid., p. 161.

79

P. Sloterdijk, *Foams. Spheres Volume III. Plural Spherology*, p. 23.

Vidimo kako se arhitektura isprepliće s ontološkom ošovinom i kako je ljudska bit neraskidivo vezana uz arhitekturu.

Ključne riječi

Biti-u-svijetu, oprostorenje opstojnosti, arhitektura, izolacija, obitavanje, Peter Sloterdijk, Martin Heidegger

Astrit Salihu

Das Sein durch die Architektur denken

Peter Sloterdijk im Dialog mit der Architektur

Zusammenfassung

Wir finden in Peter Sloterdijks Ansatz eine einzigartige Interpretation von Architektur; die eine frische Perspektive im aktuellen Architekturdiskurs eröffnet, in welchem Sloterdijk auf die Tragweite der Architektur zurückgreift, indem er sie in den breiteren Kontext unserer Lebensgestaltung stellt, während er sie zeitgleich als „räumliche Wirkung“ und Raumproduktion erachtet. Außerhalb der Ansätze des aktuellen architektonischen Diskurses, (der, nachdem er die Rolle und Funktion der Architektur im Gefolge der Kritik an der Moderne neu abgewogen hatte, einer zunehmenden Äußerung von aufgeweichten Tonalitäten des Findens kontingenter oder idiosynkratischer ästhetischer Ausdrucksformen unterlag), fängt Sloterdijk die Momente der praktischen Umsetzung der Architektur ein als eng beteiligt an der Schaffung und Gestaltung der dynamischen und mobilen Räume, in denen sie unser Dasein beherbergen. Dadurch, dass er jenseits der ideologisierenden Schemata einer missionierenden Architektur verbleibt, gibt Sloterdijk der Architektur ihre Rolle zurück, indem er sie durch ihr essenzielles Prisma präzise beobachtet, nicht nur in den Effekten der Raumproduktion, sondern auch der prozessualen Explikation des Wohnens mit technologischen Mitteln. Hier sehen wir, wie sich die Architektur mit der ontologischen Achse verwebt und wie das menschliche Wesen untrennbar mit der Architektur verzahnt ist.

Schlüsselwörter

In-der-Welt-sein, Verräumlichung des Daseins, Architektur, Isolation, Wohnen, Peter Sloterdijk, Martin Heidegger

Astrit Salihu

Penser l'être à travers l'architecture

Peter Sloterdijk en conversation avec l'architecture

Résumé

Nous découvrons dans l'approche de Peter Sloterdijk une interprétation unique de l'architecture qui amène une perspective nouvelle dans le discours actuel. En revenant sur l'importance de l'architecture et en la situant dans un contexte plus large qui prend en compte la manière dont nous façonnons notre vie, Sloterdijk la perçoit comme un « effet spatial » et une production spatiale. En marge du discours actuel sur l'architecture (qui, après avoir repensé le rôle et la fonction de l'architecture dans le sillage des critiques contre la modernité, s'est résigné à exprimer de plus en plus les tonalités adoucies de la découverte d'expressions contingentes ou idiosyncratiques et esthétiques), Sloterdijk rend compte des moments d'application pratique de l'architecture comme des moments intimement engagés dans la création et la formation d'espaces dynamiques et mobiles dans lesquels se situe notre existence. Étant en marge des schémas idéologisant de l'architecture missionnaire, Sloterdijk permet à l'architecture de reprendre son rôle en la percevant justement à travers son prisme essentiel, pas seulement dans les effets de production spatiale, mais également dans les explications processuelles d'habitation par des moyens techniques. Nous voyons ici comment l'architecture s'entremêle à l'axe ontologique et comment l'essence humaine est inséparablement liée à l'architecture.

Mots-clés

Être-au-monde, spatialisation de l'existence, architecture, isolation, habitation, Peter Sloterdijk, Martin Heidegger