

Posthuman domestic space as a becoming-machine in performance art

Asst. Prof. Mustafa Kemal Yurttaş^{1*} 

¹Haliç University, Faculty of
Architecture, Department of Interior
Architecture, İstanbul, Turkey.
mustafayurttas@halic.edu.tr

*Corresponding Author

Received: 16.09.2023
Accepted: 05.02.2024

Citation:
Yurttaş, M. K. (2024). Posthuman
domestic space as a becoming-machine
in performance art. *IDA: International
Design and Art Journal*, 6(1), 14-25.

Abstract

Domestic space can be considered a cross-disciplinary subject, not only of art and architecture but also of philosophy, sociology, geography, and anthropology, thanks to the multidirectional correlations. This paper examines domestic space as a cross-disciplinary subject, too, with a qualitative phenomenological research method because this research approaches space as the collection of experiences, like in phenomenology, concerning the perception and the body. Through an interdisciplinary literature review, the notions of domesticity and dwelling are investigated focusing on the notion of *experience*. Following these notions, the concepts of *becoming* and *machine* are explored by Deleuze and Guattari to reach the arguments on co-living that connect to critical posthuman thought. Braidotti's concept of *becoming-machine* is interpreted together with Haraway's and Grosz's contemporary arguments on becoming and co-living. In this scope, the research has reached the concepts on metastability and performativity in relation to posthuman experiences of co-living. These concepts are associated with the examples from the contemporary performance artworks. The performances of Schweder & Shelley, Gómez-Egaña and McRae are analyzed focusing on the experience that includes the posthuman possibilities for domesticity as a result of this research, aiming to rethink the relations between human and non-human in domestic space.

Keywords: Becoming-machine, Domestic space, Metastability, Posthuman, Performance

Extended Abstract

Introduction: As space is a phenomenon in relation to perception and experience, domestic space is a place for encounters and co-living of these experiences. In contemporary daily life, these experiences of co-living are not only for humans but also include non-humans. In critical posthuman thought, this mutual life of human and non-human is one of the crucial concepts as it proposes a post-dualistic understanding rather than Cartesian dualisms such as self/other, nature/culture, human/animal, and human/machine. Grounded on her notion of *cyborg* as the rejection of distinctions between organic and inorganic, Haraway (2016: 160) proposes "practices of making kin" from other species to reinvent the forms of co-living with her concept *becoming-with*. This post-dualistic understanding of living is rooted in the *becoming* notion of Deleuze and Guattari. In their philosophy, becoming is a concept about constant change, as opposed to being which is more related to stability and the machine is a description of life as a synthesis of machines, especially with the body and a metaphor different from mechanism. Posthuman theorist Braidotti (2013) develops their notions of becoming and machine by proposing a posthuman *becoming-machine*, as "a relationship to technology that is not based on functionalism". *Becoming-machine* expresses the relational powers of a posthuman subject that cannot grasp through the bonds with multiple others through technology. Braidotti mentions one of the main characteristics of becoming-machine as metastability, in relation to individuation. In this relation, metastability is an equilibrium in the direct connectivity of becoming revealing a flowing scale of variability and *becoming-machine* includes the mutual activities and interactions in-between the actors of this process, which leads to the concept of *performativity*. Although it is mostly associated with Butler's gender theory, Grosz also interpreted performativity through space in parallel to critical posthuman thought. For Grosz, performativity refers to interconnectivity and responsive multifaceted possibilities of action in-between. She proposes a space in-between for the posthuman performative possibilities of the domestic space which is more than the combination of humans, space, and technology.

Purpose and scope: The purpose of this study is to discuss the posthuman notion of becoming-machine through theoretical debates in relation to performance art. It is observed that domestic space is mostly studied in social sciences and architecture, and there are also researches in relation to posthuman subjects, which are usually in the scope of

technological advances. But there is a small number of studies on posthuman domestic space in the context of performance art. The scope of this study frames a critical perspective depending on the posthuman arguments of Haraway and Braidotti. It focuses on the notion of becoming-machine with the concepts of metastability and performativity. Through the interpretation of these concepts the selected performative artworks are analyzed for the posthuman possibilities of domestic space. Thus, with the results of these works, this study aims to present alternative perspectives and contribute to the literature on space discussions.

Method: This study employed a qualitative phenomenological research methodology to examine the notions of domesticity, spatiality, and performativity. As phenomenological research focuses on experience, these three notions also intersect with experience. This research is constructed on an interdisciplinary literature review and at first, domesticity is investigated in relation to the principal spatial theories of Heidegger, Bachelard, Schulz and Colomina on the concept of dwelling, to reach a more contemporary phenomenon of domestic space. Then, the experiential dimensions of domestic space are explored by the concept of co-living with *becoming* and *machine* notions of Deleuze and Guattari, and *becoming-machine* comes to the fore as an intersection of these notions within the posthuman studies of Haraway and Braidotti. In relation to these notions, the concepts of metastability and performativity are investigated by Simondon, Butler and Grosz, as the key concepts that are associated with all these debates for posthuman domestic space. As the results in the light of this interdisciplinary literature research, performance artworks by Schweder + Shelley, Gómez-Egaña and McRae are analyzed and discussed in the focus of *experience* for unveiling the posthuman possibilities of the domestic space in contemporary performance art.

Findings and conclusion: The discussion on domestic space is a matter of awareness on co-living what posthuman thinking also criticizes for rethinking our daily practices. The performative artworks examined in this research are examples of posthuman domestic experiences as they suggest alternatives for post-dualistic ways of co-living instead of living with Cartesian dualisms like human/machine and human/animal. These domestic spaces exceed the dualistic borders and come out with posthuman potentials. These performative experiences also discuss the possibilities of posthuman dwelling in the domestic space. In this context, the co-living inhabitants of domestic space interact for becoming-other as well as the space is becoming-machine. In Schweder + Shelley's installations; audience, artists, space are in a symbiotic performative co-living, independent of being furniture or machine. Similarly in Gómez-Egaña's installation, the performers and the construction create a mutual domesticity that can no longer be defined only as organic or mechanical. In McRae's works, there is a symbiosis of different scale in-between the bodies and products, as the bodies push their limits for an experience of non-human embracement. Additionally, the machine in these spaces is not just a passive tool as in anthropocentric spatiality because the machine and the organism perform together. Likewise, Schweder + Shelley's and McRae's machines are active participants in the space and break the divisions in-between the organic and the technological. Therefore, this is an attempt to destabilize the established relationships to unveil posthuman potentials of metastability and performativity. In conclusion, the domestic space as a becoming-machine in performance art is the space that emerges through the repetitive, fluid and live connections in-between the symbionts of the space, including the space itself.

Keywords: Becoming-machine, Domestic space, Metastability, Posthuman, Performance

INTRODUCTION

Space is a phenomenon whose boundaries are always open to discussion. The existence of space can change according to anyone who is an adult, child, or animal. Due to such perception of space, it can be dark, cold, uncanny and light, hot, safe at the same time. One may even claim that a space is non-existent because they do not see it. On the other hand, space exists as a volume that has precise dimensions and coordinates in Cartesian thought. This thought classifies such a versatility of perceptions as dualities, thus considering space to have non-relativistic properties. In phenomenology, space is formed by the experiences of different inhabitants; as Heidegger (1971: 141) argues, "do the houses in themselves hold any guarantee that dwelling occurs in them?". Similarly, Norberg-Schulz (1984: 7) writes that dwelling is "something more than having a roof over our head and a certain number of square meters". Dwelling is not only to identify a space for one's own but also to build up the process of being an individual within this domestic space. Because dwelling and domestic space become related to settlement, belonging and protection. On the other hand, domestic space has also been a scene of discrimination since ancient times. Depending on the social statuses in civilizations, domesticity was reshaped with space manifesting authority. Whether it is the palaces of a kingdom or a simple three-room home of a nuclear family, domesticity relates to power for most of the time; even call it a "battlefield" (Colomina, 2006: 296).

The domestic space is a place of encounters and it is a shared place of co-living, not always for a group of people. Humans usually share their homes with their animals for farming, and in urban life with their pets. As long as the human continues to live with other species, the notion of co-living transforms as a critical issue too. Because even now, these species are more than just organisms by including machines, robots and algorithms in the daily life of domestic space which blurs the established boundaries for humans and non-humans. Grounded on her notion of cyborg as the rejection of distinctions between organic and inorganic; Haraway (2016: 160) proposes “practices of making kin” from other species to reinvent the forms of co-living. For Haraway, these practices are about the will to connect people with species other than their own, such as animals, microbiomes, codes, machines, in the name of *becoming-with*. In critical posthuman thought, becoming is crucial as an alternative to dualistic understanding of anthropocentric ways of living. This posthuman criticism is rooted in the *becoming* philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari. For them, *becoming* is more than just a phase or process of reaching from one point to another. Becoming is a concept about constant change, as opposed to *being* which is more related to stability. Posthuman theorist Braidotti (2013) develops their notion of becoming by proposing a posthuman *becoming-machine*, leading to the performative and metastable possibilities of co-living.

Domesticity, Spatiality and The Domestic Space(s)

Domesticity is an interdisciplinary concept that transforms in relation to social changes. Before the Industrial Revolution, it was more related to the role of the woman in the house; as associated with interiors for daily routine of housekeeping and cooking while the man was associated with the outside for earning money. In time, it became a criticism of this relation, as “a whole set of ideas that developed in reaction to the division between work and home” (Heynen, 2005: 7). By the concept of *dwelling*, domesticity relates to spatiality as a phenomenon of domestic space. From this phenomenological perspective, spatiality is formed by the experiences of dwellers. In his text *Building, Dwelling, Thinking*, Heidegger (1971) argues that space is a phenomenon that continues, renews and is shaped by experience in the continuity of daily life, rather than a completed, finished product. For Norberg-Schulz (1984), dwelling is not just a domestic interior; it is a place to meet with others for a mutual life of common values. Bachelard (1994) also relates dwelling with the values as “a privileged entity... of the intimate values of inside space... to integrate all the special values in one fundamental value” and investigates the domestic space through phenomenology within the experiences of the body (Leach, 1997: 92). In the context of values, domestic space is also a subject of geography and anthropology. McDowell explores domesticity to understand common values in different geographies as “the meanings created by home are not permanent and may be rewritten over time” (Sarı, 2022: 21). Besides, in anthropology Douglas studied the symbolic layers of spaces in archeological sites: “Anthropological studies on symbolic interpretations of tribal spatial arrangements have become a source of inspiration for archaeologists, and so too have sociological studies of behavior in public and private space” (Cieraad, 2017: 48). More recently, domestic spaces are not seen as a threshold between public and private, as their boundaries become permeable. Colomina argues this permeability as an invasion from outside to the inside: “A refuge from the outside, from the city, from the public, now the public has invaded the interior; it is already inside... So the only form of defense is counterattack; the only form of domesticity is counter domesticity” (Colomina, 2007: 298).

As Colomina sees the domestic space as the arena of battle of the hierarchies, she also interprets this invasion using media technologies. For her, every space, regardless of interior or exterior, is invaded by cell-phones, e-mails, and screens, because of our dependence on communication technologies. With transforming habits, not only the close environment of the house like garden and street becomes domestic space, but also “the bedroom... into a new multimedia/office living room; the kitchen into an urban extension, because of home delivery services...; the living room in a space no longer uniquely defined, both public and privately; the bathroom... as a new extension of the office” (Enia & Martella, 2020). So, as Cieraad (2017: 50) noted “the plural of domestic spaces seems adequate than the singular” because borders of the domestic space are not strict as before and this flexibility requires an open-ended definition mentioning multiplicity of experiences instead of one true domestic space. Given the ongoing crises of the current world, domestic spaces are now “characterized by an increasing gap between... temporary dwellers, freelance workers, single parents

producing new forms of cohabiting, and... celebrated clichés of traditional family life” (Aureli & Tattara, 2015).

The Becomings of Co-living

As the places of different experiences, domestic spaces also seem like public spaces when these encounters operate as the intersections of distinct privacies. They are the spaces of co-living for parallel lines, transversal planes and tangential spheres in spinning temporalities, what Deleuze defines *becoming* as “orientations, entries and exits” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2007: 16). For Deleuze (1990: 3), becoming is a concept that destroys “common sense as the assignation of fixed identities” and the binary relationship between the self and the other by passing through the two, and does not establish integrity. Becoming is a nomadic state of being together, unlike progress or transformation. Due to being a space of actions, this space of becoming and being together operates as a “perspective simultaneously vibrates with that of others” (Dewsbury & Thrift, 2005: 105). Lorraine explores this space of becoming in the story of the whale Moby Dick and the captain Ahab: “In his becoming-other, he becomes many selves all of whom are connected only by the continuity of a line of becoming. His perceptions, affective responses and actions are no longer consolidated in terms of a self that remains the same over time with a specific location in a totalised space” (Lorraine, 2005: 169).

As Deleuzian becoming is more than a relation between two entities, it is a flow of direct connections in-between two or more singularities which constantly transform into merging multiplicities. Like in their wasp-orchid figuration, it is not an evolution because “if evolution includes any veritable becomings, it is in the domain of symbiosis that bring into play beings of totally different scales and kingdoms, with no but from which no wasp-orchid can ever descend” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987: 238). Therefore, becoming operates independently of binaries such as self/other, human/animal; and even if the previously defined other is an animal, human, refugee or machine, becoming-other is the deconstruction of the notion of *other*.

In the means of being together and co-living, becoming emerges as a domain of symbiosis in posthuman studies too. This proposal of leaving dualisms for co-living develops in the posthuman notions of Haraway and Braidotti. Haraway suggests *becoming-with* as a posthuman concept of co-living for a symbiotic life. In *A Cyborg Manifesto*, Haraway (1991) suggests breaking the boundaries between the organic and inorganic for a post-gender revolution and manifests a world where everyone is a cyborg. This call for a new world is an alternative practice of living to the established patriarchy. It is also about building new sets of social values for a life more symbiotic, not colonialistic. In her more recent book *Staying with the Trouble*, Haraway (2016: 60) notes that symbiosis is “the heterogeneous webbed patterns and processes of situated and dynamic dilemmas and advantages for the symbionts”. She suggests the term *symbiont* for the agents of this practice and draws attention to making new kins as an alternative to the continuous reproduction of organisms. For her, new kins should belong to a different species, race, or geography as opposed to pedigree. Because of the earth under an ecological crisis, humans need to stop positioning themselves as the center of the world for urgent solutions.

Braidotti improves Deleuze and Guattari’s *becoming* in order to develop a posthuman discourse on co-living, too. Braidotti suggests three types of becoming as *becoming-earth*, *becoming-animal* and *becoming-machine*. In Deleuze and Guattari, *becoming-animal* is related to molar and molecular separation like their other concepts: “Becoming-animal is not colonizing an animal with human perceptions of its nature, but finding an escape route from the human. You do not become a barking molar dog, but by barking, if it is done with enough feeling, with enough necessity and composition, you emit a molecular dog” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987: 275). Braidotti (2013: 67) reinterprets this notion for a trans-species solidarity “on the basis of our being environmentally based, that is to say embodied, embedded in symbiosis with other species”. For Deleuze and Guattari, *Becoming-machine* is related to their emphasis on machine and production with *desiring machines*, *abstract machines*, *war machines* which are not opposites of organisms and are different from mechanisms because “a mechanism is a closed machine with a specific function. A machine, however, is nothing more than its connections” (Colebrook, 2002: 56). For them, machine is not a metaphor and describes life as a synthesis of machines, especially with the body:

Everywhere it is machines—real ones, not figurative ones: machines driving other machines, machines being driven by other machines... An organ-machine is plugged into an energy-source-machine... The breast is a

machine that produces milk... the mouth... an eating-machine, an anal machine, a talking-machine, or a breathing machine. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983: 8)

Braidotti (2013: 66) develops their *becoming-machine* as removing “the division between humans and technological circuits, introducing bio-technologically mediated relations as foundational for the constitution of the subject”. Braidotti’s *becoming-machine* relates to becoming-with the technologically bio-mediated other, “meaning a playful and pleasure-prone relationship to technology that is not based on functionalism” (Braidotti, 2013: 91). The posthuman in the process of becoming-machine is a force that displaces the lines of distinction between structural differences and ontological categories such as organic and inorganic, born and manufactured, flesh and metal, electronic circuits and organic nervous systems. The process of becoming-machine expresses the relational powers of a posthuman subject that cannot be grasped by dualisms and has a privileged bond with multiple others through technology. Therefore, posthuman becoming-machine is a criticism of dualisms starting from human/machine for a post-dualistic understanding of co-living.

Metastability and Performativity for the Space In-Between

Braidotti evaluates posthuman *becoming-machine* as post-dualistic mutual connections of machines and organisms by utilizing the concept of *metastability* as a core element for their *becoming* in relation to individuation: “They entertain their own forms of alterity not only towards humans, but also among themselves, and aim to create metastability, which is the precondition of individuation” (Braidotti, 2013: 94).

For her, individuation is crucial because of its direct relation to the notion of individuality. In this relation, metastability is an equilibrium in the direct connectivity of becoming revealing a flowing scale of variability from very near unstable to very near stable. It does not have to operate as a static balance to save a position equal to its individuals or agents. Simondon discusses the connection of becoming and metastability in terms of individuality, too: “Becoming happens in phases, and that the individual has only a relative existence as an expression of one of these phases, presupposes the existence of a pre-individual state” (Hoel, 2018: 259). For Simondon, the process of individuality is never completed to be a one for it is just a phase in the continuing rebirth of being. Furthermore, this ongoing set of states is full of potential “because they belong to heterogeneous dimensions of being” and thus “the individuation is a process that sustains potentials by making them compatible” (Hoel, 2018: 260). Thus, Simondon’s thoughts on metastability draw attention to the importance of process or action by focusing on the phases of individuation, which is more productive, rather than the individual itself.

The emphasis on the potential in Simondon’s theory, letting the actions be mutually produced, leads to another notion: *performativity*. Performativity is mainly considered in relation to performance and a prominent issue in critical posthuman studies. Even by its prior relation to space, performance is full of potentials as mentioned above as well. In her book *Performance*, Diana Taylor (2016: 3-7) examines performance in terms of performance art and highlights its dimensions coming from being a live action art. Besides theoretical descriptions of performance, it is valuable to include the definitions by the performers:

Carmelita Tropicana: “Performance is art that is fluid, messy, a hybrid, an art that liberates the performer and spectator.”

Guillermo Gómez-Peña: “For me performance art is a conceptual ‘territory’ with fluctuating weather and borders... open to nomads, migrants, hybrids, and outcasts.”

Elin Diamond: “a living practice in the moment of its activation. In this sense, performance can be understood as process—as enactment, exertion, intervention, and expenditure.” (Taylor, 2016: 3-7)

These definitions not only highlight the importance of lived spatiality in performance with the selected words such as territory, borders, intervention, outcasts; but also reveal the performativity in the frame of metastable becoming by mentioning the fluid, hybrid, migrant, process.

Although Austin (1962) is the first to use the term “performative” to describe a sentence that is an action at the same time, the concept of performativity is mostly renowned for gender studies of Butler. For Butler (1993: 12), performativity cannot be excluded from a process that includes regular and limited repetition of norms, and this repetition cannot be realized by the subject: “Performativity is thus not a singular act, for it is always a reiteration of a norm or set of norms, and to the extent that it acquires an act-like status in the present, it

conceals or dissimulates the conventions of which it is a repetition". This repeatability indicates that performance is not a singular action but a continuous ritual with certain boundaries. For Butler, becoming performative of gender is not like dressing to be put on or off at will.

Elizabeth Grosz is another theorist exploring the space of becoming within the notions of performativity, metastability and individuation. Grosz emphasizes the process of metastable individuation as well, instead of an identity or substance which is in the central position of the domestic space in other spatial theories. She argues that individual identity can be transductive and self-exceeding with the potential of breaking its central ties. In addition, not only does she propose a space of becoming, she asks for a possibility of this new space: "What does it mean to reflect upon "a position, a relation, a place related to other places but with no place of its own: The position of the in-between?" The in-between is a strange space, not unlike the choric space that Plato" (Grosz, 2001: 90).

Similar to Taylor's definitions of performativity, Grosz questions space within performance. Mentioning the position and the relation in her comprehension of this space refers to the interconnectivity and responsive multifaceted possibilities of action in-between. Moreover, Grosz imagines this space in-between by means of *becoming-other* independent of Cartesian dualism of self/other, that belongs to no one, but to everyone at the same time. Therefore, this sense of becoming-other operates in direct relation to the becoming-machine notion of Braidotti as it carries the posthuman performative possibilities of the domestic space which is more than the combination of human, house and technology.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative phenomenological research method on the notions of domesticity, spatiality and performativity. As the focus in phenomenological research is *experience*, these three notions intersect with experience too, "in which the researcher describes the lived experiences of individuals about a phenomenon" (Creswell, 2013: 50). By choosing phenomenology as a method, the experiential dimension of the domestic space as a phenomenon is examined because phenomenology allows examining subjective experiences in depth. French phenomenologist Merleau-Ponty (2012) does not see domestic space as an abstract, empty space that is only lived in; according to him, it is a place where people live together, change, where emotions are reflected, but also change, a place where mutual interaction occurs. With an interdisciplinary literature review, domesticity is first investigated in relation to the principal spatial theories of Heidegger, Bachelard, Schulz and Colomina on the concept of dwelling, to reach a more contemporary phenomenon of domestic space. Then, the experiential dimensions of domestic space are explored as a matter of co-living through the becoming philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari among their emphasis on machine and *becoming-machine* comes to the fore as an intersection within the posthuman studies of Haraway and Braidotti. At the intersection of these notions, the concepts of metastability and performativity are investigated by Simondon, Butler and Grosz, as the key concepts that associate all these debates for posthuman domestic space. As the results in the light of this interdisciplinary literature research, performance artworks by Schweder + Shelley, Gómez-Egaña and McRae are analyzed and discussed in the focus of *experience* for unveiling the posthuman possibilities of the domestic space in contemporary performance art.

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

Posthuman Performative Possibilities of the Domestic Space

"Stability" and "ReActor" by Schweder + Shelley

Schweder + Shelley is an artist duo founded by Alex Schweder and Ward Shelley. They have performed in five installations which they define as *performance architecture* since 2007. Their installations are the life size structures for experiential co-living during their long durational performances. The equilibrium in-between them and the space is the main motive reiterated in these works.

Stability, exhibited in 2009, is their first installation which is a static wooden box truss suspended from the ceiling with the chains. The box is a living space with a kitchen and bathroom at the center. During the performance, each artist mostly spends their time at one end of the space. However, when they attempt to leave their location, the box starts to become unstable: “their moves, no matter how minor, created instability, with the structure tilting like a balance beam” (Kline: 2017: 7). Thus, they have to move together in synchrony if any of them needs eating or going to the toilet. If they do not act this way, the installation leans up to an angle of almost 15 degrees. Their other work, *In Orbit*, again functions like *Stability*, but it is not a box this time, it is a life size scaled wheel-like structure with furniture installed where one artist lives in the circle and the other one on the outer line of the circle. But *unlike* *Stability*’s little tilt angle, any minor movement in this circle leads to a major balance shift.



Figure 1. Schweder + Shelley, *ReActor*, 2018

The duo’s latest performative installation is entitled *ReActor* that resembles *Stability* with its prismatic form and concept of equilibrium, but this time this prismatic space is a house rotation 360 degrees on a single column at the center. The installation is a large glass and steel structure with the dimension appx. 13.5x2.5x3 m and 4.5 m of a concrete column. Similarly, the kitchen and bathroom are again at the center of the box and each artist spends their time on one side of the space. They have to move in collaboration at any time because what they perform is not an act of a script; they manifest a mutually dependent co-living. These performances are an alternative experience of stability both theoretically and practically. In relation to Haraway’s notion of *becoming-with*, the artists become more than two entities at the opposite corners for a symbiotic domestic experience. They become symbionts not only as two people, but also with the machine that they live in. So, this symbiosis is not an experience lacking stability, but a post-dualistic stability including organic and inorganic both visualizing a posthuman metastability of becoming-machine.

“Domain of Things” by Pedro Gómez-Egaña

Gómez-Egaña’s large-scale installation, *Domain of Things*, is a structure of steel construction with domestic furniture on top and performers underneath. In this installation, the artists positioned horizontally on the steel construction, move fragmented pieces of floor on top of the structure, with their hands and feet on the rails. As the floor moves, the furniture mounted on these floors, such as the sofa, the bed, and the bath tank, also move. In contrast to the speed and fluidity of well-running machines, these pieces move random and not so stable, giving the feeling of a fragile machine: “Like a machine, tacitly and slowly, these live performers set the construction into motion... Why did these people go underground? To seek shelter from the instability in the world above, or are they part of the very mechanism causing the instability?” (Gómez-Egaña, 2017).



Figure 2. Pedro Gómez-Egaña, *Domain of Things*, 2017

Similar to Schweder + Shelley 's dystopian inspiration, this work resembles people living underground due to disaster, war or freedom. For the artist, underground is a multifaceted concept open to both psychoanalytic and political readings in the context of the domination practices of governments, “where the upstairs has order and representational qualities, its *machinic* vision”; the work is a commentary on how people deal with the issues of technology in the domestic space. In this context, the artist discusses “technology as a force aiding the individualism of expression on the one hand, and as a medium manifesting a desire for connection on the other” (Larios, 2017: 207). Through a post-dualistic metastability; mechanism, performers, furniture and interior space become symbionts of a performative co-living as well. To continue this co-living experience, they have to be in a live negotiation to redefine this synchronicity independent of being only a furniture, a person or a mechanism. They create a mutual domesticity that can no longer be defined only as organic or inorganic. Because, as the construction gets into motion by the force of performers, the floor slides every time with a different combination of movements and their actions affect each other due to their random collectivity. So, this performance manifests a space of in-between like in Grosz’s questions above, a space of becoming-other of co-living as well as becoming-machine experience of domestic space.

“Compression Carpet” and “Heavy Duty Love” by Lucy McRae

Lucy McRae is an artist who refers to herself as a body architect, focusing on the performative speculations about the life of the present and the future. In her works, machines are integrated in everyday life in unusual ways. *Compression Carpet*, exhibited in 2019, is a performative installation where anyone can experience a possible hugging-like action of a machine. This machine is different from the images that come to mind at first glance because it does not look like a cold machine. It is a set of soft, human-sized leather pillows that transform into a container to cover the entire body for cuddling. The installation bends inwards with the help of a rotating arm. The work has different versions with inflatable pillows where people can adjust the intensity of the embrace with a button.



Figure 3. Lucy McRae, *Compression Carpet*, 2019

McRae's other work in 2021 shares the same approach with the *Compression Carpet*. This time, she improves the experience of hugging a machine with the question of embracement in the future: "Heavy Duty Love questions whether these future sensitive humans will find new ways for intimacy and togetherness" (Frearson, 2021). She envisions the next-generation who will be born in artificial wombs and bypass the organic mother womb. Thus, her work discusses the need for an intimacy of a living that is constructed with a less human touch or connection. McRae defines these performative works as machine-wearables, which are mini architectures performed by two squeezed and two operator people: "Large furniture-like cushions made from tarpaulin, carpet underlay and industrial velcro, surround the body's perimetre - lean against the machine and you're ready to be squeezed" (McRae, 2021). There is a symbiotic experience on different scales for a space of in-between the bodies and products in McRae's works, too. Because the squeezing performance of mini architectures is sensitive to the forms of the bodies that it covers as the bodies push their limits for an experience of non-human embracement while they are indeed squeezed. This collective performativity breaks the established dualistic prejudices between machine and body, for one is cold or unfamiliar and the other is warm or familiar. Thus, McRae's works contribute to the arguments of Grosz's on metastable performativity concerning individual identities can be transductive and self-exceeding with the potential of breaking their central ties in unexpected posthuman possibilities of domestic experiences.

CONCLUSION

This research analyzed performative artworks as examples of posthuman domestic experiences by their post-dualistic potentials. Because they suggest alternatives for co-living other than dualism. No matter if it is for ten days or seconds, each artwork manifests a genuine co-living experience of an alternative domesticity. They are participatory works that welcome visitors to live this domestic experience. Through collective experience, artists and visitors live there for a while and intervene in Cartesian artspace by breaking the dualisms like artist/audience and public/private. They eat and take baths, even hug and sleep there. Therefore, domestic space exceeds the dualistic borders and comes out with posthuman potentials.

The common characteristic of these works is their relation to metastability as a becoming-machine. As domestic space is perceived as an essence helping to build an identity, symbiotic co-living also blurs this identification in a posthuman sense. In these artworks, the hierarchy between the co-living entities is deconstructed with the help of posthuman performativity. There is no hierarchical superiority of the human over the machine. This machine is not just a passive tool for human benefit because the machine and the organism perform together to be able to have a mutual co-existence in the same space, like in Gómez-Egaña's *Domain of Things*. Likewise, Schweder + Shelley's and McRae's machines are active participants of the space and break the divisions in-between the organic and the technological in the process of building a notion of

equivalent identity. So, this is an attempt to destabilize the established relationships to unveil the posthuman potentials. Exceeding the thoughts like Bachelard's that "constitutes a body of images that give mankind proofs or illusions of stability", there emerges an alternative experience of stability which is *metastability* (Winton, 2013: 48). Again, in the installation of Gómez-Egaña, there is more than an argument on the alienation of the human in mechanical processes. This work argues for the machine itself in the Deleuzian sense, which is not just a mechanical composition. It is a becoming process that is a sensible system of differences open to the limits wandering from the near of destabilization to the near of stabilization. Thanks to this sensibility, *Domain of Things* becomes a manifestation of an alternative of posthuman metastability which also unveils an existence of a fragile machine domesticity. McRae's works also speculate on the stabilities in the domestic space as well. In the co-living experience of machines and organisms, McRae explores the fragility of the machine too. She questions the attached points of views of dualistic thinking on the technology about its insensibility. Different from Scheweder + Shelley and Gómez-Egaña, McRae interprets posthuman metastability in a more minor scale both in terms of dimensions and senses. Her works speculate on the experiences like hugging and touching that are mostly identified with organisms to rethink the transductive and mutual performative space in-between people and machines. In parallel to Bachelard's phenomenology on space, McRae investigates the domestic space of becoming-machine by looking closer to its components from a posthuman magnifier.

On the other hand, these performative experiences discuss the possibilities of posthuman dwelling in the domestic space. As Norberg-Schulz (1984: 7) mentioned, dwelling "means to meet others for exchange of products, ideas and feelings... to come to an agreement with others, that is, to accept a set of common values. In these artworks, dwelling emerges as an argument on the concept of other. It is no longer a belonging of a specified inhabitant; it is performativity of shared practices forming with changeable common values. In parallel to *The Arcades Project*, the seminal book of Benjamin, it becomes "an active form of interaction between the inhabitant and his environment in which the individual and his surroundings adjust to each other" (Heynen, 2005: 21). In this context, the co-living entities of the space become the equivalent agents of the space under the name of *symbiont*, again. So, these values are formed by the performances of the symbionts of this posthuman domestic space and are always open to reinterpretations of any of them. Through their symbiotic experiences, symbionts continue their co-living practices in varying combinations of reiterations similar to Butler's arguments above, which also manifests posthuman performativity in the domestic space. These performances visualize the transformation of the dwelling as a becoming-machine with a posthuman metastability. Within this metastability, the things that are part of the dwelling become the other independent of being a product, idea or feeling like in Schulz's sentences. The more they become other, they unveil a posthuman experience of being equivalent and symbiotic agents of space, including the domestic space itself. Similarly, like in Benjamin's emphasis on interaction above, they redefine a posthuman dwelling which is more than a passive and one-directional spatiality in the borders of Cartesian dualisms or familiar experiences. With their constant changing of becoming, they propose a dwelling that is open-ended and in-between including the machines as mini-architectures and hugging alliances. So, different from the old understanding of dwelling, there are no discriminations depending on power or active/passive relations. In posthuman dwelling, the habitual memorizations of domesticity concerning the pre-assigned functions to the interior spaces of the house changes too, as a machine can cook by interpreting food data it has collected outside the kitchen or a person can sleep in a capsule or with a machine outside the bedroom.

At the intersections of becoming, metastability and performativity; the domestic space emerges through the repetitive, fluid and live connections in-between the symbionts of the space, including the space itself; "an amplifying coupling of technics and life - a mediation across disparate dimensions that releases new potentials" (Hoel, 2018: 261). This space of becoming-machine breaks the social statuses of domesticity coming from the ancient times including many dualisms like machine/organism and human/animal as the reinvention shift of posthuman practice. Therefore, posthuman domestic space as a becoming-machine is a possibility of experiencing "space and time as fragmented, transformable, interpenetrated, beyond any fixed formulation" (Grosz, 2001: 93). So, such a domestic space that blurs the established borders of perception of space starting from its inhabitants can be an example for further practical and theoretical studies on the notion of space. Moreover, it can also unveil a manifestation of an interdisciplinary model for understanding and interpreting the notions concerning posthuman performativity in the context of experience, in relation to ongoing academic debates on the possible positions of the human of anthropocene.

Authors' Contributions

The author contributed 100% to the study.

Competing Interests

There is no potential conflict of interest.

Ethics Committee Declaration

This study does not require ethics committee approval.

REFERENCES

- Aureli, P. V., & Tattara, M. (2015). Production/reproduction: Housing beyond the family. *Harvard Design Magazine*, 41, 96-114.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Clarendon.
- Bachelard, G. (1994). *The poetics of the space*. Beacon.
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The posthuman*. Wiley.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter*. Routledge.
- Cieraad, I. (2017). Domestic spaces, In Douglas Richardson (Ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Geography*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Colebrook, C. (2002). *Understanding Deleuze*. Allen & Unwin.
- Colomina, B. (2006). *Domesticity at war*. The MIT Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE.
- Deleuze, G. (1990). *The logic of sense*. Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G., Guattari, F. (1983). *Anti-Oedipus*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G., Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G., Parnet, C. (2007). *Dialogues II*. Columbia University Press.
- Dewsbury D., Thrift N. (2005). "Genesis Eternal": After Paul Klee. In Ian Buchanan and Gregg Lambert (Eds.), *Deleuze and Space*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Enia, M., Martella, F. (2020). *The Domestic City*. EAAE-ARCC 2nd Valencia International Biennial of Research of Architecture Conference. València, Spain.
- Frearson, A. (2021). Lucy McRae creates a cushion machine to offer lab-grown humans a womb experience. *Dezeen*. https://www.dezeen.com/2021/05/20/lucy-mcrae-heavy-duty-love-machine-venice-architecture-biennale/?li_source=base&li_medium=bottom_block_1 (08.02.2024).
- Haraway, D. (1991). A cyborg manifesto: Science, technology, and socialist-feminism in the late twentieth century. In *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature*. Routledge.
- Haraway, D. (2016). *Staying with the trouble*. Duke University Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1971). *Poetry, language, thought*. Harper Colophon Books.
- Heynen, H. (2005). Modernity and domesticity: Tensions and contradictions. In H. Heynen, & G. Baydar (Eds.), *Negotiating domesticity: spatial productions of gender in modern architecture*. Routledge.
- Hoel, A. S. (2018). Metastability. In R. Braidotti & M. Hlavajova (Eds.), *Posthuman Glossary*. Bloomsbury.
- Gómez-Egaña, P. (2017). *Domain of things*. Pedro Gómez-Egaña. <https://www.pedrogomezegana.net/domain-of-things> (08.02.2024).
- Grosz, E. (2001). *Architecture from the outside*. The MIT Press.
- Kline, R. (2017). *Alex Scheweder & Warn Shelly your turn*. The Aldrich Contemporary Art Museum.

Leach, N. (1997). *Rethinking architecture*. Routledge

Lorraine, T. (2005). Ahab and becoming-whale: The nomadic subject in smooth space. In Ian Buchanan, and Gregg Lambert (Eds.), *Deleuze and Space*. Edinburgh University Press.

Larios, P. (2017). *15th Istanbul Biennial Book*. Istanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts.

McRae, L. (2021). *Heavy duty love for future sensitive humans*. Lucy McRae. <https://www.lucymcrae.net/cares> (08.02.2024).

Merleau-Ponty, M. (2012). *Phenomenology of perception*. Routledge.

Norberg-Schulz, C. (1984). *The concept of dwelling*. Rizzoli.

Sari, B. (2022). *Gender, domesticity and house In Turkey: Context and state of research* [Master of Architecture Thesis, Middle East Technical University]. Open METU.

Taylor, D. (2016). *Performance*. Duke University Press.

Winton, A. G. (2013). Inhabited space: Critical theories and the domestic interior. In L. Weinthal & G. Brooker (Eds.), *The handbook of interior architecture and design*. Bloomsbury.

Figure References

Figure 1: Schweder, A. (2018). *ReActor, Schweder + Shelley Collaboration, 2016*. Alex Schweder <http://www.alexschweder.com/reactor/> (08.02.2024).

Figure 2: Dall, R. (2018). Time and time again - interview with Pedro Gómez-Egaña. *Metropolis M*, 4, 2-6. https://www.metropolism.com/en/features/35324_pedro_g_mez_ega_a_interview (08.02.2024).

Figure 3: McRae, L. (2021). *Heavy Duty Love for Future Sensitive Humans, 2021*. Lucy McRae <https://www.lucymcrae.net/cares> (08.02.2024).

Author's Biography

Mustafa Kemal Yurttaş received B.Arch and 2003, M. Arch degrees from ITU Faculty of Architecture. 2019, received Proficiency in Art degree from YTU Art & Design. Besides, took part in personal and group exhibitions in the field of contemporary art and performed in museums such as Pera Museum, Museum Evliyagil, Berlin and Hong Kong. Yurttaş has been working full-time in Haliç University, running Project Studios and selective courses on art and design theory since 2020 and continuing participating in exhibitions, workshops and performances. In 2021, participated in the residency program at SVA New York with American Turkish Society's Artist Award.