Foaming Relations: The Ethico-Aesthetics of Relationality

Hélène Frichot, RMIT University, Australia

Abstract: The German philosopher Peter Sloterdijk uses the analogy of foam to describe the relations that cohere between one individual and the next, each co-isolated in the context of the modern city. Our habits, in co-production with the framing of our urban habitus, determine that we are arranged as networks of isolated, bubble-like, monadic cells. By effervescent means we nevertheless find ways of communicating across the cell walls that we share, and which divide us, or do we? I will enlist a series of concepts to consider the foaming relations that go toward forming the life of the urban habitus. These will include, relational aesthetics (Nicolas Bourriaud); ethico-aesthetics (Félix Guattari); human and nonhuman relations (Bruno Latour) all of which will help toward articulating a foaming, bubbling mass of relations that are external to their terms. The use of Sloterdijk's concept of 'foam city' will be employed to consider contemporary modes of occupation of the city and how occupation is a processual activity that requires innovative responses to ever-transforming spatio-temporal networks. Following Guattari, this paper will venture an ethico-aesthetic approach to the way problems can be framed by architects and designers toward new modes of occupation of urban fields enlivened by the circulation of human and non-human actors. Practices of occupation accompanied by relations of affect and percept require an ethico-aesthetic rethinking of the design process and its modes of conceptualisation. This paper will address the manner in which the contemporary urban scene is inhabited as a live medium and ask to what extent the public sphere has been rendered redundant in exchange for a multiplicity of co-habiting as well as agonistic private spheres, or what Sloterdijk has called, 'ego-spheres'.

Key Words: Foam City, Affect, Relational Aesthetics, Ethico-Aesthetics, Relationality, Generic City

Our experience of the world is less that of a long life developing through time than of a network that connects points and intersects with its own skein.
Michel Foucault[1]

An Introduction to Foaming Relations

Bubbles clustered in seething globules of foam are the inspiration for this essay, and not merely in terms of the formal qualities suggested in soapy mixtures, but in terms of the necessary and contingent relations formed between one fragile bubble and the next. It is through the precarious medium of foam that I want to address the idea of the urban habitus as a foaming mass of relations that is ever-transforming, that is composed of bubbles of affect and percept that spring up only to dissipate again, fleetingly. In this I am guided by a short essay called, "Foam City", a translated excerpt from the German philosopher, Peter Sloterdijk's great triptych, Sphären, which is composed of Spheres I: Bubble; Spheres II: Globes; Spheres III: Foam. I will also draw upon further essays from Sloterdijk, including "Cell Blocks, Ego-Spheres, Self-Container."[2] Bruno Latour, well known for his involvement in the conceptual assemblage that is called Actor-Network Theory (ANT), which is also occasionally referred to as actant-rhizome theory,[3] especially in later instantiations, is a particular champion of Sloterdijk's work for architecture. Latour insists that "Sloterdijk is the thinker of architecture," by which we can take Latour to mean that Sloterdijk is *the* thinker of architecture

today.[4] If we take foam as a medium that only fleetingly allows the identification of provisional identities (or bubbles) then the task for the designer, Latour suggests, is "to create the conditions of cohabitation."[5] Latour's work with ANT will also be of use here as it allows us to rethink the behaviour of the material stuff of architecture in relation to the mobility of human and non-human actors. I will propose that the urban habitus can be seen to be composed of so many clusters of human and non-human actors, operating at larger and smaller scales. To help further in the consideration of the multi-scalar, local and more global instantiations of the urban habitus, pictured through the medium of foam, I will employ Félix Guattari's notion of an ethico-aesthetics, together with Guattari and Gilles Deleuze's concepts of affect and percept. Where ethico-aesthetics promises to suggest a way forward for the designer, I will argue that an understanding of the circulation of affect and percept allows further insight into the formulation of Foam City that Sloterdijk forwards. Likewise, Nicholas Bourriaud's well-known curatorial work concerning relational aesthetics will be enlisted alongside Guattari's ethico-aesthetics. Finally, the counter-image to an animated urban habitus is that of the Generic City, a figure provocatively forwarded by Rem Koolhaas. The extreme case of the Generic City accommodates what the Dutch architectural theorist, Lieven De Cauter has called the Capsular Civilisation, where "people seem to have given up on the street, on the world outside."[6] This essay will also ask how these coagulated forms of a Generic City and a Capsular Civilisation can instead be reanimated through modes of occupation enlivened through the conceptual and affective medium of foam informed both by ANT and by the idea of a relational aesthetics suffused with affect and percept.

Actor-Network Theory and After

I will commence with a brief account of Actor-Network Theory, or what has come to be described as Actor-Network Theory and After,[7] in order to arrive at a tentative renovation of ANT through Sloterdijk's notion of Foam City. Networks are about nodes and trajectories between actors, human and non-human, and although they can be provisionally mapped they are ever mobile, and, as I will suggest below, following the behaviour of foam, they appear and then fade-away over time. There is nothing universal about the network, instead the term offers a structuring conceptual overlay to help us understand the stickiness or looseness of relations between people and things. Among the more challenging claims made by proponents of ANT, and especially by Latour, is that there pertains an equality between material artefacts or non-humans actors and human actors in any given network. As Robert McGrail explains "an actor (or rather any individual thing), for ANT, is constituted by its relations to every other relevant entity (its world)."[8] With respect to Actor-Network Theory, Scott Waltz explains, "artefacts, technologies, architectures, animals and text are recognized as participants acting alongside persons, groups, and institutions, in the continuing fabrication of the social world. This broadens our view of the range of social actors and relationships that constitute any given collective."[9] Kjetil Fallan also suggests in his helpful account of ANT for architects "it is not the actors per se or the network as such that are to be studied – it is the relations being built and the actions taking place that commands attention."[10] Specifically, the concern is to study how society and technology are mutually constitutive and not independent of each other's influence, nor dominant, one over the other. Although Actor-Network Theory has predominantly occupied the field called science and technology studies, Fallan and others point out how it has become increasingly transdisciplinary in its applications. Some networks, of course, prove to be more durable than others. The term network has itself fallen under critique, and in response to such critique networks are now often referred to as

rhizomes, effectively drawing on the collaborative work of Deleuze and Guattari in *A Thousand Plateaus*.[11]

Fallen, after John Law, has offered a helpful triptych that focuses the concerns and approach of ANT, that is, materiality, relationality, and process.[12] Latour explains that the Body Politik gathers around a matter of concern, that is, some very material thing or other. At the risk of excluding more mundane relations, Latour has also described such matters of concern as spaces of controversy.[13] Relationality for Latour and others such as Laws, Nigel Thrift, *et al*, suggests complex arrangements of space with no clear hierarchical ordering of the actors that operate and circulate within the space-time of the network. The network supposedly supports the voices of not only marginalised humans, but also the voice of things, creating a means of accounting for the secret life of things. Our task (or the task of the social sciences) as delineated by Latour is to make an account of such material 'missing masses.'[14] This is surely a task that resonates with the many material products associated with architecture. The use of the term 'network' to frame these spaces of flows amongst human and non-human actors (a space that can admittedly also become a space of coagulations and blockages), has been criticized as attempting to account for everyone and everything, and allowing no space for otherness, or no allowance for an 'Outside', in the sense that Maurice Blanchot and Michel Foucault, as well as Deleuze have discussed the constitutional effects of the outside.[15] Such critique has subsequently allowed Latour, for instance, to begin to make accounts of relations that have failed, and to further consider how networks are non-homogenous, multivalent, and even contradictory. We could say that the affective and perceptive flows amidst networks of human and non-human actors ebb and flow, or are more or less fluid and viscous.

In the large catalogue that accompanied the exhibition *Making Things Public* at ZKM, the Centre for Media and Art in Karlsruhe, Latour in his introductory remarks suggests that it is a very simple, even trivial thing that they are attempting. He suggests "we might be connected to each other more by our worries, our matters of concern, the issues we care for, than any set of values, opinions, attitudes or principles."[16] It is a simple thought experiment one can make to prove this point, he says, just "go into your head" and think of any of those contemporary issues, either close to home or further afield, that are presently concerning you. Now, a critique of this little experiment might be that the overlay of my habitual moral, socio-cultural aptitudes makes it more likely than not that certain things will be of more concern to me than others. Nevertheless, the assumption is that it is more likely than not that whatever concerns me also concerns a cluster of other actors, whether or not I know them, whether they are my neighbour or my enemy. If we follow Latour's logic through then these clusters can be thought of as "expanded collectives,"[17] as Sloterdijk calls them. That is, it is not just my set of concerns, and how these concerns overlap with other social and political actors, like an elaborate Venn Diagram composed of many circles of interest, but how material things, that is, objects and stuff, from street furniture, to how well my apartment is insulated, to the bottles out of which I drink my water, and how my trash is divided up according to varying categories of recycleability, all these things too need to be considered as part of the precarious foamy collective I occupy. This is also a convenient way of approaching problems for architects and designers who are always involving themselves in questions of materials and (designed) things and how these things will behave in response to identified local problems. What I will argue in the following is that the operational analogy of foam offers an alternative model to help understand these networks of humans and things, and might be one way to "let go of the trope of the network", as Hetherington and Law have suggested, in order to look for "more fluid and rhizomatic ways of thinking about the spatiality of relations."[18] What becomes clear

from Hetherington and Law in their essay "After Networks," is that there are many possible models by which an account of the behaviour of what has been otherwise described as the network can be made.

Foaming City

One of the things Sloterdijk demonstrates is that once you begin a hunt for spheres in the form of bubbles, globes and foam, and so forth, they seem to spring up everywhere, appearing in all variety of shapes and sizes and inaugurating all kinds of relations. It is the medium of foam that I will focus on now in order to extend an understanding of the network as given to us by ANT. Foam allows us to picture the bubble or sphere not as a singular unit, but in ever-present contact with a multitude of other monadic bubbles, appearing and disappearing over time. The beauty of bubbles is in their irregular, not quite spherical instantiations: when bubbles, individuals, or beings, human and non-human, amass and cohere, their influence on one another creates all manner of formal distortion. The sphere can be considered a hypothetical limit, an ideal form artificially or hylomorphically imposed that denies the material behaviour, expression or matter-flow of any given system. If instead we consider the behaviour of foam as a medium, and transfer this medium isomorphically onto an understanding of the urban habitus, composed of co-isolated, but adjacent bubbles, then, as Sloterdijk writes "whatever the degree of isolation established by respective individuals, they are always co-isolated islands that are momentarily or chronically, connected to a network of adjacent islands constituting midsized or larger structures – a national assembly, a 'Love Parade', a club, a Freemason lodge, a work force, a shareholder meeting, a concert hall audience, a suburban neighbourhood, a school class, a religious community, drivers stuck in a traffic jam, a convened federation of taxpayers".[19] These are all "confederations of life", and in each instance they circulate in the midst of the material stuff of architectural surrounds, which should not be divided off, or considered distinct from these networks. Likewise, in elaborating on his idea of relational aesthetics in a small publication called *Postproduction*, Nicolas Bourriaud suggests that social collectives or "temporary communities" include "musicians at a jam session, customers at a café or restaurant, children at a school, audience members at a puppet show, guests at a dinner."[20] Although Bourriaud's examples of networks might seem more anodyne, I will elaborate below why his work on relational aesthetics may offer a complementary conceptual framework that could be usefully placed alongside both Sloterdijk and Latour's work.

Foam can be taken isomorphically such that its structural qualities or the way it works – as distinct from what it looks like – can be mapped onto the idea of a live urban habitus. Sloterdijk argues that, "from a physical perspective, [foam] describes multichamber systems consisting of spaces formed by gas pressure and surface tensions, which restrict and deform one another according to fairly strict geometric laws," and he goes on to suggest that "it seemed to me that modern urban systems could be easily understood with analogy to these exact, technical foam analyses."[21] Foam here should be considered as more than mere metaphor, as Sloterdijk in an interview with Bettina Funcke suggests: "The term *metaphor* … makes me hesitate a bit because, in my opinion, words like *sphere* or *globe* are not metaphors but rather thought-images or, even better, thought-figures."[22] In an operative sense contemporary society in the habitat of the city can be really said to behave in this way, like seething foam, co-isolated bubbles networked in what Sloterdijk calls "episodic clusters and enduring symbioses."[23] The multifarious chambers that compose foam are fragile and resilient, opaque and transparent. Like the philosopher Leibniz's monads these chambers and

their relations to one another own both obscure and clear zones. Sloterdijk explains his version of Foam City like this: "The co-isolated foam of a society conditioned to individualism is not simply an agglomeration of neighbouring (partition-sharing) inert and massive bodies, but rather multiplicities of loosely touching cells of life-worlds."[24] That is to say, we always share at least one partition with an adjacent world cell, we are isolated, but not alone in our isolation, separated out, but also sharing in the behaviour of this structural stuff that is foam, a behaviour or expression that might not at first be read in the local encounter, but which becomes clearer the more encounters occur in a system.

Admittedly, Sloterdijk's outlook is a little less positive about our communicative abilities between one bubble and the next. In "Cell Block, Egospheres, Self-Container" he treats the apartment as the minimum living cell of the contemporary city, a zone where our relation has been reduced to a regime of self-care isolation, mirroring no one other than our self, reading no news media but the *Daily Me*, tailored to our tastes and interests. Still, one of the challenges of modern collectives, according to Sloterdijk, is that of "creating spatial conditions that enable both the isolation of individuals, and the concentration of isolated entities into collective ensembles of cooperation and contemplation. This calls for a new commitment on the part of architecture."[25] On Sloterdijk's account our fixation on the individual and her singular occupation of space is one that we appear to have to accept. How does this distinct individual form her inevitable and unavoidable relations with others? And what kinds of spaces facilitate such gatherings? In his essay, "Foam City", Sloterdijk undertakes a brief study of French revolutionary forms of gathering and the types of architecture, including arenas, stadiums, fields (the Champs de Mars in Paris, for instance), also conference rooms, and structures such as the Pantheon in Paris, formerly a church, and reconfigured for revolutionary gatherings, and suggests that the occupation of these spaces frequently occurred irrespective of what their former, pre-revolutionary use was for. Sloterdijk argues that the notion of the masses here suggests a malleable material that occupies space much as dough occupies any given container. He frequently refers to architecture as a container, as though that were sufficient to facilitate the act of gathering, in this instance, political gathering. The practice of fashioning space for political and mass occupation, he explains, soon gave way to an anxiety, even a fear, that these masses could become unruly and violent. French revolutionary forms, and the festivals planned as part of the revolutionary fervour have also required the formulation of strategies for mass event management. Importantly for this essay, Sloterdijk describes the affective qualities of these gatherings and mass rallies. The difficulty is how we might undertake a similar analysis today, and move beyond analysis as designers in order to envision how to facilitate the occupation of space at an urban scale, without merely viewing this as a problem directed at crowd management or how many people can fit into one given volume. There is a strong temptation to believe that we now no longer occupy public space as we once did, and that even what appears to resemble public space is in fact privatised, commercialised, and dedicated only to empty consumption.

The Generic City and Capsular Civilisation

A conceptual image that supports the disappearance of public space into privatised zones is Rem Koolhaas's Generic City, as described in that fabulous tome, which is to be found on every architect's bookshelf, *S,M, L, XL*.[26] Koolhaas takes the over-determined zones of the contemporary airport as an exemplary form that accommodates choreographed mobility, consumption and the suspension of relations in an over-determined space that lacks a specific identity or history. The Generic City is "a place of weak and distended sensations, few

and far between emotions,"[27] as such it would appear to suppress the circulation of affect and percept in the occupation of the urban habitus. Koolhaas's account assumes the inevitability of the infectious spread of the Generic City, he is ambivalent and even ominously eager for its arrival in a city near you. He argues that it promises a liberation from identity and history, and from a former fixation on the necessity of an identifiable centre, what's more, it can be abandoned when it falls out of use, and the "street is dead" but for vehicular traffic.[28] The Dutch theorist, Lieven De Cauter takes Koolhaas's Generic City and suggests that it both risks becoming something like a refugee camp (and here Cauter is referring to the philosophical work of Giorgio Agamben), and a capsular civilisation. Cauter writes, "our daily lives can be perfectly described as movement via transport capsules from one enclave or capsule (home, for example) to another (campus, office, airport, all-in hotel, shopping mall, and so on)" he goes on to characterise this as the process of capsularization, and adds that our "capsular routine" also includes our travels amidst the traffic of flows on the internet, where we are as likely as not to follow the familiar paths of cyburbia.[29] To counter such stultifying and coagulated relations that close down on the possibilities of new forms of sociality, new ways of considering the urban problems that confront us must be invented. Part of the challenge is exactly in the identification of problems that do not have ready-made answers, as Deleuze and Guattari put it, or else the recognition of matters of concern, as distinct from matters of fact, as Latour insists in relation to our occupation of public space, accepting that this space is one of transforming and often transitory flows.

Relational Aesthetics

In the introductory essay to the catalogue that accompanies the 2009 Tate Britain Triennial exhibition the curator Nicolas Bourriaud cites the writings of Peter Sloterdijk in order to describe the modern way of living as a "fast-burn culture", explosive in its manifestation and expression.[30] The fast-burn that can be associated with processes of modernisation, and modernism more generally, was fuelled by an assumption that energy was superabundant and readily available to be squandered by all. This was subsequently countered with the onset of so-called postmodernism, which occurred, significantly, at approximately the same moment that the developed world suffered its first oil crisis. Bourriaud here is setting up an argument that will allow him to introduce his own neologism to name the era we now inhabit: the 'altermodern'. He qualifies what he means by reserving the term in particular for what is happening in the field of art production. It is of relevance to this essay that Bourriaud describes the work of the artists he has gathered together under the banner Altermodern, as heterochronic as well as heterogeneous topographic networks. The works he insists operate as networks of signs of pre-production, production and post-production of work that should not necessarily privilege an endpoint, rather a process. Works emerge out of what could be described as a nomadic sensibility, and we could even call them rhizomatic. The artists are not studying, as sociologists would, the networks they are producing, but appear instead to involve themselves willingly as actors and actants, that is, according to the way Latour uses the term, they are being acted upon in much the same way as the material they gather is being acted upon.[31]

Relational Aesthetics, a conceptual assemblage coined by Bourriaud emphasises a situation in which relations are given primacy over the infrastructure that facilitates them. The so-called reified objects of art are treated with some suspicion and a return to something like the happening or event is encouraged. According to Bourriaud, art is created out of enduring encounters, which sounds very much like the way that Deleuze and Guattari argue that art is

about sensation made durable.[32] Bourriaud explains that a work [of art] "may operate like a relational device containing a certain degree of randomness, or a machine provoking and managing individual and group encounters."[33] The promise of such schemes is that they create relational micro-territories, which presumably can begin to have an impact at larger scales. Relational Aesthetics has been questioned, for instance by Claire Bishop, for its apparent emphasis on conviviality, and has been countered with Chantal Mouffe's notion of an agonistic politics where adversaries find a way to accept the legitimacy of opposing points of view in order to discover a way out of the dead end street of the brute antagonisms of enemies. A further critique of Relational Aesthetics, by Stewart Martin, suggests that its attempt to account for art as engaging in and creating social relations outside the capitalist machine is a reversible relation that can easily succumb to the "aesthetisization of capitalist exchange."[34] Nevertheless, both Bishop and Martin appear to want to salvage something of Relational Aesthetics, or make renovations on the manifesto forwarded by Bourriaud. Certainly the power of the thought-image or the naming of the operational concept that is now recognised as 'Relational Aesthetics' should not be dismissed too easily, even if Bourriaud does in the first instance only offer a fairly cursory sketch.

Ethico-Aesthetics

In Bourriaud's book, *Relational Aesthetics*, which often reads as a very loosely connected series of remarks toward user friendly and interactive art, he dedicates a good part of his final chapter to a treatment of Félix Guattari's identification of a new paradigm, Guattari's ethico-aesthetics.[35] Guattari frames an *ecosophy* or a new ethico-aesthetic paradigm, composed of three ecologies orientated toward: 1. Mental Ecology, that is, processes of subjectification or how the protean subject comes to be formed and transformed such that it is less a fixed identity than what Thrift has called a "provisional personhood"[36]; 2. Social ecology: which aims to rebuild social relations at every level of the socius. Social ecology considers subjectivities at a larger scale in the form of collectives, that is, how clusters of subjects form provisional relations between each other, relations of agreement, as well as agonistic, abrasive relations; 3. Environmental ecology, which must be liberated from niche and special interest groups and conceived instead in profound conjunction with both mental and social ecologies, all of which extend across the open spectrum between natural and artifactual environment-worlds.[37]

The refrain given to us by Deleuze, which attends to all these multi-scalar relations across the medium of foam, the Actor-Network or rhizome, is that *relations are external to their terms*. This is also what ANT teaches us, that the nodes in the mobile network are not fixed, but transforming in the midst of and in response to new encounters. While each bubble-cell, or individual unit may operate in insularity, self-reflecting, consuming, producing, their daily activities, focussed in upon their practice of self-care, as Sloterdijk has described, nevertheless, they do not operate in isolation. These life worlds bump up against each other, even if blindly, or in a random groping fashion. There is nothing essential or predetermined about the singular unit that makes it apt to form one relation over another. Relationality is arbitrary, or rather contingent. What is necessary is that some relation or other will be formed. Then it becomes a question of what is made of the encounter and which relations we decide to foster. Deleuze and Guattari use the concepts of affect and percept, which vary in intensity according to our contingent encounters and the relations that are born from these encounters. As an actor, or actant (if I agree that I both act and am acted upon), I encounter other actants, human and non-human, on a daily basis while going about my daily business, and for the

purposes of this essay, we can imagine these encounters occurring in the urban habitus, on a city street. There is always a composition of relations and as Deleuze reminds us, the encounters that go toward forming relations are quite local things.[38] Affect, as it is defined by Deleuze and Guattari in what is sometimes called the 'aesthetic chapter' of *What is Philosophy?,* 'Percept, Affect, Concept', is a being in its own right that belongs neither to the sentient subject who is affected nor to the thing that stirs an affection: affect is not to do with a common understanding of feeling or the emotions.[39] In fact, it is a matter of wresting affects from affections, and percepts from perceptions, suggest Deleuze and Guattari. The emphasis shifts then to the relations between one actor and the next and how affections and perceptions are transported between the bubbles in our foamy mixtures.

An Affective Conclusion

I am affected by both passions of sadness and affections of joy depending on whether my encounters agree with me or disagree with me. As an affective correlate my power of acting comes to be inhibited or augmented depending on whether I am assailed by affects of joy or the passions of sadness. To these encounters, yet further encounters can be added, including encounters with things. To borrow from ANT terminology, circulating amidst human and non-human actors there is a continuous variation, as Deleuze puts it, an increase-diminution-increase-diminution, and so on, of my power of acting or force of existing. Deleuze calls this a melodic line of continuous variation and recommends that "from a random encounter of bodies, we can select the idea of those bodies that agree with our own and give us joy, that is, that increase our power."[40] Agreeing that the world is made up of random encounters, Bourriaud calls the labour of our act of selection "critical materialism."[41] What is assumed is that we are capable of making a curatorial act of selection, and preserving those encounters that increase our joy. Through acts of joyful creation we can invent non pre-existing relations between terms,[42] we can activate what Bourriaud has identified, if somewhat weakly, as a Relational Aesthetics, or what Martin has called a "realised utopianism" and an "art of the multitude."[43] That is, despite the innumerable and ever changing constraints of circumstance and setting, it is within our power to invent new forms of sociability and even collective modes of expression in the context of the urban habitus. Even if such striving only results in provisional results, for affects and percepts continue their circulation, increase and diminution, and even if there remains the matter of what we do with our sad passions, which cannot always be entirely overcome, as both Deleuze and Spinoza agree, still, an ethical practice of sorts can be invented that is conjoined with an engaged aesthetics. The question of the myriad ways we go about this practice as designers is an open one.

Foam city offers us the expression of the bubble amassing in a foam of encounters whereby a sliding scale between co-isolation and a more thoroughgoing co-habitation is achieved through the augmentation and diminution of affect and percept. Although it would generally appear that our daily habits determine that we live out increasingly capsular existences, new collective modes of expression and challenging forms of sociability are still possible, as long as those bubbles keep seething, foaming, and do not entirely evaporate into thin air.

Endnotes

[1] Michel Foucault, "Of Other Spaces," in *Diacritics* 16:1 (Spring), p. 22.

[2] Both of the above essays have been translated in the New York based architecture journal, *Log*, edited by Cynthia C. Davidson. Peter Sloterdijk, "Foam City" in Cynthia C. Davidson ed., *Log* 9, Winter/Spring 2007, pp. 63-76; Sloterdijk, "Cell Block, Egospheres, Self-Container" in Cynthia C. Davidson ed., *Log* 10, Summer/Fall 2007, pp. 89 -109.

[3] Nigel Thrift, 'Afterwords', in *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 2000, vol. 18, pp. 213-255. P. 214.

[4] Bruno Latour, "The Space of Controversies: Interview with Bruno Latour," in *New Geographies* 0, 2008, pp. 122-135.

[5] Bruno Latour, "The Space of Controversies," p. 124.

[6] Lieven De Cauter, *The Capsular Civilization: On the City in the Age of Fear*, Rotterdam: NAi Publishers, 2004, p. 16.

[7] See John Law, *Actor-Network Theory and After*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999. See also Kevin Hetherington and John Law, "After Networks", in *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 18, 2000, pp. 127-132.

[8] Robert McGrail, "Working with Substance: Actor-Network Theory and the Modal Weight of the Material" in *Techné: Research in Philosophy and Technology*, vol 12 (Winter 2008), p. 2 of 21. http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/SPT/v12n1/mcgrail.html

[9] Scott Waltz, "Nonhumans Unbound: Actor-Network Theory and the Reconsideration of "Things" in Educational Foundations", in *Educational Foundations*, vol. 20, n. 3-4 (Summer Fall, 2006), p. 65.

[10] Kjetil Fallan, "Architecture in Action: Traveling with Actor-Network Theory in the Land of Architectural Research" in *Architecture Theory Review*, 13.1, 2008, p. 81.

[11] See Nigel Thrift, "Afterwords" in in *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 18, 2000, pp. 213-255.

[12] Fallan, "Architecture in Action," pp. 83, 93. See also John Law, *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*, London: Routledge, 2004.

[13] See Latour, "The Space of Controversies".

[14] Hetherington and Law, "After Networks", p. 129.

[15] See Hetherington and Law, "After Networks."

[16] Bruno Latour, "From Realpolitik to Dingpolitik or How to Make Things Public", in Bruno Latour and Peter Weibel eds, *Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy*, Karlsruhe, ZKM Centre for Art and Media Karlsrue and Cambridge, Massachusetts, The MIT Press, 2005, p. 14.

[17] Sloterdijk, "Atmospheric Politics," in Latour and Weibel, eds, *Making Things Public*, p. 944.

[18] Hetherington and Law, "After Networks," p. 129.

[19] Peter Sloterdijk, "Foam City," p. 63.

[20] Nicolas Bourriaud, *Postproduction*, New York: Lukas and Sternberg, 2002, p. 49

[21] Sloterdijk and Bettina Funcke, "Against Gravity: Bettina Funcke talks with Peter Sloterdijk", in *Bookforum*, February/March 2005. http://www.bookforum.com/archive/feb_05/funcke.html

[22] Sloterdijk and Funcke, "Against Gravity".

[23] Sloterdijk, "Foam City", p. 63.

[24] Sloterdijk, "Foam City", p. 64.

[25] Sloterdijk, "Foam City", p. 65.

[26] Rem Koolhaas, "The Generic City", in O.M.A., Rem Koolaas, and Bruce Mau, *S, M, L, XL*, New York: The Monacelli Press, 1997 (1995).

[27] Koolhaas, "The Generic City", p. 1250.

[28] Koolhaas, "The Generic City", pp. 1252, 1253.

[29] Lieven De Cauter, *The Capsular Civilization: On the City in the Age of Fear*, Rotterdam: NAi Publishers, 2004, p. 82.

[30] The Altermodern Triennial exhibition is being shown at the Tate Britain from 3rd February to 26th April, 2009. Nicolas Bourriaud, "Altermodern" in Nicolas Bourriaud, ed. *Altermodern: Tate Triennial*, London: Tate Publishing, 2009, p. 16.

[31] Actant, Kallan explains is the term Latour uses to describe how actors are something that is "made to act". Kallan, "Architecture in Action", p. 83. See also Bruno Latour, *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

[32] "So long as the material lasts, the sensation enjoys an eternity in those very moments. Sensation is not realized in the material without the material passing completely into the sensation, into the percept or affect." See Deleuze and Guattari, *What is Philosophy?,* p. 166, 167.

[33] Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics*, p. 30.

[34] Stewart Martin, "Critique of Relational Aesthetics," in *Third Text*, vol. 21, issue 4 (2007), p. 371. pp. 369-386.

[35] Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics*, pp. 86-104.

[36] Thrift, "Afterwords", p. 213.

[37] Félix Guattari, *Chaosmosis: An Ethico-Aesthetic Paradigm*, trans. Paul Bains and Julian Pefanis, Sydney: Power Publications, 1995; Guattari, *The Three Ecologies*, London: Athlone Press, 2000.

[38] See Deleuze's Spinoza Seminars, Cours Vincennes of 24/01/78, pp. 9; 11. http://www.webdeleuze.com.

[39] Deleuze and Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, trans. Graham Burchell and Hugh Tomlinson , London: Verso, 1994, p. 164.

[40] See Deleuze's Spinoza Seminars, Cours Vincennes of 24/01/78: 3. http://www.webdeleuze.com. See "Spinoza and the Three 'Ethics'", in *Essays Critical and Clinical*, trans. Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco, London: Verso, 1998, p. 144.

[41] Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics*, p. 110.

[42] "*…relations are external to their terms* [Deleuze's italics]. Relations will consequently be posited a something that can and must be instituted or invented. Parts are fragments that cannot be totalised, but we can at least invent non preexisting relations between them, which testify to a process in history as much as to an evolution in nature." See Deleuze, "Whitman," in *Essays Critical and Clinical*, p. 58.

[43] Martin, "Critique of Relational Aesthetics," p. 371.

References

Bishop, Claire. (2004) 'Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics' in *October* 110 (Fall).

Bourriaud, Nicolas ed. (2009) *Altermodern: Tate Triennial*, London: Tate Publishing.

Bourriaud, Nicolas. (2002) *Relational Aesthetics*, trans. Simon Pleasance and Fronza Woods, with Mathieu Copeland, France: Les Presses du Réel.

Bourriaud, Nicolas. (2002) *Postproduction*, New York: Lukas and Sternberg.

Cauter, Lieven De. (2004) *The Capsular Civilization: On the City in the Age of Fear*, Rotterdam: NAi Publishers.

Deleuze, Gilles. (1998) *Essays Critical and Clinical*, trans. Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco, London: Verso.

Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari, Félix. (1994) *What is Philosophy?,* trans. Graham Burchell and Hugh Tomlinson, London: Verso.

Deleuze, Gilles. (1978) Spinoza Seminars, Cours Vincennes. http://www.webdeleuze.com.

Fallan, Kjetil (2008) 'Architecture in Action: Traveling with Actor-Network Theory in the Land of Architectural Research' in *Architecture Theory Review*, 13.1, 2008, pp. 80-96.

Foucault, Michel. (1986) 'Of Other Spaces' in *Diacritics* 16:1 (Spring).

Guattari, Félix. (2000) *The Three Ecologies*, London: Athlone Press.

Guattari, Félix. (1995) *Chaosmosis: An Ethico-Aesthetic Paradigm*, trans. Paul Bains and Julian Pefanis, Sydney: Power Publications.

Hetherington, Kevin and Law, John. (2000) 'After Networks' in *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 18, pp. 127-132.

Koolhaas, Rem. (1997) 'The Generic City' in O.M.A., Rem Koolaas, and Bruce Mau, *S, M, L, XL*, New York: The Monacelli Press, pp. 1239-1264

Latour, Bruno. (2008) 'The Space of Controversies: Interview with Bruno Latour' in *New Geographies* 0, pp. 122-135.

Latour, Bruno. (2005) *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Latour, Bruno and Weibel, Peter eds. (2005) *Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy*, Karlsruhe, ZKM Centre for Art and Media Karlsruhe and Cambridge, Massachusetts, The MIT Press.

Law, John. (2004) *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*, London: Routledge.

Law, John *Actor-Network Theory and After*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.

Martin, Stewart. (2007) 'Critique of Relational Aesthetics' in *Third Text*, vol. 21, issue 4, pp. 369-386.

McGrail, Robert. (2008) 'Working with Substance: Actor-Network Theory and the Modal Weight of the Material' in *Techné: Research in Philosophy and Technology*, vol 12 (Winter), http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/SPT/v12n1/mcgrail.html.

Sloterdijk, Peter. (2007) 'Foam City' in Cynthia C. Davidson ed., *Log* 9, Winter/Spring 2007, pp. 63-76.

Sloterdijk. (2007) 'Cell Block, Egospheres, Self-Container' in Cynthia C. Davidson ed., *Log* 10, Summer/Fall 2007, pp. 89 -109.

Sloterdijk and Funcke, Bettina. (2005) 'Against Gravity: Bettina Funcke talks with Peter Sloterdijk' in *Bookforum*, (February/March). http://www.bookforum.com/archive/feb_05/funcke.html

Thrift, Nigel. (2000) "Afterwords" in in *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 18, pp. 213-255.

Waltz, Scott. (2006) 'Nonhumans Unbound: Actor-Network Theory and the Reconsideration of "Things" in Educational Foundations' in *Educational Foundations*, vol. 20, n. 3-4 (Summer Fall), pp. 51-68.