Recurrent Debate of '*Interior-Exterior Split*' in Archıtecture; Economy-Political Perspective on the Concept of '*Skin*'

Prof. Dr. Murat Çetin
[ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6047-9020]
(Kadir Has University, Department of Architecture – Istanbul / Turkey)
{Cibali Campus Fatih 34083 Istanbul - Turkey}

Abstract
This article critically examines the persistent interior–exterior dichotomy in architecture, tracing its evolution from Gottfried Semper's theory of Bekleidung (covering) to its present-day manifestation in technologically mediated building skins. It argues that what appears as a disciplinary cliché is in fact a symptom of deeper socio-economic structures, particularly capitalism's instrumentalization of architecture for image production and capital accumulation. Through a historical and theoretical lens, the essay shows how architecture's autonomy was achieved by externalizing interior space and aligning with façade-centric, spectacle-driven practices—ultimately reinforcing capitalist control over both urban and domestic environments. The proliferation of digital tools and the fragmentation of professional roles have further deepened the inside–outside divide, producing two rival domains: interior and exterior architecture. Rather than a natural outcome of architectural logic, this fragmentation is revealed as a response to the exponential expansion of knowledge and the stagnation of capital investment in construction. The architectural skin, once a site of meaning and mediation, now functions as an ideological tool that legitimizes systemic inequalities and pacifies critique. By exposing these dynamics, the article calls for a rethinking of architecture's disciplinary boundaries and a critical confrontation with the political-economic systems that shape spatial production.
Keywords: *interior design, interior architecture, interior-exterior, architectural skin, architectural shell.*

Date of Submission: 13-06-2025   Date of Acceptance: 26-06-2025

I.   Introduction

This paper explores the roots of the "interior - exterior" split in architecture. Along this route, the essay navigates through not only narratives or myths that portray architecture as a unity of both interior and exterior but also rhetorics that conceive interior and exterior of architecture as seperate aspects of a (*so-called*) unified entity. The paper tracks down the economical, political, ideological, social, cultural, philosophical, metaphysical genealogy of this legendary divide between two components of human spatiality. Throughout the essay, it is interest to understand the causality behind this well-rooted division. Therefore, the essay pursues the traces of recurrent patterns whereby the split between 'interior space' and 'exterior form' in architecture has kept re-emerging throughout the architectural history and along the human adventure of building shelters and creating settlements. Moreover, the paper endevours to discover the conditions in which the pattern of the mythical split between the two (*complementary*) phenomena carry on repeating are determined. Furthermore, the essay investigates the common attributes and similarities among these conditions and circumstances at different ruptures in architectural history. Having focused on the multi-faceted transformations through the time line of pre-modernity / modernity / post-modernity, the study attempts to interpret the recurrences of this split in history on the basis of various developments in regard to class-based structures of societies.

On a parallel path, the paper questions several concepts which have become defaults and cliches such as (building) 'skin', 'shell' or 'envelope' (*in architectural terminology*) on the basis of their significant role in construction of this myth about the split between *inside and outside* as well as *interior and exterior*. The essay discusses that the role played by these cliches manifest itself at both theoretical and practical levels. Thus, the paper argues not only on the plausability of a deliberate (*and actually externally imposed*) strategy of polarisation by creating two different areas of sub-specialization (*profession*), but also on the possibility of this (*either artificial or enforced*) segregation between two types of experts becoming (*eventually and inevitably*) to operate as a self-destructing mechanism for both parties (*i.e. architects and interior designers*). The basis of these arguments underlies beneath the fact that; firstly, both interior and exterior of architecture is currently dominated by the mass-

products / techniques of the building industry, and secondly, all of these efforts in a competitive climate between the rival parties eventually serve tothe flourishment of the real-estate industry. Therefore, the paper intends to raise the question in regard to; the role of feodal / imperial / capitalist / neo-liberalist policies, their monopolising dynamics and their (*economical, political, ideological, social, cultural, philosophical*) ramifications in the (*recurrent*) creation of the myth of 'interior-exterior split' in architecture.

This paper, which not only approaches architecture through the lens of correlating society and nature but also seeks to generate new questions, aims first to address one of architecture's self-perpetuating clichés and seconly to challenge it by introducing alternative lines of inquiry. The focus is the familiar cliché tied to the common question posed to architects by lay-people (*particularly in peripheral and developing nations*) upon learning of their profession: "Interior or exterior?" The common reply of architects to these people and their question — "Does architecture have an inside or outside? Of course I am just the (*exterior*) architect...!" — and their tendency to disparage people's question (*as an ignorant one and associating the questioners with lower social classes*) constitute the starting point of the discussion of this paper. The goal is to explore the concepts and practices underlying both this rampant question and the discomfort it generates within the architectural community.

This societal perception and the disproportionate discomfort it evokes will be examined by exploring both the conceptual framework in which architecture has enwrapped itself, and the tangible (*though often unacknowledged*) practices that reveal the erosion of this cliché (of '*architecture covers interior anyway*'). The discussion will be grounded in the realities observed in architectural (*and interior design*) practice, especially through the lens of fundamental architectural concepts such as "clothing", "skin" and "shell" with a particular focus on key historical turning points. By situating these conceptual and practical developments within the context of contemporary political and economic systems, this paper will argue that the cliché in question ('*interior or exterior architect?*') has long since been drained of its degrading meaning.

II. Interior-Exterior Split in the Context of Architecture as a Matter of 'Skin'

Two fundamental questions can initiate this discussion. First; why is architecture widely perceived as a profession defined by an inside and outside? Second; why does architecture as a discipline find this divided perception troubling? A follow-up to the second question might be; why does architecture accuse those who hold this perception of (*so-called*) 'ignorance'?

This essay argues that the discipline of architecture itself is primarily responsible for this divided perception and that this condition arises from the cultural (*even philosophical*), economic, and political contexts architecture (*as both a discipline and community*) has embedded itself in. According to this argument, the split between inside and outside is inevitable (*in current socio-economical context*), and the guilt stemming from the inconsistency between the discourse and actions of those responsible for this split manifests as a form of class-based condescension toward those who articulate this duality — highlighting the class-based character of architectural discourse. The elitist attitude of architectural circles manifests itself with their contemptuous and even insulting tone, not only towards those who ask about the 'interior-exterior split', but also towards their colleagues (*interior designers / interior architects*) who are specialised on the 'interior' component of architectural space. Such a discrimating tone of response to a genuine question is, in fact, an indicator both confirming and (*actually*) confessing the class-bound ideological content of the matter of the 'split'. Such a downgrading tone is; firstly, the indication of architects' ignorance towards the naked truth (as far-sightedly distilled by the general public), and secondly, the beacon of their own ignorance and contempt towards the majority of general public.

This mythical rupture (*inside-outside and interior-exterior*) can be traced back to the concept of "clothing," which also encompasses the relationality between society and nature. As seen in Semper's *The Four Elements of Architecture* (2010 [1850]), this concept can be considered as one of the fundamental theoretical elements explaining the interior-exterior distinction, particularly from a historical perspective. Gottfried Semper (1803–1879), one of the most prominent theorists and practitioners of 19th Century German architecture, discusses in *Style* (2004 [1860]) his "principle of clothing" (*Bekleidungsprinzip*), identifying the roots of the modern perception of architecture as a dual system of inside and outside.

Semper's notion of the "principle of clothing, skin and cladding" refers to the concealment and masking of structural and tectonic elements. This points to the beginnings of a rupture from a holistic understanding of the environment — an approach that predates industrialization and capitalism, and which will be discussed further in the following section. Citing Semper, Şentürk (2015) notes that such masking has historically been almost the only way to transcend the limitations of materiality and thus to achieve a sense of freedom. While this idea of clothing and cladding has cultural roots in many cultural traditions — where walls are seen as more than mere load-bearing elements — it's also true that values like material honesty, tectonic integrity, and simplicity, formed the essence of spatial existence in many of these cultures. Nonetheless, the act of clothing and cladding, as pointed out by Semper and harshly criticized at the time for being unconventional, gradually became inevitable as the split between inside and outside deepened. Indeed, Şentürk also states that even those who fundamentally curse

cladding have secretly found themselves compelled to produce 'covered' surfaces of building facades and of conventional structural elements.

Architecture has not only become an activity focused on the construction of "skins" but as can be observed in both the modern and post-modern periods, the growing emphasis on designing these skins has surpassed the focus on "space" — architecture's true essence. This marked the beginning of a separation between interior and exterior (*partially conceptual, but primarily practical*). Although radical in essence, this separation may also be seen as inevitable given the surrounding conditions. Economic inputs, political climates, and the philosophical and cultural currents that paralleled them have pushed architects toward the skin — toward form, its appearance, its aesthetics and perception, its imagery. So, the 'skin' has become a fetish object by itself at the peril of (*interior*) 'space' – the overlooked essence of architecture. Architects, swept up in this current, have embraced it enthusiastically, redefining their professional identity within the new global order (Wigley, 2001). Therefore, it would not be wrong to suggest that architecture (*as a profession, institution, organisation and community*) itself is liable for this legendary 'split' in the first place.

Inevitably, this has created a vacuum regarding architecture's core concern: space. However, acknowledging the existence of this vacuum would be difficult for those who claim to have once embraced a holistic view of the environment. On the one hand, architecture is reluctant to surrender its dominance over 'space' and thus, attempts to legitimize its presence through increasingly discursive frameworks which advocate the view of architecture is inclusive of interior as *a-priori*. On the other hand, its energy and practice are directed outward — toward the skin. This dual (*and self-contradictory*) strategy is, in essence, a class-based endeavor within the architectural field. It is, therefore, no surprise that the accusation and disparagement of those who casually (*and quite righteously*) ask the simple yet revealing question — "interior or exterior?" — serves as a class-based act of punishment.

When we begin with the concepts of skin, covering, and clothing, we inevitably encounter phenomena such as fashion and fetishism. Wigley's (2001) discussion of the covering phenomenon in architecture — especially his interpretation of its relationship with our mental interiority — can be associated with Cheng's (2011) analysis of Josephine Baker's stage performances, where she explores the connections between skin and fetishism. Cheng's argument about how the skin leads us away from essence and content toward fetish is certainly applicable to architecture too, as she herself suggests. We will delve into the philosophical dimensions of this captivity to the fetish — how we move away from architecture's core, space (*and perhaps from its real problems*), and become fixated on a constantly changeable garment, namely the architectural envelope that implies existence of both its inside and outside.

While Semper's theory of covering and clothing helps us explain this phenomenon, Ekici (2016) explores the architectural reflections of the concept of "skin" (*and thus the issue of covering*) from a parallel perspective, linking it to the concept of 'hygiene'. In order to explain this point, Ekici refers to Pettenkofer, a marginal figure in late 19th Century architectural history and physics, also known as the father of experimental hygiene. By examining Pettenkofer's discussions, which link breathing to hygiene, skin, clothing, and housing, Ekici traces a trajectory — from 19th Century hygienic membranes to today's high-performance ecological smart building skins (Schittich, 2006) — that outlines architecture's subtle departure toward the exterior from the interior. At this stage, tracing the historical development of this separation in practice — especially in relation to the theoretical split we have discussed thus far — adds greater meaning to the central argument of this essay.

III. From a Holistic Environment to the Separation of Interior and Exterior in Architecture

In its essence, architecture is an act of sheltering, and by the same token a matter of interiority. In contexts where architecture was directly produced by its users collectively and had not yet been commodified (*in terms of the real-estate and construction industries*), it is fair to speak of a holistic living environment — both socially, physically and spatially — where distinctions between public and private, interior and exterior, artificial and natural, were relatively minimal. One could argue that architecture naturally served this integrated existence. From cave dwellings carved into rock to vernacular architecture produced directly through local materials and craftsmanship by local people, this type of architecture — perhaps not even worthy of being labeled then as "architecture" — was far detached from today's inside-outside divide discussed above. Compared to present-day cities composed of disjointed buildings (*both literally and metaphorically*), the architecture of traditional cities — more homogenous, seemingly carved from a single substance or composed of nearly identical units creating a sense of unity — was produced by builders (*craftsmen or even ordinary people building their own homes*) who were unaware of terms like "architecture" let alone debates over its interior and exterior. Architecture, as a distinct profession, only emerged when it separated itself from the broader field of engineering in the early 19th century (*just like the interior design recently seperated itself as a profession from architecture in mid 20th Century*).

Nolli's map of Rome describes an urban continuity in which interior spaces are extensions of the exterior (*and were constructed and used as such*). In *Collage City*, Rowe & Koetter (1978) critique the modern city and compare Nolli's map with Le Corbusier's Saint-Dié plan in France, the Parma plan in Emilia-Romagna, and the Plaza Mayor in the Spanish city of Vitoria. Alongside Le Corbusier's 1925 *Plan Voisin*, these examples illustrate

how far the 20th Century city has diverged from the holistic urbanism of traditional cities — particularly in terms of the interior-exterior continuum.

While the clearest breaking points of this separation are the mid-19th Century and 20th Century modern architecture, another important early rupture — one that reveals the deep roots of capitalism — can be found in the architecture of the late 16th and early 17th Century European aristocracy, which expressed itself through the Baroque aesthetics. This period mirrors today's consumption frenzy and design exuberance. For instance, Borromini's San Carlino Church from the early 17th century presents an exceptional case within the aforementioned holistic urban fabric by displaying a differentiation between interior and exterior — a condition that came to typify later eras. The articulation of the façade in this atypical example bears a striking resemblance to contemporary architectural practices, especially to the design approach of 'F.Gehrian' architects, who treats the façade as a distinct and celebrated entity. Given the political and economic parallels between these periods (*especially in light of the following discussions*), this architectural continuity serves as a compelling embodiment of the article's central argument.

The divorce between the exterior shell (*facade*) and architectonic structure of buildings in the Baroque Period can be related to the ostentatious way of life for the bourgeois class of the society (*which also provide the patronage for art & architecture*) in the same era. So, after the extravagant buidings of Antiquity and Imperial eras (*and to a certain extent, Renaissance "facadism" in the period of feodal city states*), Baroque era and movement can be considered as the first and the most apparent example of the emphasis given to shell/skin/envelope and thus, of the split between building and the facade as well as between interior and exterior. A similar break-up between facade and the building was later going to be observed in the (*neo-revivalist*) context of the 19th Century whereby industrialist elite would live a very different life from the large working class of the society. Obviously, certain associations can be found with present day (*neo*)facadism in architecture in an era of social (*class-based*) segregation under the influence of prevailing neo-liberalist socio-economic and socio-political order. Therefore, it is possible to see the recurrent pattern of the interior-exterior split in architecture in the historical periods that are characterised with social imbalance, inequality, and a noticeable increase in luxurious expenditure or over-consumption by rich minorities of society while the rest is almost struggling for survival. Interestingly enough, fascinating developments in architectural theories (*such as Semper's 'Cloth' or Venturi's 'Decorated Shed'*), approaches (*such as 'facadism', 'revivalism', 'historicism', 'eclecticism'*), constructional products/methods/techniques (*such as 'double-shell', 'curtain wall', 'cladding', 'double-skin envelope system', 'green envelopes', 'hi-tech envelopes' 'kinetic/intelligent skins / membranes'*) and also practices/precedents (*such as F. Borromini's 'San Carlo alle Quattro Fontane', J. Lavirotte's 'Lavirotte Apartment', T. Mayne's 'Cooper Union' or F. Gehry's 'Walt Disney Concert Hall'*) which (*non-accidentally*) promote the 'divide between exterior and interior' seem to have followed a parallel path, going hand-in-hand with the recursive social dynamics (*or sequential economic crises*) as if they were part of a greater narrative or of the same broader agenda. No matter how artistic or philosophical they all sound in disguise, the obvious and ultimate agenda was purely economical as much as political. Despite its speculative appearance, there seems an undeniable and suspicious coincidence in all these recurrent line of events which seems sufficient (*at least*) to develop new (*and controversial*) debates and arguments in regard to the theory of interior design.

IV. The Absolute Rupture of Inside and Outside in the Era of Modernist Architecture

As previously discussed, although the roots of the inside-outside rupture can be traced back to the Baroque period, its definitive and irreversible manifestation can arguably be linked to Modernism. Despite its discourse asserting principles of honesty — such as the façade being an expression of the interior space — modern architecture (*with the exception of sub-currents like Brutalism or Critical Regionalism*) was conceived around a logic that detached tectonics from both the space it enclosed and the façade that "covers" this tectonics to visualize the manifesto of a new architecture. However, this internal inconsistency — or rather intrinsic self-contradiction — is never confessed *per se*. Like all doctrinaire approaches fortified by the political and economic power of their time, Orthodox Modernism conceals its weaknesses, at least rhetorically.

One might argue that the first and most explicit manifesto of this inside-outside rupture is embodied in Le Corbusier's archetype of the 'Domino House' — he is, after all, regarded as the father of modern architecture. Proposed as a prototype for post-war mass housing production models — and thus, a design concept meant to stimulate both the construction industry and a stagnant post-war economy — the moment Corbusier introduced the *Domino House*, the already loosening ties between the interior and exterior of architecture began rushing irreversibly toward a definitive rupture. This first rupture was later going to be completed by Venturi's assertion on defining architecture (*or building*) as a 'Decorated Shed' which sanctified not only the act of 'clothing' but also the concepts and practices of 'skin/shell/envelope' in the strong winds of post-modernity. Aren't all the architectural products that populate our built environment today — ranging from the simplest to the most sophisticated — nothing more than derivatives of this archetype before their outer shells are "clothed" and their interiors "wrapped" according to the individual preferences of users (*or actually producers*)?

Before being dressed up by ('*external*') architects, photographed, theorized, labeled, and marketed with layers of meaning and conceptual burden, these buildings are essentially mere tectonic constructions — spatially descriptive in their bare materiality. What makes them subjects of architectural discourse and interpretation are the "skins" that clothe them, both inside and out. In other words, there were two types of skins; interior and exterior. By the same token, there were two types of architecture; interior and exterior. Those who praise the *Domino House* idea and continue to build its countless cheap variations have little right to feign surprise — or express indignation — over today's debate about whether "interior or exterior architecture really exists," or to dismiss the public's recurring question to these so-called superior beings (*all-inclusive architects*): "Are you an interior or exterior architect?"

V. Inside-Outside Rupture in the Contexts of Post-Modernist Image-Fetishism and the Spectacle

As architecture evolved in the post-war period, the consumption-driven climate of the Cold War and subsequent post-modern era, further nourished and empowered the rupture between inside and outside. In this context, concepts like "image culture" and the "society of the spectacle" — which glorify and legitimize this rupture — have intensified the sanctification of the façade as an independent object (*a mask, a costume etc.*). Interior facade had no exemption from the glorfication of exterior facade. In this new wave of consumer frenzy — arguably the first since the Baroque—the façade is once again poised to become a consumer object. The intended consumer of this product is, undoubtedly, the building investor (*the owner*). And the designer of this marvellous product is, of course, the architect. But now, the architect has essentially become an *exterior architect*, although tortfeasors cannot and will not admit this. Internally, they sense the professional vacuum they have left behind and are aware of the emergence of a new profession (*interior design*) poised to fill it — and they instinctively take defensive measures.

The (*exterior*) architect, now intoxicated by the thrill and addiction of images and spectacle, has drifted away from architectural 'space'. Meanwhile, the *interior* (space) becomes the domain of the user — or more accurately, of the new professional to whom this responsibility has been delegated, as users have been deprived of the ability to construct their own shelters since the 18th Century. The *exterior* (façade) becomes the medium through which the architect and patron express themselves. It is now an entity of spectacle and a designer's signature. This elitist and bourgeois dynamic reached its peak in the 1980s. Toward the late 1990s, some architects — either to fill the resulting vacuum or realizing that images and spectacle could also be generated from within the shell — turned their focus inward (*becoming interior designer*), seizing the opportunity offered by the post-modern age. This shift infuriated the (*exterior*) architects who had previously dominated the spotlight on the outer face of the architectural coin, as a portion of the built environment "cake" had now been claimed by a new competitor: interior architects. Similarly, additional competitors, such as restoration specialists and landscape architects, have also stirred discomfort. Observing this trend, one can predict that more rivals (*new sub-professionals*) will emerge as the built environment's knowledge base continues to expand in parallel to the neo-liberalist economic policies which fuel the over-consumption as the spirit of the age neccessitates. Consequently, what will follow is an economic struggle for a larger slice (*share*) over that metaphorical cake — an issue we will address through the lens of economics shortly.

The early signs of this conflict manifest in architects, who regard themselves as distinguished members of an elite class within the current socio-political structure, belittling these new competitors. They organize to impose disciplinary constraints, legal-legislative measures and attempt to monopolize the 'cake'. Thus, when architects — who, as argued, have little right to do so — respond to the public's "interior or exterior?" question with "there's no such thing; it's all architecture," what they express is not just arrogance, but a veiled declaration of tyrannical intent: *"this cake is all mine. I'm not sharing it."* What lies behind this cliché is the public's capacity to perceive this naked reality in all its rawness; the reaction to this perception is nothing more than an attempt to cover up an unethical and ugly truth. The (*exterior*) architect, having once abandoned the 'space' in favor of spectacle and fame, now returns — only because a new consumable value has emerged — launching a legitimized, class-coded attack on those who arrived before them.

VI. Inside and Outside of the 'Skin'; An Archaic and Bankrupt Architectural Cliché

As becomes evident, the emphasis on the concept of *covering* — rooted in Semper's theory — and its manifestation in the architectural 'skin' has imprisoned architecture within the inside-outside cliché under current capitalist dynamics. Despite its lengthy and layered history, this binary status persists. The architectural community has yet to transcend the dichotomy — or the recurring cliché of "Are you into the inside or the outside?" Despite its praise for knowledge society, architecture as a discipline has not only colonised all social science methods and appropriated tools of the physical sciences under the guise of building physics, but has also monopolised every digital tool — from parametric design, virtual space and artificial intelligence to simulation software and the Maker Movement — for the benefit of itself.

Yet, despite the lack of its own distinctive scientific methodology (*aside from spatial organization and tectonic sensitivity*), the architectural domain resists recognising *interior architecture* as a growing and distinct

discipline — with its own knowledge base in material technology, detailing, acoustics, lighting, spatial psychology, colour & texture knowledge and many more (*which all address to the sensual needs of human as direct users of architectural space*). Ironically, this resistance persists even though architecture itself struggled painfully through the 19th Century to emancipate from engineering and claim its own disciplinary autonomy.

Still, this dichotomy cannot persist much longer. As we have discussed, it has become hollow and obsolete today. What we are witnessing are the final spasms of a certain group of (*exteriorized*) architects reacting to a shrinking slice of the 'pie'. Ultimately, the issue boils down to two interrelated dynamics: first, the exponential and uncontrollable expansion of knowledge (*which architects can no longer manage as easily as they used to*); second, the contraction of capital investment in the global construction industry. This duality has given birth to two off-shoots from within architecture itself: the interior and the exterior.

The expanding body of knowledge has long exceeded the grasp of a single profession, forcing architecture to split into sub-domains. Meanwhile, the construction industry, plagued by capital stagnation, has been artificially inflated — necessitating more professionals to absorb its investment load and maintain economic equilibrium. And so, new actors were created. However, having forgotten that they were brought into existence as tools for redistributing capital, these new white-collar actors — driven by greed — now set their eye on each other's share. Tragically, this greed leads to a loss of disciplinary identity and expertise. The interior architect, even before entering school, may ask whether they will have the authority/licence to sign off on an entire two-story building (*in peripheral/developing countries*). The (*exteriorised*) architect, meanwhile, have started to lack even basic understanding of staircases and tectonics, brushing aside such matters as "the engineer's job," scorning color and material issues, focusing instead on striking renders and sophisticated theoretical texts filled with pictograms and infographics — drifting ever farther from (f)actual issues of spatial design.

On the other hand, interior architects are being trained with an emphasis on spatial competence and conventional architectural knowledge, enabling them to fulfill their predicted roles within this divided field and claim their promised share of the pie.

Thus, as long as capitalism survives — despite its never-ending crises — it will continue to integrate these new actors and eventually dissolve the cliché, at least until capitalism itself collapses. When that day comes — however apocalyptic it may sound — this frenzy of technology and consumption will give way to basic needs and essential sheltering knowledge. Only then will the inside-outside duality be overcome, and we will probably return to the true and simple essence of spatial production. At that point, it will be worth examining in greater detail the impact of today's technological and informational 'explosion' on the inside-outside dichotomy.

VII. The Deep Divide of Inside-Outside through Technology-Covered Envelopes

It has been extensively discussed above that the cliché of inside and outside, which we are trapped within today, is underpinned by the rise of knowledge and, as a result, new technologies. Again, it was mentioned above that there was a time when architecture was indisputably regarded as the sole professsonal authority when it came to design. In a historical perspective, this corresponds to a very specific and limited period. This kind of egocentric professional understanding can certainly be contextualized in the architectural perspective of countries that secondarily consumed the climate of rapid and economical construction following World War II (*and the necessity to export this environmental template to other countries over time*). At that time, the architect, who was capable of designing everything from urban planning to furniture with limited materials and construction techniques, is no longer in possession of such capacity. Inevitably, the architect must now work together with other professionals. The spawning of professions, the division of labor among these sub-disciplines, the phasing and coordination of tasks have become indispensable components of today's economic system. Moreover, the building envelope is now woven by technology that releases brand-new products to the market each passing day. Especially considering the mass production diversity and consumption frenzy that characterize today's post-Fordist economy, rather than lamenting the inside-outside divide, it must be stated that architecture — which, by its own choices, has overtly made itself a servant of the system — is compelled to rapidly adapt to an economic (*and of course, political*) mechanism.

VIII. The Relationship Between the Phenomenon of 'Skin' in Architecture and the Socio-Economic System

The sectoral impacts of capitalism on the formation of the inside-outside divide were discussed above. Here, focusing on the design aspect, it is necessary to mention the tendency of (*externalized*) architects to design the envelope of buildings (*that is, the 'cover' or 'dress'*) as affirmers of capitalism. These new envelope designs, which exemplify this exclusive and privileged architectural tendency, are not only tools for some distinguished global capital groups to express themselves, but also carry the mission of affirming the dominant politico-economic system, legitimizing it, neutralizing potential critiques of the system, concealing and pacifying systemic conflicts, subtly and pleasurably getting this system accepted by the masses and individuals alike. Therefore, the (*externalised*) architect, through this described envelope design practice, also determines the physical-spatial environment (*i.e., the stage set*), which is one of the most persuasive components of the mentioned mission. As

Spencer (2016) points out, this new (*external*) architectural mentality — shaped by a sense of inevitability, uncriticizability, irresistibility, pseudo-progressivism, and the pleasure born from submission — serves to make the masses practically worship the capitalist system as if it were a dogmatic (*thus unquestionable, uncriticizable, unchangeable*) religion. Indeed, terms used to describe the economic and political functioning of capitalism, such as "smoother" and "more fluid", are also applied to this new architecture. For example, the photogenic buildings of architects such as Hadid, Gehry, and Mayne (*in which the dominance of exterior appearances requires no reminder*) mesmerize us with their smooth and fluid forms and trap us first physically and visually, then emotionally, and at last mentally. We end up admiring and surrendering to these buildings and the politico-economic conditions that created them — even though those conditions may be our own executioner in many ways. However, these kinds of exterior shells (*and their designers; the {externalized} architects*), through the visual illusions they create, legitimize the inside-outside divide created by capitalism and thus the total destruction of a holistic understanding of environment and society. For example, Spencer (2016) shows how FOA's design of the Meydan Shopping Mall, by co-opting the concept of an "accessible envelope," serves to domesticate the poor under the guise of publicness.

IX.   The Role of 'Property Ownership' in the Inside-Outside Divide

Another (*yet complementary*) mechanism of capitalism, the issue of "property", plays an important role in the inside-outside divide. Individual property is guaranteed by law, while public property — and therefore public space — is gradually eroding. While the properties of individuals making up the 'publicness' are confined to interiors, the urban space that once fully belonged to the public is now becoming the surfaces of advertisement and expression for large capital groups via building masses and facades (*i.e. outer shells*). Condominium laws define individuals' shares in public space in an abstract way via square meters and do not grant actual intervention rights. On the other hand, under the Law on Intellectual Property Rights, the architect's rights over interior spaces apart from the exterior shell are also abstractly limited. It can be argued that such legal frameworks, regulated by the legal leg of the capitalist system, essentially prepare the infrastructure for a clear division between private properties belonging to individuals in architecture, and the envelope properties belonging to the architect and the contractor.

Therefore, it is the capitalist system that has dictated this divide. What needs to be questioned is not the outcomes of this problematic split, but the larger picture that has caused this divide (*and the actors who enthusiastically facilitated it from the very beginning*).

X.   Practices Regarding the Inside and Outside of the Envelope

In line with the technical, economic, and political conditioning discussed above, the formation practices of the physical environment have already started to proceed along two separate tracks: inside and outside. The interior envelope is in constant flux, and this is precisely what makes the pie attractive. Shops that close down and are replaced with new ones, buildings whose functions are altered by vivid economic dynamics, and structures renewed through urban transformation/gentrification projects, all contribute to the frequent redesign of the interior shell and space, far more rapidly than structural tectonics would suggest. On the other hand, the exterior envelope is also no longer as static as it used to be. Because architecture, which has been squeezed into the outer shell, is also trying to expand its own pie. Sometimes due to visual appeal, sometimes due to the factor of aging, sometimes due to the need for new marketing surfaces, and sometimes due to environmental performance and ecological impulses, the exterior envelope is constantly being renewed. In many cities, we see buildings along main arteries shedding their skins every 5–10 years. On the other hand, the living environments in which we dwell — where housing architecture has long been trapped in a sea of stacked, repetitive units aimed at maximizing contractor profit — are dominated by a type of facade architecture that can be defined as "compensatory architecture," a futile effort to cover up this banality. Thus, let alone interior architecture, even exterior architecture has now become a distinct field of *de-facto* professional practice. The number of architectural firms that only design and produce building facades is not negligible. Departments or schools that are slowly emerging in "building envelope design" are signs that this field, like interior architecture, is on the verge of institutionalization.

XI.   Conclusion

In this article, it is discussed that the widespread perception which architecture has an inside and an outside — through Semper's concept of the "cover" or "skin" — and the discomfort that architects feel regarding this perception (*which, if shared by the wider public, may point to a reality beyond mere perception*). We explored the technical, economic, political, and cultural inputs behind this perception and the negative (*and defensive*) reaction to it. It is attempted to reveal the role that capitalism — as the dominant political and economic system — plays in the inside-outside split that occurs within architecture. The responsibility of the architect, who at that critical breaking point gradually laid out by history chose the outside, in this split — along with the sense of guilt

that stems from this choice, and the share that the architect's desire for power over (*interior*) space has in the reaction to this widespread perception — are examined in this paper.

Having explored the roots of the "interior - exterior" split in architecture, this paper navigated through not only theories, manifestoes, myths, rhetorics or various types of narratives and manuscripts reveal a corpus of dual arguments. One the one side of this duality the arguments which portray architecture as a unity of both interior and exterior can be found. On the other side of it, debates which postulate interior and exterior of architecture as different facets of a presumably unified entity. As a result of the scrutiny on the economical, political, ideological, social, cultural, philosophical, metaphysical lineage of the recursive divide between interior – exterior it can easily be suggested that there are recurrent (*and even cyclical*) patterns to come accross with this mythical split in architectural history. The circumstances which repetitively conditions these patterns seem to exhibit significant similarities in regard to the economic and political climates of each era. Although its causality can only be speculated, the common ground among these circumstances (*re-emerging in history*) can be associated with oscillations of spatial, social segregations, extremities, polarities, imbalances, inequalities, exploitations etc. in regard to class-based structures of societies. Nonetheless, existence of (*at least*) a certain type of relation between the conceptual split of interior from exterior and the concrete split of socio-economic classes in society is quite clear throughout the multi-faceted transformations along the time-line of pre-modernity / modernity / post-modernity.

It can be asserted that a certain set of defaults and cliches in architectural terminology such as (*building*) 'skin', 'shell' or 'envelope', has (*theoretically and practically*) played a major part in the scenario of splitting 'interior' from 'exterior'. It can be concluded that the Post-World-War idea of *Domino House* (*as a bare/exposed skeleton structure that define the interior space*) and the Post-Cold-War idea of *Decorated Shed* (*as a self-appointed 'clothing' that covers the skeleton structure*) were two leading figures in the 'spectacle' of architectural stage. The idea of "the fancy Decorated Shed wrapping the naked Domino House" was a vital instrument in legitimizing the 'interior-exterior' split. It was the paramount dream of building / construction industry; constructing the whole city with a simple post-and-lintel structures through their standardised and industrialised methods/techniques and cladding them all with the highly-engineered and patented 'building skins' that are not only developed merely in their own R&D labs/plants but also can solely be applied by their own experts with trade-marked skills for precision and accuracy. The idea of capital owners for materialising their ultimate dream was to exploit the mythical 'split' (*interior-exterior*) towards the absolute monopoly of shaping the physical built environment.

The long-term result has been the establishment of two (*derivative*) sub-expertise areas (*i.e. architecture and interior design*) whereby both parties were positioned against eachother in a highly competitive climate of running their art as business practices. This process inevitably turned into a territorial struggle to define their own boundaries of responsibility against the other. Nonetheless, this professional division, which perpetuates the 'interior-exterior' split, has eventually grown into a self-destructive dynamic that enabled building and real-estate sectors to dominate the whole field of built environment. Such a process, have obviously raised a reasonable doubt about the contribution of the feodal / imperial / capitalist / neo-liberalist line of policies, their common monopolising dynamics and their similar (*economical, political, ideological, social, cultural, philosophical*) ramifications in the (*recurrent*) creation of the myth of 'interior-exterior split' in architecture. Indeed, the split between interior and exterior, transpires as the spatial reprecussions of the troublesome social splits between; rich and poor, elite and layman, upper and lower class, distinguished and underprivileged, minority and majority, powerful and weak, perpetrator and victim, oppressor and oppressed. Within the framework of their reciprocal relationship, the more the social splits grow further, the more the spatial split (*and that of interior-exterior spaces and skins*) becomes harsher, darker and sharper.

At this point, which is the outcome of the capitalist formations to which architecture has surrendered itself, the concluding remark can be asserted as such: architecture indeed has both an inside and an outside as an inevitable and *de-facto* result of prevailing socio-political conditions, socio-economic circumstances and their supplementary cultural-philosophical determinants. There are both interior and exterior architects. Therefore, architecture's arrogance in attempting to dominate the environment on its own, is now on the verge of crumbling away. Thus, the 'value' of 'interior design' is rising up due to; its potential / capacity to address the disadvantaged segments of the social splits, its ability to touch their (*once-abandoned*) souls and remedy their (*once-ignored/denied*) spatial needs. For this reason, rather than focusing on and lamenting the consequences of this dichotomy, architecture (*as an epistemology, as a praxis and as a community*) will soon need; to question and self-criticise itself, to go back to the essentials of space as its *raison d'etre*, to turn toward an ethical struggle with the political-economic system that not only gave rise to this dichotomy in the first place but also to its heinous deceit at the peril of space and timeless values of society / virtues of humanity, and finally to start re-learning to fully collaborate with interor designer colleague(s) by prioritising people over clients.

References

[1]. Cheng, A. A. (2011). *Second skin: Josephine Baker & the modern surface*. Oxford University Press.
[2]. Ekici, D. (2016). Skin, clothing, and dwelling: Max von Pettenkofer, the science of hygiene, and breathing walls. *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, *75*(3), 281–298. https://doi.org/10.1525/jsah.2016.75.3.281
[3]. Forty, A. (2004). Transparency and illusion. In *Words and buildings: A vocabulary of modern architecture* (pp. 292–298). Thames & Hudson.
[4]. Leatherbarrow, D., & Mostafavi, M. (2002). *Surface architecture*. MIT Press.
[5]. Mallgrave, H. F. (2005). From object to envelope. In H. F. Mallgrave (Ed.), *Architectural theory: Volume II – An anthology from 1871–2005* (pp. 612–614). Blackwell.
[6]. Rowe, C., & Koetter, F. (1978). *Collage city*. MIT Press.
[7]. Schittich, C. (2006). *Building skins*. Birkhäuser.
[8]. Semper, G. (2010). *The four elements of architecture and other writings* (H. F. Mallgrave & W. Herrmann, Eds.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1851)
[9]. Semper, G. (2004). *Style in the technical and tectonic arts; or, practical aesthetics* (H. F. Mallgrave, Trans.). Getty Research Institute. (Original work published 1860)
[10]. Şentürk, L. (2015). Unutulmuş bir aykırı: Gottfried Semper. *XXI, ExLibris*. https://xxi.com.tr/i/unutulmus-bir-aykiri-gottfried-semper
[11]. Spencer, D. (2016). *The Architecture of Neoliberalism: How Contemporary Architecture Became an Instrument of Control and Compliance*. Bloomsbury Academic.
[12]. Wigley, M. (2001). *White walls, designer dresses: The fashioning of modern architecture*. MIT Press.