The British architectural historian, critic and writer, Reyner Banham, formed the concept of ‘unhouse’ in a period of intense technological transformation during the middle years of the twentieth century. His unhouse proposed the seemingly radical idea to dematerialize the walls and roof of a house, to remove the strictures that tie buildings, and thus people, to the encumbrances of what he termed: ‘the dead weight of domestic architecture’ (A Home is Not a House, 1965). This paper situates Banham’s unhouse within a category of dominant architectural and design theory that suppressed or diminished the importance of interior spaces and their relevance to human wellbeing and social relations. It suggests that in exploratory designs from contemporary projects, including Philips’ *Microbial Home* (2011) and Superflux’s *Mitigation of Shock* (2017-19) the designers create immersive experiences in future interiors, pointing to the development of new theories of design and domesticity in the twenty-first century.

Presented as an accumulation of technological services, combined with a ‘power membrane’, which would furnish a curtain of hot or cold air around the unhouse, the design proposed that the exterior building or fixed structure might be dispensed with altogether. Overall, however, the unhouse does not represent a freeing up of humans from their environment, with a low-cost, itinerant lifestyle choice. Rather, unhouse exists within theories or ideas that might be described as ‘anti-interiority’, themes that originate within Modernist architecture and that have been challenged over recent decades. Therefore,

(Reed, 1996; Colomina et al, 1996; Sparke, 2008; and Hollis, 2009). It argues that architecture and design in the twenty-first century, whilst acknowledging the prescient nature of Banham’s concept, takes into account the significance of social meanings that are ascribed to the interior. For example, in exploratory designs from more contemporary projects, such as Superflux’s *Mitigation of Shock* (2017-19) and Philips’ *Microbial Home* (2011), the designers seek to create immersive experiences in future interiors. Subjective encounters with internal spaces are incorporated with much thought and consideration for human patterns of behavior; of domestic rituals, self-sufficiency, comfort and embodied materiality. Banham (and others) sought to expunge the interior of historical ‘weightiness’ but in doing so merely avoided the intrinsic, and sometimes, difficult nature of our relationship to our interiors, and the ways in which physical interiors are not simply reflective of our personalities but are, importantly, the summation of our interiority as human beings. In Banham’s shift from ‘form and hardware to service and software’ (Whiteley, 2002), he essentially repeated Modernist attitudes to domestic life in the interior, as elements of our being that ought to be streamlined, updated and restructured, in an ‘almost universal expendability’ (A Home is not a House, 1965); in this sense, the ‘mess’ and subjectivity of life in the domestic interior was not an important factor in the delivery of new technologies. The opposite might be said today as domestic technologies are grounded in user experiences. Such ideas are explored in this paper that explains how new theories of interior space are emerging from architecture and design practices engaged with the many layered meanings of interiority, embracing the significance of ‘home’ that Banham and others appeared to overlook.