

*Critical Spatial Practices: Setting Out a Feminist Approach to some Modes and what Matters in Architecture*¹

Setting Out

This essay sets out some modes and matters, which are a current feature of the work of a wide range of practitioners and theorists from various disciplines, interested in feminism and architecture. It is an attempt to describe – here and now – the quality of the interdisciplinary encounter between architecture and feminism. The ‘here’ is defined by the place of writing – my own position as an intellectual who travels but is located within the academy in London, UK, and the ‘now’ by the time of writing – the end of the first decade of the twenty-first century. My setting-out notes some characteristic modes of working for feminists engaging with architecture, and in so doing also draws attention to specific matters of concern. It is not intended to be an overview survey or a detailed analysis: but rather to put in place some markers, which highlight several particular thematics and their relation to one another. This setting out has therefore a certain precision, but also selectivity: it describes work that I have encountered directly, right here, right now, and which I consider to offer a critical feminist alternative to conventional architectural practice.

Before starting to set things out in the here and now, I’d like to take a step back to the there and then, to 1999, to a collection of essays, which I co-edited with Iain Borden and Barbara Penner. This book, *Gender, Space, Architecture*, aimed to provide a detailed map of the shifts in the debate around feminism and architecture over a forty-year period, from the 1970s, when (arguably) feminist debate in architecture first emerged, to the 1990s, when discussions concerning the relationship between gender and space gained theoretical strength in the academy.² At that time there were a number of collections on gender, feminism and architecture, all of them fascinating, but none of them providing an overview of the subject area. *Gender, Space, Architecture* attempted to address that gap and provide an interdisciplinary approach which located architecture’s relation with feminism (and vice versa of course) in a broader territory which explicitly acknowledged the ways in which anthropology, art history, cultural studies, film theory, geography, psychoanalysis and philosophy had provided useful tools and models for critiquing architectural culture – design, theory and history.

While the other edited collections of the time had in common a multifaceted nature, composed of specially commissioned essays,³ *Gender, Space, Architecture* comprised a collection of

existing seminal texts organised both chronologically and thematically and structured into three parts. 'Section 1: Gender' introduced key debates in the development of feminism, women's studies and gender theory over the past century. 'Section 2: Gender, Space' covered different ways of thinking about these terms from alternative academic positions, such as anthropology, cultural studies, geography, philosophy and psychoanalysis and the different ways that gendered representations had been produced and received in different cultural and social practices – including writing, painting and dwelling. 'Section 3: Gender, Space, Architecture' consisted of chapters largely drawn from inside the discipline of architecture which dealt with considerations of different forms of architectural practice – design, history and theory. While Sections 1 and 3 offered two historical perspectives on how feminist thinking had changed over time, outside architecture, in the former, and then inside architecture, in the latter, Section 2 had a spatial rather than historical quality to its epistemological framework, and attempted to *map* the variations in debate across the disciplines across space rather than through time.

Gender, Space, Architecture looked at the series of changes architecture's engagement with gender difference had undergone, from the earlier more overtly politicized discourse of feminism(s), where some, taking a liberal position, argued for equal representation in architecture, and others, taking a more radical approach, called for the overturning of the patriarchal profession of architecture and its replacement in the 1990s by a new form of feminist practice. Through the course of the 1990s feminist research in architecture itself shifted understandings of the role of theory in architecture, from an early position where theory tended to be generated from inside architecture and operate as a form of 'how-to-do-it' or design prescription, to a later position in which the theoretical tools came from outside architecture, from critical theory, and offered possibilities for the critique of design methodologies from intellectual positions generated elsewhere, connecting architecture not only to production, but also to reproduction through representation, consumption, appropriation and occupation.

The work of feminist architectural practices such as muf in the United Kingdom, to whom I will return later, and the one-time Liquid Incorporated in the United States, strived to relate feminist theory to architectural design, built practice to written text, and dealt with issues of femininity and decoration, relations of looking and the materiality of fluids.⁴ The drawn and written projects of American architect and critic, Jennifer Bloomer were highly influential in this respect.⁵

Bloomer's work aimed to reveal the insufficiency of logical and rational structures such as spoken language to explain the world, and instead brought into operation the irrational and subversive elements in written texts – the feminine. Bloomer's work demonstrated that the feminine can be a radical element in architectural practice. Drawing parallels between the creation of a building, assumed to be a clean act of control and precision, and the mess of childbirth, Bloomer questioned the gender of creativity. Through her dirty drawings and her incorporation of parts of the female anatomy – breasts, milk, fluids, blood, hatching, udders – into architecture, Bloomer generated a critique of the sterility of the architectural drawing process. The feminine in her work was to be found in the so-called slippage of words, for example, the term 'big jugs' placed within an architectural context, suggested many things, including large breasts, but also the role of the feminine and female body as a container or empty signifier used to represent patriarchal ideologies. This type of feminist work influenced a number of other architectural design projects, which, drawing on theoretical concerns, stimulated new forms of design, from the choosing of site to the articulation of services.⁶

Another important aspect of feminist work in architecture in the late 1990s which also tested architecture's professional and disciplinary boundaries, was demonstrated through the projects of architects who developed an artistic aspect of their practice, such as Maya Lin, or collaborated with artists and other spatial practitioners in the public spaces of the city.⁷ Collaborating with those operating through other modes of spatial practice, for example in dance, film, art and writing, provided architecture with new feminist spatial tactics and strategies, where the role of audience, user and critic became increasingly vital to the construction of subjectivity through aesthetic and spatial processes.

Feminist French philosopher Luce Irigaray has argued that if women are not speaking subjects in the existing symbolic order, then the only way for women to represent themselves is through an acknowledgement of this condition – through mimicking or parodying their objectified position.⁸ Architect Elizabeth Diller addressed this issue through a project, which showed how feminist critiques of women's role as domestic labourers could be used to inspire creativity in architecture.⁹ Diller's project involved a complex choreography, where, by performing a series of folding movements similar to origami a number of shirts were ironed into perfectly useless forms. This project can be understood as

a parody of the precision of housework and a reworking of the skills of the housewife for a new function: feminist architectural design.

In working across the boundary between theory and practice, and between architecture and other disciplines, these significant and influential feminist projects of the 1990s point to certain matters of concern, specifically critiques of disciplinary boundaries and procedures informed by a political concern with subjectivity. Their work suggests new modes of enquiry and action, which have since been developed through current endeavors, moving from providing a gendered analysis of architecture and its multiple forms of representation, to the production of work inside and outside the academy where subjects, selves and spaces are understood to be performed and constructed rather than simply represented.

It is over a decade now since the publication of *Gender, Space, Architecture*, and it is clear that much has changed. The rise of interdisciplinary and practice-led research in the UK, accompanied by a more general shift in focus from theory to practice, has produced a state of play where the work of contemporary feminist practitioners interested in architecture is located at sites of encounter between different spatial disciplines. Such work highlights an interest not only in the end product, but in the process of design itself, pointing to the importance of the dialogue between theory and practice in architecture. In *Gender, Space, Architecture* I called this mode of operation, 'feminist architectural praxis', but here I am more interested in thinking about the feminist characteristics of critical spatial practice, for two reasons. First, because the emphasis on interdisciplinary perspective needs to be strengthened in order to accommodate the various forms of emergent criticality in contemporary feminism, and for me the term 'spatial' signifies a more expanded field than 'architectural'. Second, because the term 'praxis' has a very precise technical meaning in Marxist literature, and although I do want to retain a critique of capitalism here, I feel more comfortable using the phrase 'critical practice', which also draws on a Marxist tradition, but that of the revisionist work of the early Frankfurt School, whose practice of 'critical theory' as a reflective and emancipatory activity I go on to discuss in more depth below.

This essay will now go on to set out in more detail certain feminist aspects of contemporary critical spatial practice. I will suggest that specific terms and concepts, processes and modes of analytic enquiry and interpretation, as well as aspects of critical and creative production appear across the work of a wide range of feminist practitioners in and outside architecture. So

following this introduction and the subsequent definition of the term critical spatial practice, the essay offers an account of five thematics I have noted in the current dialogue between feminism and architecture, which I consider to characterize a particularly feminist approach to critical spatial practice, and which feature as the location of original new research in academe and the profession: collectivity, interiority, alterity, performativity, materiality.

Critical Spatial Practice

If the past decade has seen a flourishing of activity in feminism and architecture, driven by interdisciplinary concerns, then one of the changes in knowledge and understanding this has produced has been a rethinking of the role of theory, from a tool of analysis to a mode of practice in its own right. I use the term 'theory' here not to refer to modes of enquiry in science through either induction or deduction but rather to critical theory,¹⁰ specifically because critical theories are forms of knowledge which are 'reflective' rather than 'objectifying' and take into account their own procedures and methods; they aim neither to prove a hypothesis nor prescribe a particular methodology or solution to a problem but to offer self-reflective modes of thought that seek to change the world.¹¹ I find it helpful to extend the key qualities of 'critical theory' encapsulated by the Frankfurt School to include the work of feminists and others whose thinking is also self-critical and desirous of social change – who seek to transform rather than simply describe.¹²

In a fascinating conversation between philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Michel Foucault that took place in 1972, Deleuze reveals quite directly, though certainly abstractly, how he comprehends a 'new relation between theory and practice'. Rather than understanding practice as an application of theory or as the inspiration for theory, Deleuze suggests that these 'new relationships appear more fragmentary and partial',¹³ and discusses their relationship in terms of what he calls 'relays': 'Practice is a set of relays from one theoretical point to another, and theory is a relay from one practice to another. No theory can develop without eventually encountering a wall, and practice is necessary for piercing this wall.'¹⁴

The Deleuzian view of the relationship between theory and practice as fragmentary and partial resonates with key concerns of a feminist approach to critical spatial practice, as does his notion that theory is 'not for itself': 'A theory is exactly like a box of tools. ... It must be useful. It must function. And not for itself. If no one uses it, beginning with the theoretician himself (who then ceases to be a theoretician), then the theory is worthless or the moment

is inappropriate.¹⁵ Much feminist practice in architecture and other related spatial disciplines, sometimes with explicit reference to Deleuze, has developed ways of working with the 'useful' aspect of theory, not necessarily from a pragmatic point of view, or in the mode of application, but rather through the practice of theory in a speculative manner – proactive and inventive. Deleuze notes that in its encounter with 'obstacles, walls and blockages' theory requires transformation into another discourse to 'eventually pass to a different domain'.¹⁶ In *The Point of Theory*, cultural historians and theorists, Mieke Bal and Inge E. Boer, also point to the productive aspects of theory, and argue that theory is a way of 'thinking through the relations between areas' and 'a way of interacting with objects'.¹⁷

'Theory' only makes sense as an attitude; otherwise the generalization of the very concept of 'theory' is pointless. Part of that attitude is the endorsement of interdisciplinarity, of the need to think through the relations between areas where a specific theory can be productive, and of the need to think philosophically about even the most practical theoretical concepts, so-called 'tools'.¹⁸

This transformational passage, of 'passing from one domain to another' (Deleuze) or 'thinking through the relations between areas' (Bal and Boer), offers the potential for change, and the possibility that an encounter with 'an other' brings; and as such has been and continues to be a key inspiration for a feminist project which combines critique and production.

A fascination with the critical, political and ethical possibilities of interdisciplinarity as the site of exchange between theory and practice has been the key stimulus to the work of many feminists. Over the past ten years this term's status has changed dramatically, from occupying the margins, to currently taking up centre stage of government and funding body discourse in the UK at least, in ways, which sometimes bear little relation to the site of its genesis. So it is worth saying a little bit here about how I understand the nature of feminism's affinity with interdisciplinarity and how this relates to the critical derivation of this term.

In both academic and arts-based contexts, the term interdisciplinarity is often used interchangeably with multidisciplinary, but I understand the terms to mean quite different things. Multidisciplinary research for me describes a way of working where a number of

disciplines are present but maintain their own distinct identities and ways of doing things; whereas in interdisciplinarity research individuals operate between, across and at the edge of their disciplines and in so doing question the ways in which they usually work. This can occur when one individual's work moves from one discipline to another, and it can also occur in collaborative work when individuals from different disciplines work with one another getting closely engaged in the procedures and ideologies and structure each other's research paradigms in order to question and develop them.

It is possible to describe this kind of work as having a spatial patterning (in terms of critical spatial practice) that prioritizes horizontal actions (surveying a field, examining the fissures, boundaries, folds, overlaps, tears and rips – the points where disciplines come apart, and the places where they come together) over the vertical procedures favoured by traditional research (going in depth into a subject). I have often understood my own work in terms of what it means to travel outside my discipline into another in order to provide a new vantage point, a chance to understand one discipline from the perspective offered by another.

In exploring questions of method or process that discussions of interdisciplinarity and the relationship between theory and practice inevitably bring to the fore, Julia Kristeva has argued for the construction of 'a diagonal axis':

Interdisciplinarity is always a site where expressions of resistance are latent. Many academics are locked within the specificity of their field: that is a fact . . . the first obstacle is often linked to individual competence, coupled with a tendency to jealously protect one's own domain. Specialists are often too protective of their own prerogatives, do not actually work with other colleagues, and therefore do not teach their students to construct a diagonal axis in their methodology.¹⁹

In my view, engaging with this diagonal axis demands that we call into question what we normally take for granted, that we question our methodologies, the way we do things, and our terminologies, the words we give to the things we do.

The construction of 'a diagonal axis' is necessarily a difficult business. Kristeva's phrase 'expressions of resistance' points to the unconscious operations at work in interdisciplinary

practice.²⁰ And cultural theorist Homi Bhabha also describes the encounter between disciplines in psychoanalytic terms as an ‘ambivalent movement between pedagogical and performative address’ – suggesting that we are both attracted by and fearful of the interdisciplinary.²¹

It is precisely for this reason that I am a passionate advocate for interdisciplinarity; because interdisciplinary projects are for me both ethical and political – interdisciplinary work is difficult – not only critically and intellectually, but also emotionally and psychically. In demanding that we exchange what we know for what we don’t know, and give up the safety of competence for the dangers of inability, the transformational experience of interdisciplinary work produces a potentially destabilising engagement with dominant power structures allowing the emergence of new and often uncertain forms of knowledge.

The aim of such work is to question dominant processes that seek to control intellectual and creative production, and instead generate new resistant forms and modes of knowledge and understanding. It seems to me that this is why an interdisciplinary approach, as I have defined it here, is crucial for feminism. Interdisciplinarity does not, I argue, reflect a desire to work to existing standards, rather it is the kind of transformative activity that intellectual and creative life requires to critique and question such ‘norms’.

It is only through the interdisciplinary, that the opposition between history/theory/criticism (or activities which write about architecture) and design (or activities which produce architecture) can be reformulated as an interaction or productive exchange. Within academia, the rise in what has been termed ‘practice-led/-based research’²² as well as the influence of the writings of Henri Lefebvre and Michel de Certeau on spatial practice, has produced an understanding of practice as a process which occurs not only through the design of buildings but also through the activities of using, occupying and experiencing them, and through the mode of writing and imaging used to describe, analyze and interrogate them. This has allowed architectural design to be understood in a more extended way, and has thus opened architecture out to fascinating engagements with other creative disciplines, particularly art, design, film, performance, poetics, theatre. At the same time, the realm of professional architectural practice has seen the rise of collaborative and interdisciplinary work across art and architecture, where the constructing of relationships between disciplines and a focus on the process as well as the product of design has started to play a key role and shape debate in the shaping of the public realm.

In Michel de Certeau's discussion of spatial practices, he uses the terms strategy and tactic. For de Certeau, strategies seek to create places that conform to abstract models; whereas tactics do not obey the laws of places.²³ While for Henri Lefebvre, spatial practices, along with representations of space and spaces of representation, form a trialectical model where space is produced through three inter-related modes.²⁴ For Lefebvre, spatial practices can be understood in terms of perception and representations of space in terms of conception. Lefebvre also makes a careful distinction between representations of space and spaces of representation; the first he sees as operations which involve a systematized set of abstract and dominant codes, the second as the spaces of resistance, where invention and imagination flourish.

It is possible to draw connections between de Certeau's strategies and Lefebvre's representations of space on the one hand, and de Certeau's tactics and Lefebvre's spaces of representation on the other, and suggest a distinction between those practices (strategies) that operate to maintain and reinforce existing social and spatial orders, and those practices (tactics) that seek to critique and question them. I favour such a distinction and have called the latter – 'critical spatial practice' – a term which serves to describe both everyday activities and creative practices which seek to resist the dominant social order of global corporate capitalism.²⁵

In the context of this particular collection of essays, it is pertinent now to consider whether there is a set of particular qualities, which together or apart might characterize a specifically feminist approach to critical spatial practice. I suggest that the following five themes – collectivity, interiority, alterity, materiality, performativity – start to hint at the subject matters that resonate with feminists as well as modes of operation that feature strongly in a predominantly feminist mode of spatial practice.

Collectivity

[insert image 2.1]

In Hanley, in 1998, muf won an open competition set up by Stoke City Council with the Public Art Commissioning Agency. muf's brief was to make a lifting barrier to prevent illegal traffic entering Hanley town centre as part of a larger urban regeneration project. In

dialogue with the council planner at an initial stage of the project, the brief was opened out to reveal how 'art can contribute to a safer, more social environment'.²⁶ The proposal was to make two ceramic benches in close collaboration with Armitage Shanks from a design generated by muf. The Stoke area has a strong tradition of ceramic production, today branching out into sanitary ware, and this was the inspiration for the design of the bench, ceramic patterned with oversized fragments of a blue dinner plate design positioned among white birches and roses. Projected overhead, in close physical proximity to the benches, a video showing portraits of people's faces, was a documentation of the design process and underscored the benches' role in tracing the relationships between the various people who produced the work, as well as their position as prompts for future conversations between those who lived and worked around them about the site and its culture of ceramic production: 'We wanted to reveal this as the place where the hands of the person you sit next to on a bus or pass in the street are the hands of the person who shaped the plate from which you eat your dinner.'²⁷

As an architectural practice, muf's work, also included elsewhere in this book, has made influential and inspirational contributions to feminist architecture over the past twenty years, while never (at least almost never!) referring to themselves as feminists. There was a period in the first decade of the twenty-first century when muf was frequently criticized in mainstream architectural discourse for not producing any 'architecture', but this was because the discourse was unable to recognize architecture as the production of anything other than stand alone object-buildings. muf's very mode of operation continues to evolve and invent new feminist approaches to critical spatial practice precisely because its way of working is itself a critique of architectural design methodologies that emphasize form and object making. muf's working method highlights the importance of exchange across art and architecture, the participation of users in the design process and the importance of collaborating with other producers. For muf, the architectural design process is not an activity that leads to the making of a product, but is rather the location of the work itself. As one architect member of muf comments in reference to an artist colleague: 'There is a sharp contrast with what Katherine [Clarke] has taught me – that the conclusion is unknown – with the deceptive reassurances of architects who begin by describing a conclusion.'²⁸

muf's methodology is established out of a critique of the brief, and through the ensuing development of a dialogue between clients, artists, architects and various other material

fabricators, between those who produce the work and those who use it. In architecture, to position a building as a 'methodology' rather than as the end result of the method or process that makes a building, is a radical proposition. This approach to practice, that the process is the product, is familiar to those working in the field of fine art, for whom the terms 'social sculpture' and 'relational aesthetics' are common place, and where it is not hard to consider the making of relationships or the processes of materialization to convey aesthetic values, but architecture and other built environment disciplines are still challenged by the idea that aesthetic values might not only be object-driven but also related to time, process and subjectivity.²⁹ There are many collectives current in art practice, but although, perhaps because, architecture is produced by numerous people, the collaborative qualities of design tend to be normalized as part of day-to-day practice, and are rarely raised as part of a critical discourse.³⁰ In the 1970s and 1980s there was evidence of socialist design build collectives which operated to critique the capitalism system of building production, the feminist architectural cooperative Matrix was part of this tradition at its outset.³¹ The early 1990s saw the rise of various practices, such as muf, but also fat and Fluid, which highlighted their collaborative intent by choosing non-proper nouns as names to challenge the use of the name of the leading director as usual single architectural signature of authorship, and currently there are in operation at least two fascinating versions of a particularly feminist collective practice: FATALE and taking place.³²

Interiority

[insert image 2.2]

The philosophy of deconstruction developed by Jacques Derrida has allowed us to critique binary thinking and understand how the hierarchical relationship often assigned to two terms in a pair is not natural or pre-given but a social construction that can change according to how we are positioned. In a binary model, everything that one is, the other cannot be, thus limiting the possibility of thinking of two terms together. Such a model operates hierarchically, where one of the two terms is placed in a dominant position. Derrida's project aims to expose the ways in which binary systems allow things to be only 'like' or 'not like' the dominant category and replaces such prevailing intellectual norms with new formulations.³³ The radical move deconstruction offers is to think 'both/and' rather than 'either/or', putting deferrals and differences into play and suggesting instead

‘undecideability’ and slippage.³⁴ Feminist theorist Diane Elam has observed that Derrida’s understanding of ‘undecideability’ is not indeterminate but rather a ‘determinate oscillation between possibilities’ and argues that by refusing to choose between one and another such a position offers a political potential.³⁵

Feminist critique has been particularly effective in mobilizing the possibilities of Derridean deconstruction in architecture, to allow a thorough and ongoing critique of a number of binary oppositions, but most specifically the separate spheres or the ‘public-private’ division of gendered space manifest in different cultures at various historical periods. This work has drawn attention to the spaces both marginalized within gendered binaries in mainstream architectural discourse such as the domestic and the interior, and/or positioned as the term which exceeds such a binary distinction, such as the margin, the between, the everyday, the heterotopic and the abject.³⁶

The interior and the domestic have been perhaps the most thoroughly explored of these ‘other spaces’ as they have both been directly associated with the private sphere, and as such subordinated to the public city, in both patriarchal and capitalist cultures, and within the discourse of modernity. There is a huge feminist literature, which critiques the separate spheres, and revalues the private sphere, but what is significant in this newer work, is the lack of defensive positioning. The arguments are not necessarily foregrounded in the separate spheres debate, nor launched from a specifically feminist position, and often forge alliances with texts that are not part of the feminist lineage.³⁷

The research on the interior has a different resonance, with, I think, a unique set of reasons surrounding its current emergence. First, the newfound confidence of interior design or interior architecture, a professional and academic discipline, which has long been marginalized in relation to architecture.³⁸ Mark Taylor and Julieanna Preston’s reader *Intimus*, for example, sketches out an intellectual context for interior design and architecture, which celebrates its difference from the main stream profession, and in so doing draws on a rich and far more densely textured field of reference.³⁹ Preston’s own work as an architecture-artist engages with the interior through a wonderfully rich range of sculptural work, which has transformed through several stages, one of which involved physically working into standard modularized building materials to reveal their unique and often sensual interiors.

Second, the interior – as has been pointed out by Charles Rice – is both a space and an image,⁴⁰ and as Rice so eloquently discusses, its emergence in the bourgeois culture of late-nineteenth century Europe, links it closely to the birth of psychoanalysis as a discipline. This is a subject explored in relation to writing practice by both Diane Fuss and Victoria Rosner.⁴¹ The significance of current interest in the interior might then be understood then in terms of the position it occupies as the site of convergence between space and subjectivity, place and psyche.

In visual and spatial culture, feminists have drawn extensively on psychoanalytic theory to further understand relationships between the spatial politics of internal psychological figures and external cultural geographies.⁴² The field of psychoanalysis explores these various thresholds and boundaries between private and public, inner and outer, subject and object, personal and social in terms of a complex understanding of the relationship between ‘internal’ and ‘external’ space. The work of Elizabeth Grosz and Steve Pile has been particularly influential in this area,⁴³ as have the writings of key Australian feminist philosophers, such as Moira Gatens and Genevieve Lloyd, whose thinking has revealed, from a feminist perspective, the spatial qualities of mainstream philosophy. One of the most interesting forms of critical spatial practice emerging today continues this feminist challenge to conventional spatial epistemologies, and located in Australia, seeks to forge relations between the separated professions of interior and landscape architecture. Informed perhaps by the extent of Australia’s own enormous interior landmass, as well as its rich feminist traditions in philosophy and in public/land art, this extraordinarily creative vein of practice considers both ‘the interior’ as a form of landscape, but also external landscapes and masses to have interior qualities.⁴⁴

Alterity

[insert image 2.3]

The 1990s saw a rise in the relevance and pertinence of identity politics focusing on class, gender, race, ethnicity, and sexuality. Emerging through, and at times diverging from, this discourse, has been the work of post-structuralist feminists, which has been particularly important for architecture in offering metaphorical insights through their focus on *location*. In this work new ways of knowing and being have been discussed in spatial terms,

developing conceptual and critical tools such as 'situated knowledge' and 'standpoint theory' to examine the inter-relations between location, identity and knowledge.⁴⁵ The groundbreaking personal/poetic writing of black women such as bell hooks is seminal here, as well as the work of Rosi Braidotti who exemplifies this beautifully, for her the figure of the 'nomadic subject' describes not only a spatial state of movement, but also an epistemological condition, a kind of knowingness (or unknowingness) that refuses fixity.⁴⁶

This subtle understanding of position as physical, emotional and ideological, and difference as multiple rather than binary, well as a diversified knowledge of the role of colonializing practices/discourses, is present in new understandings of positioned knowledge from a range of post-structuralist feminists as Seyla Benhabib, Sue Best, Rosalyn Diprose, Jane Flax, Moira Gatens, Sandra Harding, Elspeth Probyn, Linda Nicholson, Andrea Nye, Gayatri Spivak. As this work makes clear, identities are contingent and situated, and constructed in response to particular times and places, the notion of gender difference as essentialist – as a historical and ageographical – has been thoroughly critiqued. Many of those with an Anglophone perspective have been wary of the 'feminine' for its association with biological essentialism, but for those with a training in continental philosophy and in the French language, it is clear that the 'feminine' is not only biological but also cultural, and has been associated with the other, lack (following Jacques Lacan), and the is located as the site of difference itself (Derrida). The feminine is a term which allows an engagement with aesthetic experience and as one feminist critic has suggested, can the role of females in producing architectural space be examined without recourse to the 'feminine'?⁴⁷

An important and timely volume, *Altering Practices*, edited by Doina Petrescu and published in 2007 focuses the debate around feminism and architecture around the 'poetics and politics of the feminine'.⁴⁸ In taking account of the feminine, rather than, or at least as well as, the feminist, essays in this book acknowledge the role of aesthetics as well as ethics, form as well as function, in architecture, turning the focus to the processes through which practices of space are gendered. The volume originates in a conference held between L'Ecole d'Architecture Paris Villemin and L'Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Beaux Arts in 1999 in Paris, under the title of *Alterities*. The focus on the other, and within the book the development of an understanding of practices which aim to change, transform or alter – as forms of practicing 'otherwise' or 'otherhow' – evidences the diverse range of feminist work current in architecture in a clear, articulate and political way. Petrescu's own practice as an architect with aaa (atelier

d'architecture autogérée), and the ECObox project based in the La Chapelle area of Paris, is trans-disciplinary, locally focused and works to produce small ecological and cultural changes on a micro level in the community.⁴⁹

The question of alterity and difference taken up and explored by feminists, draws on the important work done in post-colonial theory. In architecture, research in this area has transformed from 'critical regionalism' into a more profoundly politicized and radical arena. Although Felipe Hernandez's work does not deal explicitly with gender, it is of importance in that he has chosen to develop the critical concept of 'transculturation' generated by the Cuban anthropologist, Fernando Ortiz, in the early 1940s, in relation to his own research on Latin American architecture, as a pointedly political alternative to the more usual use of the 'holy trinity' of Homi Bhabha, Edward Said and Gayatri Spivak, whose theoretical writings are the backbone of postcolonial studies, yet whose own locational positions are rarely taken into account. For Hernandez, the use of a critical concept generated in the Caribbean, is an important part of his project, which raises the issue of the location of post-colonial theory in architecture.⁵⁰ Lilian Chee's work attempts to 'locate' research practice by bringing together both feminist and post-colonial discussions of difference through her invention of 'spider writing' as a new form of architectural history which grows out of an 'intimate encounter' with the postcolonial site of the Raffle's Hotel, Singapore.⁵¹

Lesley Lokko has addressed issues of black identity in her edited book *White Papers, Black Marks: Architecture, Race, Culture* which holds fast to a strong sense of desire for political change while recognizing the often contingent and situated conditions of race and identity⁵² This collection is subdivided into three sections by scale: '1: 125,000 – Urban Angles', '1: 1250-Displacement/Diaspora', '1:1 – One on One'. Scale operates from the macro to the micro in terms of the physical scale of the practices described, from strategic planning and policy making to architectural details and small-scale art projects. Scale also describes a differential mapping of subjectivity, from the huge distances covered by movements of migration created through colonisation and subsequent diasporic displacements, to the close-up proximity of more intimate relationships. Such shifts of scale also operate within many of the chapters themselves. For example, in Ana Betancour's and Peter Hasdell's discussion of tango, the intimate spatial tension between two dancers is used a way of exploring the interactions of colonized and colonizer in the urban history of Buenos Aires. In Feleccia Davis' chapter, the artist's small-scale critical art interventions in Manhattan make visible much broader cultural

histories in the development of New York, previously embedded in the urban fabric. This spatial structuring device demonstrates the book's main aim: the bringing of architectural modes of operation, the use of scale as a mode of knowing, into the very writing of urban and architectural history and theory. This is evidence of the spatialisation of the discipline not just in content but also in form. *White Papers, Black Marks* is a highly creative text, where differences of race are shown to be intrinsic to architecture, and where architectural thinking – or at least spatial thinking – informs the very ways in which we understand racial difference.

The veil and the associated practice of *pardah*,⁵³ which involves separating and hiding women through clothing and architecture – veils, screens and walls – from the public male gaze, have in many ways occupied a key position in recent debates around gender and space in post-colonial studies. The origins of *pardah* are highly debated culturally, religiously and geographically,⁵⁴ connected to class as well as gender,⁵⁵ and have provoked much controversy, especially in feminism.⁵⁶ In an account of arguments for and against the veil raised in early twentieth-century Egypt in response to the publication in 1899 of Qassim Amin's *Tahrir Al-Mar'a* (The Liberation of Woman), feminist cultural historian Leila Ahmed argues that in identifying the veil as a tool of female oppression, feminism has, perhaps unwittingly, along with anthropology, played the role of 'handmaid' to colonialism.⁵⁷ In using the veil to represent Muslim culture as backward, the aim of unveiling women in order to liberate them from repression, has operated as the mode of justification for one patriarchal culture to possess another. This is an attitude and practice witnessed historically, for example, in the French colonization of Algeria, where, as Ahmed quotes from Franz Fanon's *A Dying Colonialism* (1967), 'the occupier was bent on unveiling Algeria'.⁵⁸ More recently unveiling was given as one of the reasons to justify the invasion of Afghanistan by today's crusaders – the United States, the United Kingdom and their allies – to depose a regime, which, as well as supporting terrorists, also oppressed women through its use of the veil.

The rise in interest in the veil through cultural forms – film and literature – has increased dramatically since the western invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq.⁵⁹ Iranian director Moshen Makhmalbaf's film *Kandahar* (2001) tells the story of an Afghan woman journalist living in Canada who travels back to Afghanistan when her sister writes from Kandahar to say she is going to kill herself before the next solar eclipse. The female protagonist's journey is at times filmed from behind the *burqa* she is wearing, offering western audiences a view out from the inside of the veil, so reversing the usual media representation of the camera

imaging a covered faceless figure.⁶⁰ And it is the disguise offered by the veil in Yasmina Khadra's *The Swallows of Kabul*, that allows the central characters – two Afghan women – to change positions unnoticed and dramatically alter the narrative as agents of their own history.⁶¹ Describing how under the Taliban regime, in Shia areas such as Herat, in western Afghanistan, women's lives were the most oppressed, Christina Lamb's *The Sewing Circles of Heart* discovers how, in order for women writers to read, share ideas and study banned foreign literature, they had to meet under the guise of sewing groups, such as the Golden Needle Sewing Circle.⁶² But these stories told from 'behind the veil' are often authored by those who have not experienced this reality directly, extending the problem of the western-dominated representation of the veil in the media, which in Christina Noelle-Karimi's opinion has rendered Afghan women faceless and voiceless: the veil obscures their faces; while others tell their stories,⁶³ returning us to a key question for feminism and architecture: what does it mean to intervene, to write, to design for an another, or on their behalf?

Performativity

[insert image 2.4]

The insights of psychoanalysis, or the exploration of one's relation to another, have slowly but surely infused architectural theory in recent years, destabilizing understandings of both the boundaries of the subject of architecture and the researching subject him/herself, placing emphasis on the performance of subjectivities and sexualities. The differing impact of the theoretical insights concerning the relationship between subjects, objects and spaces, emerging out of the writings of Sigmund Freud, Jacques Lacan, Julia Kristeva and Luce Irigaray, and their interpreters in philosophy and cultural geography have been highly influential in engendering a shift in architectural theory which has (finally) begin to take questions around subjectivity seriously.

Although architecture has been informed by psychoanalysis at the level of theoretical interpretation of buildings, images and texts, what is new in the feminist work in this area, is the degree to which understandings of subjectivity are informing the position of the writing subject and construction of the theoretical texts themselves. The level of self-reflectivity in architectural debate lags behind other disciplines, namely art and literature.⁶⁴ Although, there has been, in architecture, some degree of exploration of the relation between

criticism, history and theory,⁶⁵ there has been, to my knowledge, very little explicit discussion of the situated-ness of the critic herself, and therefore the relation between criticism and practice. The *Critical Architecture* conference, which I co-organised at the Bartlett School of Architecture in 2004, aimed to address this relation.⁶⁶

In the 'Architecture-Writing' session of the conference I was keen to bring the debate on art-writing, which informed my own practice of 'site-writing' into architectural criticism. The possibilities opened up for criticism by art-writing engage closely with debates around the relationship between theory and critical practice in the visual and spatial arts. But what happens when such ideas are taken into architectural criticism? Are such concepts and creative modes of production derived from elsewhere seen to be as relevant to architecture as those generated within the discipline itself? For some, interdisciplinary debate is a distraction: critical enquiry and architectural production are relevant only when they emerge out of architecture itself.⁶⁷ 'Travelling concepts' are indispensable,⁶⁸ they allow us to challenge assumptions internal to disciplines and to re-think, in this instance, what architecture is, what it might be and how we might think, write and make buildings critically. This is not to ignore the particularity of the context in which architectural criticism is located – the architectural profession – but to return to it, having been transformed through ideas experienced somewhere else.

In my own work I have begun to recognize how movements of exchange between disciplinary sites creates a spatial pattern – moving outside a discipline to a new one from which it is possible to review the mechanisms of operation of a former discipline, before returning in order to suggest alternative modes of enquiry. Although my aim has been constant, I have sought to make manifest the position of the writing subject and her choice of objects of study and subject matters, processes of intellectual enquiry and creative production; my methods have transformed from the more literal attempt to produce a feminist Marxist architectural history to current work which is more lateral and metaphoric.⁶⁹ It was through the process of writing *Art and Architecture: A Place Between* – a theorised study of projects that occupy places between art and architecture and which I call critical spatial practice – that I came to understand how my position between art, architecture and theory was constantly changing and that this migratory aspect of the research influenced my interpretative accounts. I concluded *Art and Architecture* by arguing that criticism is a form of situated practice in its own right, one that is critical and spatial.⁷⁰

This new work explores the position of the author, not only in relation to theoretical ideas, art objects, and architectural spaces, but also to the site of writing itself.

'Site-Writing' is what happens when discussions concerning site-specificity extend to involve art criticism, and the spatial qualities of the writing become as important in conveying meaning as the content of the criticism.⁷¹ Conceptual concerns frame my argument for the spatialisation of criticism as a form of critical spatial practice, but the criticism operates as a form of practice, where site-writings transform over time depending on their specific locations.⁷² My suggestion is that this kind of criticism or critical spatial writing, in operating as a mode of practice in its own right, questions the terms of reference that relate the critic to the work positioned 'under' critique. This is an active writing, composed of a constellation of voices that spatially structure the text, constructing as well as tracing the sites of relation between critic and work.

Feminists in cultural, literary and post-colonial criticism, such as Hélène Cixous and Gloria Anzaldúa, have woven the autobiographical into the critical in their texts, combining poetic writing with theoretical analysis to articulate hybrid voices.⁷³ A 'voice' in criticism can be objective *and* subjective, distant *and* intimate. From the close-up to the glance, from the caress to the accidental brush, such an approach to the writing of criticism can draw on spaces as they are remembered, dreamed and imagined, as well as observed, in order to take into account the critic's position in relation to a work and challenge criticism as a form of knowledge with a singular and static point of view located in the here and now. Mieke Bal's exploration of the critic's 'engagement' with art explores this territory in art history, as someone coming from literary criticism; her interest in narrative opens up ways of thinking about subject positions in criticism.⁷⁴

In architecture, Guiliana Bruno, another interdisciplinary traveller, moving this time from film criticism to architecture, also points to the situated nature of writing about architecture, outlining both a personal journey in the introduction to her *Atlas of Emotion*, as well as suggest that the book itself adopts a spatial structure.⁷⁵ Rather than write *about* the work, I am interested in how the critic constructs his or her writing in relation *to* and in dialogue *with* the work. The focus on the preposition here allows a direct connection to be made between the positional *and* the relational.⁷⁶

The work of Katja Grillner and her colleague Rolf Hughes, and one-time students, now colleagues, Katerina Bonnevier and Malin Zimm, at KTH, Stockholm, has been developing in similar directions. Interestingly Grillner when links the two words – architecture and writing – she does it the other way around: ‘Writing Architecture’, not architecture-writing.⁷⁷ What difference does it make if one word comes before another, or if a preposition, for example, ‘for’, ‘with’, ‘to’, is inserted between the two terms?⁷⁸ And what of the hyphen? This small line that brings the architecture and writing into close proximity allows us to think of one in relation to the other, but also creates a hybrid form. It is important that we focus here on this insignificant point of conjunction, on such a tiny detail as the hyphen, to demonstrate the importance of the decisions we make in designing the position of words – writing constructs as well as reflects meaning. The role of writing as a form of practice in its own right, has been explored by Hughes in his discussion of the prose poem as a hybrid genre which combines critical and creative writing practices and in relation to what is called practice-led or based research.⁷⁹ Bonnevier operates a performative writing which stages theoretical analysis and historical research to re-examine queer space.⁸⁰

The discipline of performance studies is increasingly becoming a central reference point for feminists writing in architecture, mainly because it is within performance practice, including theatre, that one finds the conceptual depth to the thinking-through of ‘performativity’. Here I want to make particular reference to the collaborative work of feminist practitioners, such as Dorita Hannah (performance designer and scenographer) and Carol Burns (dancer and choreographer) and their consideration of the relation of the female body to architecture through performance,⁸¹ but also the more broadly based approach of performance writing, generated out of the MA with that name operating at Dartington College in the 1990s, and also the speculative work of theorists and practitioners based in academic settings in the UK today.⁸²

The autobiographical approach to Peggy Phelan’s commentaries on performance art have developed a mode of writing criticism that declares its own performativity and the presence of the body of the critic in the writing as ‘marked’.⁸³ In drawing attention to the conditions of its own making at the level of the signifier, not only the signified, much autobiographical writing is performative. In Della Pollock’s highly informative discussion of the key qualities of performance writing, she includes being subjective, as well as evocative, metonymic, nervous, citational and consequential as exceptional aspects of this type of writing.⁸⁴ And in

Gavin Butt's edited volume *The End of Criticism*, the attempt by critics and practitioners to 'renew criticism's energies' within fine art occurs specifically through a 'theatrical turn'.⁸⁵

Across the arena of experimental and critical writing, new possibilities are being invented, usually performative, which question the distanced objectivity of academic writing styles.⁸⁶ This includes artists producing text-based works,⁸⁷ writers exploring the poetics of criticism,⁸⁸ as well as performance writers,⁸⁹ poet-artist practitioners,⁹⁰ and philosophers who question subjectivity through alternative visual writing forms.⁹¹ Spatial practitioners can draw inspiration from this intensely creative and theoretically rigorous strand of speculative criticism, yet within it there is also a very particular focus for those engaged in architecture: to enhance writing's spatial qualities and in so doing to explore the 'position' of the writer through the spatial and *material* qualities of the text. In architecture there is a growing feminist interest in the critical, interdisciplinary performative qualities of writing, as a form of materialized philosophy, in the work of H elene Frichot and Stephen Loo; art practice, in the work of Linda Maria Walker; and criticism, in the work of Naomi Stead.⁹²

Materiality

[insert image 2.5]

Although some critics are also beginning to consider the possibilities that the medium of their work affords and many have written about the spatial potential writing affords, fewer have actively exploited its textual and material possibilities, the patterning of words on a page, the design of a page itself – its edges, boundaries, thresholds, surfaces, the relation of one page to another, or wondered what it would mean for criticism to take on new forms – those of art, film or even architecture.⁹³ Each medium surely has its own architectonics – a series of procedures for the material organisation and structuring of space. Literary critic Mary Ann Caws's concept of 'architexture' is helpful here in allowing us to take texts, structures which are not buildings, as architecture, a move which is rather more closely guarded against in architecture itself, where the professional view still tends to dominate. A term that refers to the act of reading rather than writing, for Caws, architexture 'situates the text in the world of other texts'⁹⁴ drawing attention to the surface and texture of the text, and suggesting rather implicitly, or certainly this is what I draw out of her work, that we might consider the text as a form of material construction or architecture. And to return to

Jennifer Bloomer briefly, her texts have a materiality that is spatially structured, operating as metaphoric sites through which imaginative narratives are explored, as well as employing metonymic devices to bring the non-appropriate into architecture. For Bloomer, different modes of writing express new ways of understanding architecture through the intimate and personal, the subjective rather than objective, though sensual rather than purely visual stimulation. Bloomer's text is her architecture; her textual strategies are used to interpret architectural drawings and spaces but also to create new notions of space and creativity, allowing links to be made between architectural design and theory

It is possible to consider how this kind of research positions the modes in which we practice theory and criticism to be more than a description of content, but to define critical positions. The 'architecture' of the writing of history, theory or criticism, might then take into account the structure, processes and materials of the medium employed, considering these modes as integral to the construction of the writing, indicating that the spatial practices of history, theory and criticism have a materiality, thus offering a new way of connecting with architecture through a particularly feminist and material aspect of critical spatial practice.

The influence of Marxist methodologies in architectural history has played a key role in critiquing a type of architectural history, which placed the designer and the form of the building at the forefront of the discipline. Historical materialism pointed instead to the 'social production of space' – to the role of the construction industry, cultural/social context, as well as the reproduction of space through its representation and use. Such methodologies were adopted/adapted by certain feminists in the field to highlight the gendering of processes of production and reproduction, but also through feminism's own version of materialist analysis, which involves an understanding of the role of body as matter, following on from the rich discussions of chora, foundational in the feminist architectural work of the early 1990s.

More recently, this understanding of 'materiality' or matter has started to produce work where material is not only as the social and economic context for architecture but also viewed as an active ingredient in the processes of making architecture. This might appear to be more obvious in its relation to architectural design, but feminist explorations of the different potential of architectural materials from the conceptual design to the level of the detail remain limited. Sarah Wigglesworth Architecture is one practice, which has consistently exploration new potentials for materials, most famously in 9 Stock Orchard Street, the Straw House, 2001.⁹⁵

It is also the case that new considerations of materiality have informed processes of researching and writing architecture, placing emphasis on embodiment, narrative and voice, and articulating texts that are patterned, and that create topographies of intersecting epistemologies and ontologies.⁹⁶ In Peg Rawes' theoretical writings she explores spatial figures in philosophy while drawing attention to different theories of subjectivity, criticality and materiality, while Katie Lloyd Thomas has looked specifically at the role of matter and its relation to writing in the architectural specification.⁹⁷

Setting In

I am aware that the range of feminist approaches to critical spatial practice that I have described here – characterized by their modes and matters in terms of a specific set of thematics – might appear to be quite an exclusive gathering. This is in part because my own focus on art criticism as a form of feminist critical spatial practice in recent years has produced a narrow focus. In attempting to look for commonalities, I may well have presented a sense of easy alignment between those present inside the terrain of my setting out and thereby suggested a new-found integration across the diversity of this practice which leaves aside the productive tensions that exist across difference – I hope this has not been the case. I am also aware that a great breadth of feminist critical spatial practice exists outside the markers I have set out here, so in the final paragraphs of this essay, I would like acknowledge that my setting out has limits, and point towards the presence of work that lies beneath, beyond or outside the themes I have been discussing in order to push the debate into new arenas.⁹⁸

Issues raised by feminism and taken forward through debates on the 'feminine' and gender difference have infused architecture to such an extent that they are no longer visible explicitly in terms of concerns generated out of sexual politics. Conditions of visibility have been very much part of feminist debate over the past decades, in particular the ways in which vital contribution of feminist forbears have often been obscured, thus we must be careful now not to produce a new version of 'hidden from history' and partake in the act of obscuring feminism's political imperative, while still allowing it to be indirect and to diffuse. Feminist architectural historian Karen Burns has noted very recently that despite the large number of feminist publications in the 1990s, this was also the decade that saw the absence of feminist texts in major architectural theory anthologies and the inclusion of the

'feminine' in such anthologies through invited contributions authored by men. Most provocatively she makes the excellent point that feminist architectural discourse and practice has, in various instances, in particular the discussions between Jacques Derrida and Peter Eisenman, been conducted by men through the bodies of women – through choric space.⁹⁹

The topic of feminism in architecture itself has perhaps been less than visible in recent years. There seem to have been fewer sole authored publications on topics of feminism in architecture than in other disciplines such as visual culture, art history and cultural geography and recent edited collections which have deepened the exploration of certain gendered dimensions of architectural design and culture have done so in a more nuanced, subtle and implicit way than earlier work. These collections often examine themes derived from feminist enquiry, for example, domesticity, materiality, interiority, criticality and pattern, but, for the non-informed and often non-feminist reader, the association with the concerns of gender and sexual politics might not be at all obvious, at least not at first! Such collections have been edited by feminists who ten years ago would have made their feminist agenda explicit (and I include myself here) but now perhaps because of the theoretical advances feminism has made in some parts of the academy they no longer feel the need to directly flag up their political position, making it possible not necessarily to abandon politics, but to explore alternative, perhaps less oppositional, ways of being feminist.

However, the danger is that, unless the references to feminism are made clear, we are unwittingly 'unwriting' architecture's feminist genealogy. This then poses questions about acknowledgement, and raises the dangers of invisibility and of appropriation, to quote the Guerilla Girls, of 'seeing your ideas live on in others'. Additionally and more importantly, to focus myopically on this issue, is to be blind to today's context where far more urgent forms of oppression, marginalization and difference demand our attention right now. Some of these remain directly connected with sex and gender, others are less obviously connected, for example operations of resistance against neo-conservative and neo-liberal politics at work in architecture, connections between military domination and oil consumption, the uneven distribution of wealth between the majority and minority world, and the rapid unfolding of environmental catastrophes. Most recently we have witnessed gross acts of finance acquisition, where in the name of 'bank bailouts', wealth is being transferred, with government consent, to a tiny majority, while the catastrophic amounts of debt owed by

ordinary people are ignored, and very conditions that created the so-called credit crunch in the first place are not placed under review. In this situation, in the UK to name just one country, in the ComDem Government's Comprehensive Spending Review of 2010, women have been named as one group of society to loose out.¹⁰⁰

It is important to recognize the international dimensions of the feminist struggle as well as the gendered dimensions of transglobal power – dominant and resistant. Because these operate at both macro and micro levels connections need to be constructed between the large scale and the small detail, linking up concerns of the marginalized in the north and the south. It strikes me that this is the task for a feminist critical spatial practice in the second decade of the twenty-first century – this is the *matter* at hand and that the *modes* of working characteristic to a feminist approach to critical spatial practice which I have set out in this essay are highly appropriate for tackling the three stranded collapse of ecology, energy and economy that faces us now – the disasters produced by climate chaos; the resource crises, including peak oil, mineral depletion and food scarcity; and the unacceptable inequalities created by a capitalist global economy driven by credit and debt – all three are now setting in.

List of Images

Image 2.1: muf architecture/art, *The Pleasure Garden of the Utilities*, in situ after completion, (1998), Stoke-on-Trent. Photograph: Cathy Hawley, (1998).

Image 2.2: Julieanna Preston, *SHEAR*, one standard sheet gypsum wall board, dimensions: 2400mm x 2400mm x 5mm (2009). Photograph: Paul Hillier (2009).

Image 2.3: atelier d'architecture autogérée, *Passage 56*, cultural and ecological space managed by residents of St. Blaise neighbourhood, Paris, (2005– ongoing). Photograph: Constantin Petcou (2009).

Image 2.4: Jane Rendell, *An Embellishment: Purdah*, kohl on glass, (2006), *Spatial Imagination*, The Domo Baal Gallery, London. Photograph: David Cross of Cornford & Cross (2006). Reproduced by kind permission of David Cross.

Image 2.5: Sarah Wigglesworth & Jeremy Till, *Stock Orchard Street*, Sandbag Wall, London (2000). Photograph: Paul Smoothy, (2001).

Notes

¹ This essay draws on and extends Jane Rendell, 'Tendencies and Trajectories: Feminist Approaches in Architecture', *Architectural Theory Handbook*, Stephen Cairns, Greg Crysler, Hilde Heynen, Gwendolyn Wright (eds) (London: Sage, 2011).

² See Jane Rendell, Barbara Penner and Iain Borden (eds.), *Gender, Space, Architecture: an Interdisciplinary Introduction*, (London: Routledge, 1999).

³ See for example, Beatriz Colomina (ed.), *Sexuality and Space*, (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1992); Diane Agrest, Patricia Conway and Leslie Kanes Weisman (eds.), *The Sex of Architecture*, (New York: Harry N. Abrams Publisher, 1997); Debra Coleman, Elizabeth Danze and Carol Henderson (eds.), *Architecture and Feminism*, (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996); Francesca Hughes (ed.), *The Architect: Reconstructing Her Practice*, (Cambridge, Mass.: M. I. T. Press, 1996); Duncan McCorquodale, Katerina Rüedi and Sarah Wigglesworth (eds.), *Desiring Practices*, (London: Black Dog Publishing Limited, 1996) and Joel Sanders (ed.), *Stud: Architectures of Masculinity*, (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996).

⁴ See muf, *Architectural Design*, (August 1996), v. 66, ns. 7-8, pp. 80-3 and Amy Landesberg and Lisa Quatralé, 'See Angel Touch', Debra Coleman, Elizabeth Danze and Carol Henderson (eds.), *Architecture and Feminism*, (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996), pp. 60-71.

⁵ Jennifer Bloomer, 'Big Jugs', Arthur Kroker and Marilouise Kroker (eds.), *The Hysterical Male: New Feminist Theory*, (London: Macmillan Education 1991), pp. 13-27 and Jennifer Bloomer, *Architecture and the Text: the (S)cripts of Joyce and Piranesi*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993).

⁶ In the work of Clare Robinson, this is clearly formulated in a project which redefines site as chora or female container. For Michelle Kauffman, the gaps between buildings and occupied by women in patriarchy gave rise to a design project based on a lacuna wall. See Claire Robinson, 'Chora Work', 'Dear Jennifer', *ANY*, n. 4 (January/February 1994), pp. 34-7 and Michelle Kaufman 'Liquidation, Amalgamation', *Dear Jennifer*, *ANY*, n.4 (January/February 1994), pp. 38-9.

⁷ See for example, Nina Felshin, *But is it Art?: the spirit of art as activism*, (Seattle: Bay Press, 1995); Suzanne Lacy (ed.), *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*, (Seattle, Bay Press, 1995).

⁸ Luce Irigaray's theory of 'mimicry' has been used to show how, when working within a symbolic system with predetermined notions of feminine and masculine, where there is no theory of the female subject, women can seek to represent themselves through mimicking the system itself. See Luce Irigaray, 'Any Theory of the "Subject" Has Always Been Appropriated by the "Masculine"', *Speculum of the Other Woman*, (New York: Cornell University Press, 1985), pp. 133-46.

⁹ Elizabeth Diller, 'Bad Press', Francesca Hughes (ed.), *The Architect: Reconstructing Her Practice*, (Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1996), pp. 74-94.

¹⁰ Critical theory is a phrase that refers to the work of a group of theorists and philosophers called the Frankfurt School operating in the early twentieth century. The group includes Theodor Adorno, Jurgen Habermas, Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse and Benjamin; and their writings are connected by their interest in the ideas of the philosopher G. W. F. Hegel, the political economist Karl Marx, and the psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud. Taken together, their work could be characterized as a rethinking or

development of Marxist ideas in relation to the shifts in society, culture and economy that took place in the early decades of the twentieth century.

¹¹ Raymond Geuss, *The Idea of Critical Theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981) p. 2.

¹² For a detailed discussion of the various possibilities opened up by critical theory for thinking the relationship between theory and practice, see Jane Rendell, 'Between two: theory and practice', in Jonathan Hill (ed.) *Opposites Attract: Research by Design, Special Issue of Journal of Architecture* (Summer) vol. 8, no. 2 (2003) pp. 221–38.

¹³ Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze, 'Intellectuals and power: a conversation between Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze', in Donald F. Bouchard (ed.) *Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews* (New York: Ithaca, 1977) p. 205.

¹⁴ Foucault and Deleuze, 'Intellectuals and power', p. 206.

¹⁵ Foucault and Deleuze, 'Intellectuals and power', p. 208.

¹⁶ Foucault and Deleuze, 'Intellectuals and power', p. 206.

¹⁷ Mieke Bal and Inge E. Boer (eds) *The Point of Theory: Practices of Cultural Analysis* (New York: Continuum, 1994) pp. 8–9.

¹⁸ Bal and Boer, *The Point of Theory*, p. 8.

¹⁹ Julia Kristeva, 'Institutional Interdisciplinarity in Theory and Practice: an interview', Alex Coles and Alexia Defert, eds, *The Anxiety of Interdisciplinarity, De-, Dis-, Ex-*, v.2, (London, 1997), pp. 3-21, pp. 5-6.

²⁰ See for example Jessica Benjamin, *Shadow of the Other: Intersubjectivity and Gender in Psychoanalysis*, London: Routledge, 1998, p. 25 and Diane Fuss, *Identification Papers*, London: Routledge, 1995, pp. 2-3.

²¹ Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, London: Routledge, 1994, pp. 163.

²² See for example, Jane Rendell, 'Architectural Research and Disciplinarity', *ARQ* (2004) v. 8, n. 4, pp. 141–7.

²³ Michael de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988, p. 29.

²⁴ See Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991.

²⁵ Jane Rendell, *Art and Architecture: A Place Between*, (London: IB Tauris, 2006).

²⁶ muf, *This is What we Do*, p. 92.

²⁷ muf, *This is What we Do*, p. 92.

²⁸ muf, *This is What we Do: A muf Manual* (London: Ellipsis, 2001) p. 25.

²⁹ See for example my discussion in Section 3 of Rendell, *Art and Architecture*. See also Joseph Beuys, 'Not just a few are called, but everyone' (completed in 1972), in Charles Harrison and Paul Wood (eds) *Art in Theory 1900–1990: An Anthology of Changing Ideas* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992) pp. 890–92; Nicholas Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics*, translated by Simon Pleasance and Fronza Woods

(Dijon: Presses du reel, 2002) and Grant H. Kester, *Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).

³⁰ For an exceptional collection of essays that challenges this perspective, see Peter Blundell Jones, Doina Petrescu and Jeremy Till (eds), *Architecture and Participation* (London: Spon Press, 2005).

³¹ See Matrix, *Making Space: Women and the Man Made Environment*, (London: Pluto Press, 1984).

³² For FATALE, see for example, http://researchprojects.kth.se/index.php/kb_7796/io_10197/io.html and for taking place, see for example, Katie Lloyd Thomas, Helen Stratford and Teresa Hoskyns 'taking place', *Scroope*, v. 14 (2001), Doina Petrescu and Teresa Hoskyns, 'Taking place and altering it', Doina Petrescu (ed.) *Altering Practices: Feminist Politics and Poetics of Space*, (London: Routledge, 2007); Katie Lloyd Thomas with taking place, 'The Other Side of Waiting', Imogen Tyler and Dr Caroline Gatrell (eds), *Birth*, special issue of *Feminist Review*, (2009). For an excellent collection of essays exploring and critiquing the concept of authorship in architecture, see Tim Anstey, Katja Grillner and Rolf Hughes (eds) *Architecture and Authorship* (London: Black Dog Publishing, 2007).

³³ See for example, Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976) especially pp. 6–26. See also Jacques Derrida, *Dissemination*, translated by Barbara Johnson (London: Athlone Press, 1981) for an attempt to perform rather than describe deconstruction. See also Christopher Norris, *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice* (London: Routledge, 1991).

³⁴ Derrida's aim is not to destroy the categories but to 'destabilize, challenge, subvert, reverse or overturn some of the hierarchical binary oppositions (including those implicating sex and gender) of Western culture'. See Elizabeth Grosz, *Sexual Subversions* (London: Taylor & Francis Grosz, 1989) p. xv.

³⁵ Diane Elam, *Feminism and Deconstruction: Ms. En Abyme* (London: Routledge, 1994) p. 83.

³⁶ See for example Mary McLeod, 'Everyday and "Other" Spaces', Debra L. Coleman, Elizabeth Ann Danze and Carol Jane Henderson (eds.), *Feminism and Architecture*, (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996), pp. 3-37, Ben Campkin and Paul Dobraszcyk (eds) *Architecture and Dirt*, Special Issue of the *Journal of Architecture*, v. 12, n. 4, (September 2007), Ben Campkin and Rosiie Cox (eds) *Dirt: New Geographies of Cleanliness and Contamination* (London: IR Tauris, 2010) and the conference *The Rise of the Heterotopia: On Public Space and the Architecture of the Everyday in a Post-Civil Society*, AAE Conference 2005, Leuven, Belgium, 26-28 May 2005 organised by Hilde Heynen.

³⁷ Hilde Heynen and Gülsüm Bayday (eds), *Negotiating Domesticity: Spatial Productions of Gender in Modern Architecture*, (London: Routledge, 2005) and Hilde Heynen, 'Architecture, Gender, Domesticity', Special Issue of the *Journal of Architecture*, v. 7, n. 3 (Autumn 2002).

³⁸ See for example Ro Spankie, *Drawing Out the Interior*, (Switzerland: AVA Academia, 2009).

³⁹ Mark Taylor and Julieanna Preston (eds) *Intimus: Interior Design Theory Reader*, (Chichester: Wiley-Academy, 2006).

⁴⁰ Charles Rice, *The Emergence of the Interior: Architecture: Modernity, Domesticity* (London: Routledge, 2007). See also Barbara Penner and Charles Rice (eds) 'Constructing the Interior', Special Issue of the *Journal of Architecture*, v. 9, n. 3 (Autumn 2004) and Barbara Penner, 'Researching Female Public Toilets: Gendered Spaces, Disciplinary Limits', *Journal of International Women's Studies*, v. 6, n. 2 (June 2005), pp. 81–98.

⁴¹ Diane Fuss, *The Sense of an Interior: Four Rooms and the Writers that Shaped Them*, (London: Routledge, 2004) and Victoria Rosner, *Modernism and the Architecture of Private Life*, (Columbia: Columbia University Press, 2005).

⁴² See for example, Susan Stanford Friedman, *Mappings: Feminism and the Cultural Geographies Of Encounter*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998; Diane Fuss, *Identification Papers*, London: Routledge, 1995; Irit Rogoff, *Terra Infirma*, London: Routledge, 2000; and Kaja Silverman, *The Threshold of the Visible World*, London: Routledge, 1996.

⁴³ See for example Steve Pile, *The Body and the City: Psychoanalysis, Subjectivity and Space* (London: Routledge, 1996); Elizabeth Grosz, *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994 and Elizabeth Grosz, *Architecture from the Outside: Essays on Virtual and Real Space*, (Cambridge MA.: MIT Press, 2001).

⁴⁴ The instigators of this hybrid feminist practice⁴⁴ are landscape architect Gini Lee and curator Suzie Attiwill. See also <http://www.idea-edu.com/Journal/IDEA-Journal>. See also Rochus Urban Hinkel (ed) *Urban Interior: Informal Explorations, Interventions and Occupations* (forthcoming 2011).

⁴⁵ For example Donna Haraway's 'situated knowledges', Jane Flax's 'standpoint theory' and Elsbeth Probyn's notion of 'locality', all use 'position' to negotiate such on-going theoretical disputes as the essentialism/constructionism debate. See Jane Flax, *Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, Feminism and Postmodernism in the Contemporary West*, Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991, p. 232; Donna Haraway, 'Situated knowledges: the science question in feminism and the privilege of partial knowledge', *Feminist Studies*, vol. 14, no. 3, Fall 1988, pp. 575–603, especially, pp. 583–8; and Elspeth Probyn 'Travels in the Postmodern: Making Sense of the Local' in Linda Nicholson (ed.), *Feminism/Postmodernism*, London, Routledge, 1990, pp. 176–89, p. 178. See also Seyla Benhabib's articulation of 'feminism as situated criticism' in *Situating the Self: Gender, Community and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992, pp. 225–8; and bell hooks' discussion of the margin in *Yearnings: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*, (London: Turnaround Press, 1989).

⁴⁶ See Rosi Braidotti, *Nomadic Subjects*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994).

⁴⁷ Ann Bergren, 'Dear Jennifer', *ANY*, n.4 (January/February 1994), pp. 12-5.

⁴⁸ Doina Petrescu, *Altering Practices: Feminist Politics and Poetics of Space*, (London: Routledge, 2007).

⁴⁹ Doina Petrescu, 'Losing Control, Keeping Desire', in Peter Blundell Jones, Doina Petrescu and Jeremy Till (eds), *Architecture and Participation* (London: Spon Press, 2005), pp. 43–64.

⁵⁰ Felipe Hernandez (ed.) *Transculturation in Latin America and Architecture*, special issue of *Journal of Romance Studies* v. 2, n. 3, (Winter 2003) and Felipe Hernandez, Mark Millington and Iain Borden (eds) *Architecture and Transculturation in Latin America* (New York and Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006).

⁵¹ Lilian Chee, 'An Architecture of Intimate Encounter: Plotting the Raffles Hotel through Flora and Fauna (1887–1925; 1987–2005)', University College London, (2006) unpublished thesis.

⁵² Lesley Naa Norle Lokko (ed.), *White Papers, Black Marks: Architecture, Race, Culture*, (London: Athlone Press, 2000).

⁵³ Quoting Malek Alloulla, David A. Bailey and Gilane Tawadros describe how the veil marks the closure of private space and its extension to public space where the viewer is to be found. See David A. Bailey and Gilane Tawadros, 'Introduction', David A. Bailey and Gilane Tawadros (eds) *Veil: Veiling, Representation and Contemporary Art* (inIVA and Modern Art Oxford, 2003), pp. 16–39, pp. 22–23. Referring to the writings of Hamid Naficy on the poetics and politics of the veil in revolutionary

Iranian cinema, Bailey and Tawadros suggest that veiling is not fixed or unidirectional, but that it is rather 'a dynamic practice in which both men and women are implicated', and that the relation between veiling and unveiling is dialectical.

⁵⁴ See for example Leila Ahmed, 'The Discourse on the Veil', *Women and Gender in Islam: Historical Roots of a Modern Debate* (Yale: Yale University Press, 1993) pp. 144–168.

⁵⁵ For example, Ahdaf Soueif, in a discussion of the differing practices and terms for the veil in Muslim cultures across the world including Arab countries, focuses on the history of its use in Cairo, Egypt. He explains how between the 1920s to the 1960s, as part of the move to accept western culture, the veil was rejected, except the *bisha*, which continued to be worn by working class women and more traditional women of all classes over 50. The veil was taken up again as the *hijab* and the full *niqab* in the 1970s and more recently as a sign of resistance to the west. See Ahdaf Soueif, 'The Language of the Veil', first published in *The Guardian*, weekend supplement (8 December 2001) pp. 29–32 and reprinted in Bailey and Tawadros (eds) *Veil*, pp. 110–119.

⁵⁶ Ahmed, 'The Discourse on the Veil', pp. 144–168.

⁵⁷ Ahmed, 'The Discourse on the Veil', p. 155.

⁵⁸ Ahmed, 'The Discourse on the Veil', p. 164.

⁵⁹ Alison Donnell has drawn attention to the number of books that feature an image of a veiled woman on the cover. See Alison Donnell, 'Visibility, Violence and Voice? Attitudes to Veiling Post-11 September', Bailey and Tawadros (eds) *Veil*, pp. 122–135.

⁶⁰ Samira's Makhmalbaf's *At Five in the Afternoon* (2003) made by Moshen Makhmalbaf's daughter, also focuses on the life of women in Afghanistan.

⁶¹ Yasmina Khadra's *The Swallows of Kabul* (London: Vintage, 2005) was first published in French as *Les Hirondelles de Kaboul* (Paris: Julliard, 2002).

⁶² Christina Lamb, *The Sewing Circles of Heart: My Afghan Years* (London: HarperCollins Publishers, 2002) pp. 156–160.

⁶³ Christina Noelle-Karimi, 'History Lessons: In Afghanistan's Decades of Confrontation with Modernity, Women have always been the Focus of Conflict' (April 2002). See <http://www.wellesley.edu/womensreview/archive/2002/04/highlt.html>. (accessed 14 May 2008).

⁶⁴ See for example, Gavin Butt (ed.) *After Criticism: New Responses to Art and Performance*, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005).

⁶⁵ See Kate Nesbitt (ed.) *Theorizing a New Agenda for Architecture: An Anthology of Architectural Theory 1965–1995*, New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996, p. 16 and Michael K. Hays (ed.) *Architecture Theory since 1968*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000, p. v. See also Neil Leach (ed.) *Rethinking Architecture*, London: Routledge, 1997; Iain Borden and Jane Rendell (eds) *InterSections: Architectural History and Critical Theory*, (London, Routledge, 2000).

⁶⁶ See Jane Rendell, Jonathan Hill, Murray Fraser and Mark Dorrian (eds.) *Critical Architecture* (London: Routledge, 2007). See also Peg Rawes and Jane Rendell (eds) *Spatial Imagination* (London: The Bartlett School of Architecture, 2005).

⁶⁷ A variation on this position is the one that argues that architecture is itself interdisciplinary and so has no need to engage with other disciplines. For an expanded discussion of many of these issues see Jane Rendell, 'Architectural Research and Disciplinarity', *ARQ*, 2004, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 141–7.

⁶⁸ I thought I had invented the term 'travelling concepts' but it turns out Mieke Bal had also been using it. See Mieke Bal, *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002).

⁶⁹ Compare for example Jane Rendell, *The Pursuit of Pleasure*, to my 'site-writings'. See for example, Jane Rendell, 'Travelling the Distance/Encountering the Other', in David Blamey (ed.), *Here, There, Elsewhere: Dialogues on Location and Mobility*, London: Open Editions, 2002, pp. 43–54; and Jane Rendell, 'Writing in place of speaking', in Sharon Kivland and Lesley Sanderson (eds), *Transmission: Speaking and Listening*, vol. 1, (Sheffield Hallam University and Site Gallery, 2002), pp. 15–29.

⁷⁰ Jane Rendell, *Art and Architecture*. See also Jane Rendell, 'Critical Spatial Practice' in Judith Rugg (ed.) *New Curating Practices*, (Bristol: Intellect Books, 2009), for an account of my collaborative work.

⁷¹ On art and site-specificity see for example, Alex Coles (ed.), *Site Specificity: The Ethnographic Turn*, London: Black Dog Publishing, 2000; Nick Kaye, *Site-Specific Art: Performance, Place And Documentation*, London: Routledge, 2000; and Miwon Kwon, *One Place After Another: Site Specific Art and Locational Identity*, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2002.

⁶⁷ See Jane Rendell, *Site-Writing: The Architecture of Art Criticism* (London: IB Taurus, 2010).

⁷³ See Gloria Anzaldua. *Borderlands/La Frontera: the New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Lute Books, 1999 and Hélene Cixous. 'Sorties'. (trans. Betsy Wing) from Susan Sellers (ed.). *The Hélene Cixous Reader*. London: Routledge, 1994.

⁷⁴ See Mieke Bal, *Louise Bourgeois' Spider: The Architecture of Art–Writing*, London and Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001, p. xi. See also Norman Bryson, 'Introduction: Art and Intersubjectivity', in Mieke Bal, *Looking in: The Art of Viewing*, Amsterdam: G+B International, 2001, pp. 1–39, p. 12.

⁷⁵ See Guiliana Bruno, *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture and Film*, (London: Verso, 2002).

⁷⁶ The significance Trinh T. Minh-ha assigns to the shift from speaking 'about' to speaking 'to' has been stressed by Irit Rogoff who underscores how, instead of taking power relationships to produce spatial locations, it is possible for a change in position to advance a change in relation. See Irit Rogoff's discussion of Trinh T. Minh-ha's assertion in Irit Rogoff, 'Studying Visual Culture', Nicholas Mirzoeff (ed.), *The Visual Culture Reader*, London: Routledge, 1998, pp. 14–26, p. 18.

⁷⁷ See <http://www.akad.se/progwri.htm>. (AKAD: The Academy of for Practice-based Research in Architecture and Design). See also Katja Grillner 'The Halt at the Door of the Boot-Shop', in Katja Grillner, et al. (eds), *01.AKAD*, Stockholm: AKAD and Axl Books, 2005; Katja Grillner, *Writing and Landscape – Setting Scenes for Critical Reflection* in Jonathan Hill (ed.), *Opposites Attract*, Special Issue of the *Journal of Architecture*, 2003, v. 8, n. 2, pp. 239-49 and Katja Grillner, *Ramble, Linger and gaze: Dialogues from the Landscape garden*, PhD Dissertation 2000, KTH Stockholm.

⁷⁸ The role of the preposition is a personal fascination. For me, prepositions indicate the importance of 'position' and 'relation' in the spatial encounter between the critic and the art or architectural work. Michel Serres, for example, writes of the angelic qualities of prepositions in terms of their role as messengers and their transformational qualities. See Michel Serres, *Angels: A Modern Myth*, Paris: Flammarion Press, 1995, pp. 140–7.

⁷⁹ Rolf Hughes, 'The DROWNING METHOD: On Giving an Account in Practice-Based Research', Jane Rendell, Jonathan Hill, Murray Fraser and Mark Dorrian (eds.) *Critical Architecture* (London: Routledge, 2007), pp. 92-102. See also Rolf Hughes, 'The Poetics of Practice-Based Research', in Hilde Heynen (ed.), *Unthinkable Doctorates?* Special Issue of *The Journal of Architecture*, v. 11, n. 3, 2006, pp. 283-301.

⁸⁰ Katerina Bonnevier, *Behind Straight Curtains: Towards a Queer Feminist Theory of Architecture*, PhD Dissertation 2007, KTH Stockholm, (Stockholm: Axl Books, 2007).

⁸¹ See for example Dorita Hannah and Carol Brown, *HER TOPIA: A Dance Architecture Event*, Duncan Dance Centre of Research in Greece (Athens, 2005).

⁸² Here I should note the work of practitioners and writers at the University of Roehampton, such as P.A. Skantze, Emily Orley and Ella Finer, and Susan Melrose, at the University of Middlesex.

⁸³ See for example, Peggy Phelan, *Unmarked: Politics of Performance* (London: Routledge, 1993) and Peggy Phelan, 'To Suffer a Sea Change', *The Georgia Review*, v. 45, n. 3 (Fall 1991) pp. 507–525.

⁸⁴ Della Pollock, 'Performing Writing', Peggy Phelan and Jill Lane (eds) *The Ends of Performance* (New York: New York University Press, 1998) pp. 73–103.

⁸⁵ Butt (ed) *After Criticism*.

⁸⁶ See for example Maria Fusco (ed.) 'The Dream that Kicks: Transdisciplinary Practice in Action', special issue of *a-n (Artists' Newsletter)* (London, 2006). See also *The Happy Hypocrite* a new journal edited by Fusco.

⁸⁷ See for example Brigid McLeer, 'From "A..." to "B...": A Jealousy', Peg Rawes and Jane Rendell (eds) *Spatial Imagination* (London: The Bartlett School of Architecture, UCL, 2005) pp. 22–23 and Ken Ehrlich and Brandon Labelle (eds) *Surface Tension Supplement, n. 1* (Copenhagen and Los Angeles: Errant Bodies Press, 2006).

⁸⁸ For alternative strategies of critical writing by poets and others, see for example, Juliana Spahr, Mark Wallace, Kristen Prevallet and Pam Rehm (eds) *A Poetics of Criticism* (Buffalo, New York: Leave Books, 1994). For an account of critics exploring creativity in critical writing see Rob Pope, *Textual Intervention: Critical and Creative Strategies for Literary Studies* (London: Routledge, 1995).

⁸⁹ See for example Iain Biggs, *Between Carterhaugh and Tamsheil Rig: A Borderline Episode* (Bristol: Wild Conversation Press, 2004) and Mike Pearson, *In comes I: Performance, Memory and Landscape* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2007).

⁹⁰ See for example the work of Carolyn Bergvall, Redell Olsen and Kristen Krieder. See Carolyn Bergvall, *Éclat* (pdf edition, ububooks, 2004) http://www.ubu.com/ubu/bergvall_eclat.html; Carolyn Bergvall *Fig*, (Cambridge: Salt Publishing, 2005); Redell Olsen, *Book of the Fur* (Cambridge: Rem Press, 2000); and Kristen Krieder, 'Toward a Material Poetics: Sign, Subject and Site' (University of London, unpublished PhD, 2008).

⁹¹ See the work of Sue Golding (Johnny de Philo) and Yves Lomax. See Sue Golding (Johnny de Philo) *Games of Truth: A Blood Poetics in Seven Part Harmony (this is me speaking to you)* an Inaugural Lecture delivered at the University of Greenwich, 27 March 2003; Yves Lomax, *Writing the Image: An Adventure with Art and Theory* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2000); and Yves Lomax, *Sounding the Event: Escapades in Dialogue and Matters of Art, Nature and Time* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2005).

⁹² See for example the recently published *Architectural Theory Review*, v. 15, n. 3 (December 2010) edited by Naomi Stead.

⁹³ I teach 'site- writing' as part of the MA in Architectural History at the Bartlett School of Architecture, UCL, and aspects of site-specific writing and poetics are taught on the MA in Poetic Practice at Royal Holloway. See <http://www.rhul.ac.uk/english/studying/Postgraduate-Study/MA/PoeticPractice.html>.

⁹⁴ Mary Ann Caws, *A Metapoetics of the Passage: Architectures in Surrealism and After* (Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1981) p. xiv.

⁹⁵ See <http://www.swarch.co.uk/>

⁹⁶ See Ana Araujo, Jane Rendell and Jonathan Hill (eds) *Pattern*, special issue of *HAECCEITY* (2007).

⁹⁷ See for example, Peg Rawes, 'Plenums: Re-thinking Matter, Geometry and Subjectivity', in Katie Lloyd Thomas, *Material Matters: Architecture and Material Practice*, (London: Routledge, 2007), pp. 55–66 and Peg Rawes, *Irigarary for Architects*, (London: Routledge, 2007). See also Katie Lloyd Thomas, 'Going Into the Mould: Process and materials in the architectural specification' in *Radical Philosophy*, 144 (July/August 2007) and Katie Lloyd Thomas 'Specifications: Writing Materials in Architecture and Philosophy' in *ARQ*, v.8, n. 3-4, (2004).

⁹⁸ Here I am aware of the important work currently undertaken by feminist architects such as Sasa Lada at the School of Architecture, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki and those working in the Department of Architecture at METU.

⁹⁹ Karen Burns, 'Of Murmurings and Muses: Luce Irigarary and Architecture', keynote presentation at *Whirlwinds* (chaired by Jane Rendell), *Sexuate Subjects: Politics, Poetics, Ethics*, conference held at UCL, 3-5 December 2010.

¹⁰⁰ See for example, <http://www.fawcettsociety.org.uk/index.asp?PageID=1198> (accessed 21 January 2010).