

PROOF COVER SHEET

Author(s): Jane Rendell
Article Title: Conclusion: the social condenser—a thing in itself?
Article No: RJAR1323996
Enclosures: 1) Query sheet
2) Article proofs

Dear Author,

1. Please check these proofs carefully. It is the responsibility of the corresponding author to check these and approve or amend them. A second proof is not normally provided. Taylor & Francis cannot be held responsible for uncorrected errors, even if introduced during the production process. Once your corrections have been added to the article, it will be considered ready for publication.

Please limit changes at this stage to the correction of errors. You should not make trivial changes, improve prose style, add new material, or delete existing material at this stage. You may be charged if your corrections are excessive (we would not expect corrections to exceed 30 changes).

For detailed guidance on how to check your proofs, please paste this address into a new browser window: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/checkingproofs.asp>

Your PDF proof file has been enabled so that you can comment on the proof directly using Adobe Acrobat. If you wish to do this, please save the file to your hard disk first. For further information on marking corrections using Acrobat, please paste this address into a new browser window: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/acrobat.asp>

2. Please review the table of contributors below and confirm that the first and last names are structured correctly and that the authors are listed in the correct order of contribution. This check is to ensure that your name will appear correctly online and when the article is indexed.

Sequence	Prefix	Given name(s)	Surname	Suffix
1		Jane	Rendell	

Queries are marked in the margins of the proofs, and you can also click the hyperlinks below. Content changes made during copy-editing are shown as tracked changes. Inserted text is in **red font** and revisions have a red indicator **▲**. Changes can also be viewed using the list comments function. To correct the proofs, you should insert or delete text following the instructions below, but **do not add comments to the existing tracked changes**.

AUTHOR QUERIES

General points:

1. **Permissions:** You have warranted that you have secured the necessary written permission from the appropriate copyright owner for the reproduction of any text, illustration, or other material in your article. Please see <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/permissions/usingThirdPartyMaterial.asp>.
2. **Third-party content:** If there is third-party content in your article, please check that the rightsholder details for re-use are shown correctly.
3. **Affiliation:** The corresponding author is responsible for ensuring that address and email details are correct for all the co-authors. Affiliations given in the article should be the affiliation at the time the research was conducted. Please see <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation/writing.asp>.
4. **Funding:** Was your research for this article funded by a funding agency? If so, please insert ‘This work was supported by <insert the name of the funding agency in full>’, followed by the grant number in square brackets ‘[grant number xxxx]’.
5. **Supplemental data and underlying research materials:** Do you wish to include the location of the underlying research materials (e.g. data, samples or models) for your article? If so, please insert this sentence before the reference section: ‘The underlying research materials for this article can be accessed at <full link>/ description of location [author to complete]’. If your article includes supplemental data, the link will also be provided in this paragraph. See <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation/multimedia.asp> for further explanation of supplemental data and underlying research materials.
6. The **CrossRef database** (www.crossref.org/) has been used to validate the references. Changes resulting from mismatches are tracked in **red font**.

QUERY NO.	QUERY DETAILS
	No Queries

How to make corrections to your proofs using Adobe Acrobat/Reader

Taylor & Francis offers you a choice of options to help you make corrections to your proofs. Your PDF proof file has been enabled so that you can edit the proof directly using Adobe Acrobat/Reader. This is the simplest and best way for you to ensure that your corrections will be incorporated. If you wish to do this, please follow these instructions:

1. Save the file to your hard disk.
2. Check which version of Adobe Acrobat/Reader you have on your computer. You can do this by clicking on the “Help” tab, and then “About”.

If Adobe Reader is not installed, you can get the latest version free from <http://get.adobe.com/reader/>.

3. If you have Adobe Acrobat/Reader 10 or a later version, click on the “Comment” link at the right-hand side to view the Comments pane.
4. You can then select any text and mark it up for deletion or replacement, or insert new text as needed. Please note that these will clearly be displayed in the Comments pane and secondary annotation is not needed to draw attention to your corrections. If you need to include new sections of text, it is also possible to add a comment to the proofs. To do this, use the Sticky Note tool in the task bar. Please also see our FAQs here: <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/index.asp>.
5. Make sure that you save the file when you close the document before uploading it to CATS using the “Upload File” button on the online correction form. If you have more than one file, please zip them together and then upload the zip file.

If you prefer, you can make your corrections using the CATS online correction form.

Troubleshooting

Acrobat help: <http://helpx.adobe.com/acrobat.html>

Reader help: <http://helpx.adobe.com/reader.html>

Please note that full user guides for earlier versions of these programs are available from the Adobe Help pages by clicking on the link “Previous versions” under the “Help and tutorials” heading from the relevant link above. Commenting functionality is available from Adobe Reader 8.0 onwards and from Adobe Acrobat 7.0 onwards.

Firefox users: Firefox’s inbuilt PDF Viewer is set to the default; please see the following for instructions on how to use this and download the PDF to your hard drive: http://support.mozilla.org/en-US/kb/view-pdf-files-firefox-without-downloading-them#w_using-a-pdf-reader-plugin

Conclusion: the social condenser—a thing in itself?

Jane Rendell

j.rendell@ucl.ac.uk

In his 1968 paper 'The Use of an Object', the psychoanalyst D. W. Winnicott describes how 'relating may be to a subjective object, but usage implies that the object is part of external reality'.¹ For Winnicott, to use an object is to take into account its objective reality or existence as 'a thing in itself' rather than its subjective reality or existence as a projection. The change from relating to using is for him significant, as it 'means that the subject destroys the object' and that the object stands outside the omnipotent control of the subject, recognised as the external object it has always been.²

The conversation Michał and I had with the architects now in charge of the restoration of the Narkomfin—Natalya Shilova and Alexey Ginzburg, the grandson of Moisei Ginzburg, the building's original designer—marked a turning point in my own relation to the Narkomin. This was a moment where I had to face up to the fact that I had been 'relating' to the social condenser, in Winnicott's words, projecting my aspirations onto it, according to my need to find a socialist design history and typology to inspire me.³ I had been reading all that I could find (in English translation) about its history; but this had turned out to be a reading *with* the designer's intention, reinforcing my act of relating to the building, rather than a reading *against* it or according to those uses that come after design and can involve appropriation. In trying to understand the Narkomfin historically, I had discovered its architect's intentions, and since those intentions coincided with my own, this meant that I turned its

objective reality and existence as 'a thing in itself' to my own ends. Encountering Alexey and his strong scepticism about the building as a socialist icon and his grandfather's Marxist intentions made me wonder about my own idealism (again).

Self-reflection is a theme that threads through many of the contributions to this special issue; wistful and in some cases passionate desires for socialist societies are critically re-valued through a careful attention to historical detail and to the contemporary context. Several of the authors have considered again their earlier attachments to ideas and architecture, revisited concepts and memories of places that once inspired them, and examined afresh sites of aspiration and hope in their own previous work. Victor Buchli's essay is a beautiful example of this, in which the Narkomfin shifts from the centrepiece of his previous ethnography—a groundbreaking investigation and analysis of the building and its designers and occupants over decades—to become a palimpsest or motif of the process of condensation itself. This is why the transdisciplinarity of this issue shapes the ways in which we return to the Narkomfin, through not only architecture, but also art theory, psychoanalysis and ethnography. As Michał Murawski's article also shows, the ethnographer's sustained and deep-digging into the specificities of the uses of social condensers as they change over time, is so important in offering an understanding of occupation that is often eclipsed in architectural theory by the return—time and again—to the architect's intentions.

The fact that Alexei is the grandson of the original designer of the building, Moisei Ginzburg, makes him a blood relative. I did feel closer to the origins of the building sitting next to him. And when we were talking, I hoped somehow that through his breath, the truth of the building's history would emerge. One good reason, I reflect in retrospect, not to mix oral interviews with archival research. How can a piece of dry paper win over a human voice, with all its styles of persuasion? As a materialist historian I knew of course that to hope like this is wrong, and then again, I sensed that somewhere in Alexei there was matter relating to his grandfather. But through our conversation, such hopes were dashed, in Alexei's refutation of the socialist origins of the social condenser as an architectural type.

Alexei's determination is to write history such that the social condensing in the Narkomfin can be understood, on the one hand, as a result of the increasing density of cities, specifically Moscow, and on the other, as fitting with the desire of Soviet designers to produce artefacts and spaces in the international style. The decision to offer a choice of apartment types, and minimal kitchens following the European approach, in the Narkomin, is not for him an intention to 'crystallise' the new *byt* under socialism, but a design decision taken as a sign of the times: globalisation, industrialisation, urbanisation.

Michał and I took Alexei's refutation of our reading of Ginzburg's claims in his texts from *Sovremennaia Arkhitektura (SA)* as a challenge. In re-examining those texts, extractions and quotations that had been translated from Russian to English, we realised there were several quite problematic dis-

crepancies with the secondary sources: either a lack of precision concerning the source of the original or no citation at all. We also realised that there were a number of texts, many by Ginzburg, which were often referred to, but had never been translated into English. So we decided to get these key sources translated, and in some cases retranslated, from the Russian originals. These have been incredibly helpful for resituating Ginzburg's own voice back into the arguments over the building and its intention that have ensued way beyond his death. The translations from the 1920s provide a strong sense of the context and manner of architectural theoretical argument at that time; the important issues at stake, the need to make claims powerfully, and to refute criticism. So I think we can state safely now, *contra* his grandson, that these sources do provide evidence of Ginzburg as the designer of social condensers with socialist aims. But this is certainly not the end of the story. Key questions still stand, for example, on the relation between form and function as they are styled in architectural theory, or between material and consciousness as Andrew Willimott and Nick Beech discuss in their essays here. Not least, can architecture determine behaviour? And from a more historical perspective, were these social condensers intended to change social relationships or to respond to such change?

Environmental determinism. Now, today, this is a discredited idea, that architectural form can determine social relationships: most would reject this in favour of a more interactive way of approaching the relation between form and behaviour, function, programme or use. For my part, I would still rather follow the potential of the Marxist geographers'

35

40

45

50

55

60

notion, which was highly influential in the late 1990s, of the 'socio-spatial dialectic' (from Edward Soja's reading of Henry Lefebvre),⁴ that spaces can change people, but that people can change spaces. Ginzburg, and the Russian-speaking commentators on Ginzburg coming some forty to fifty years later, use a variety of different terms to describe the relationship between the spatial and the social or design and use, translated into English as assist, crystallise, encourage, facilitate, focus, foster, generate, induce, promote, permit and stimulate. However, the concept of environmental determinism has recently returned under a different guise, at least in housing discourse through outfits such as Create Streets who wish to argue that living in houses rather than high-rise flats does and will make people happier.⁵

Social scientists using tools such as space syntax argue that behaviour is influenced by spatial form. But even if it is possible to track patterns of movement, what can those traces really tell us about what people want? We talk of desire lines, how one can choose to take a short cut to get from A to B, across the mud and the grass, rather than to go the long way around the concrete path following the designer's intentions. But what can these so called 'desire-lines' really tell us about what people were hoping and dreaming when they performed such movements? Just because someone ended up living in a flat in Moscow without a kitchen, can we ever know whether they aspired to social revolution?

As Willimott argues that, in a manner that parallels Alexey Ginzburg's thinking in form, but is asserted for a wholly different set of reasons (like

the social condenser itself, we might argue), by looking at a range of archival sources, it is necessary for us to consider the social condenser as a response to behaviours that already existed, rather than a prop architects put in place in order to encourage the social transformations in users that they were hoping for. Thought of this way, the Narkomfin and other social condensers of the transitional type, can be understood as designs for new buildings that match the social transformations in users' behaviours— aspirational, desirous, political — rather than as buildings that predict and dictate those new behaviours; this, Willimott argues, is what the primary evidence shows.

If so, did those living collectively do so out of necessity, because of the shortage of housing, or because they wanted to try socialism? Were those communal kitchens shared because it was cheaper, or because the ideal of communal living was aspired to? And what became of the social condenser as it was reworked in the London of the late 1950s, and then into the 1960s? Was the UK really full of social condensers as late as the 1970s— on the Aylesbury Estate, as I suggest, and in the arts centres that Andrea Phillips discusses? And is it going too far to suggest that the welfare state was a social condenser? It was an attempt to reduce wealth disparity, that we know, but not to redistribute wealth. So if there was no intention of social change or revolution, is the staircase at Bevin Court designed by the Russian émigré architect Berthold Lubetkin, simply to be read, for example, as a functional or economically determined statement?

In his essay in this Issue, Owen Hatherley goes back over his early work, questioning his reading

of Moscow's social condensers of the 1920s, and revisiting what he is now calling 'actually-existing social condensers', for what they are today. His forensic examination of these icons of socialist modernism is a salutary tale, which prompts us to ask, how far can the concept and the typology of the social condenser be translated across time, as well as culture and place? Is such an architectural type historically and materially determined or can it be re-figured today? And what is at stake in arguing for the need to look back at its point and purpose of origin today?

The image of both the social condensers of Moscow and those built in their image elsewhere and decades later, is one often viewed through a nostalgic eye, and with tendency to eulogise. The gaze which looks back has an inbuilt tendency to focus on what has been lost, because it is looking for what was and so can be no more. But an attempt to re-build an image of 'lost' social condensation, as one might discern from my own essay here, as well as those of Nick Beech and Andrea Phillips, might be worth it – if at least to remember what it is that is being destroyed, especially when the alternatives being offered are deceptive and cruel. Can the social condenser be more to us than a lost object, can anything be more than that? Well, as Winnicott points out, a use object—as a thing in itself—may have more agency.

Agency is important, so is action, possibility and projection. The future face, the looking forward, of the social condenser is an important counterpart to the looking back. The architectural design project has this at its heart: the projection of a future intention, a new series of actions to be performed in and

through built form. And such project(ions) do not have to *determine* future use. A form designed for one purpose in the past, can also be used for something different in the present, or future, as Bernard Tschumi has suggested in his design tactics of dis-, cross- and trans-programming, where one function can be laid on top of another providing the potential for multiple programmes to critique and destabilise each other.⁶ The example of 'Arry's Bar, which I discuss in my essay, is interesting to consider in terms of trans-programming, where one programme gets laid over another not normally associated with it, here a public planning inquiry over a bar at a football club. But whether or not this creates a dis-programming, where one programme can be overturned and potentially undo the other, depends on specific patterns of use themselves: how far is that public inquiry aiding this council to dispossess those residents of their homes, or helping to protect their human rights; are the usual bar-time drinkers, fans or managers; does one group of people ever get to meet the other?

Is anyone today inventing new typologies, or setting the conditions for cross-, trans- or dis-programming? The era of the grand project is over, and we are operating on the back foot in a mode that is exhaustingly outraged and permanently resisting, always having to say no, rather than yes. And even if we build a new yes, how long can a form or programme constructed in the service (or even hope) of radical social change last, before it is co-opted? These questions need considering more carefully through the scope of what Łukasz Stanek writes here as occurring in the shift from functionalism to desire and pleasure, or what Phillips describes

95

100

105

110

115

120

as resubjectification. This brings into focus architecture's relationship to emotion, to feelings as well as behaviours, to psychoanalysis as well as psychology.

125 The close connection between architecture and psychoanalysis is present in a word like 'condensation', which Sigmund Freud deployed, along with 'displacement', to discuss the psychic mechanisms of the dream work. He described these mechanisms in his 1900 *The Interpretation of Dreams*,⁷
130 translated into Russian in 1913.⁸ While condensation may be a form of compression (and we can, as Alexey did, observe that people get compressed in cities), this does not mean we know what they will do when they are compressed. Perhaps under compression or condensation they will do something completely unexpected?

When the dream work condenses, two different thoughts come together in a new and ambiguous state, where the distinctions held by each original are lost. *Ostranenie*? Perhaps. In a translation of a key text by Lev Vygotsky, who brought Freud and Marx together around the notion of conditional reflexes, 'develop[ing] a system of "reflexological Freudian psychology" in the spirit of dialectical materialism',⁹ we find these two terms in adjacency: ' "condensation" (*ostranenie*) '.¹⁰ Condensation was a term Vygotsky used to understand the interaction of external and inner speech; and yet the appearance of the term *ostranenie* beside it (as Vygotsky's translation or perhaps the translator's) firmly signals its intended relationship to Victor Shklovsky's concept of defamiliarisation or making strange. Was this Vygotsky's suggested translation or an idea of the translator's? We can never know

for certain, nor can we know if Moisei Ginzburg read Freud. But we can be certain that, under condensation, things defamiliarise.

Michel de Certeau argues that:

Psychoanalysis and historiography [...] conceive of the relation between the past and the present differently. Psychoanalysis recognizes the past *in* the present; historiography places them *beside* one another. [...] Two strategies of time thus confront one another.¹¹

Here in this special issue we have placed an appendix of translations of original Russian sources on the social condenser from the 1920s beside a series of contributions discussing the relevance of the concept and the typology for the present. The act of reading is such that the past is no longer *beside* but *in* the present: is this what happens when the social condenser socially condenses?

Notes and references

1. D. W. Winnicott, 'The Use of an Object', *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, v. 50 (1969), pp. 711–716; 715.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 713.
3. Jane Rendell, *The Architecture of Psychoanalysis: Spaces of Transition* (London, IB Tauris, 2017).
4. Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, Donald Nicholson-Smith, trsl. (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1991 [1974]), p. 8. This quotation from Henri Lefebvre is discussed in, Edward Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Social Theory* (London, Verso, 1989), p. 81, footnote 4.
5. See, for example, 'Create Streets', *A Direct Planning Manifesto for London* (February, 2016), p. 4; <http://www.createstreets.com> [accessed 10/03/17].

6. See, Bernard Tschumi, *Architecture and Disjunction* (Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press, 1996), pp. 191–2, 205. See also, Bernard Tschumi, 'Interview with Bernard Tschumi: Architecture and the City', in, Iain Borden, Joe Kerr, Jane Rendell, eds., with Alicia Pivaro, *The Unknown City: Contesting Architecture and Social Space* (Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press, 2001), pp. 370–85; Jane Rendell, *Art and Architecture: A Place Between* (London, IB Tauris, 2006), pp. 115–6.
7. Sigmund Freud, '(A) The Work of Condensation' and '(B) The Work of Displacement', in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume IV (1900): The Interpretation of Dreams (First Part)*, translated from the German under the general editorship of James Strachey (London, The Hogarth Press, 1953), pp. 279–304, 305–309.
8. See, Lev Vygotsky, Alexander Luria, 'Introduction to the Russian translation of Freud's Beyond the Pleasure Principle', translated from the Russian by Renée van de Veer and Theresa Prout, in, Renée van de Veer, Jaan Valsiner, eds., *The Vygotsky Reader* (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1994 [1925]), pp. 11–18; first published in, Sigmund Freud, *Po tu storonu principa uduvol'stviya* (Moscow, Sovremennye Problemy, 1925), pp. 3–16. See also, Alexander M. Etkind, 'How Psychoanalysis was received in Russia, 1906–1936', *Journal of Analytic Psychology*, v. 39 (1994), pp. 191–202.
9. L. Vygotsky, A. Luria, 'Introduction to the Russian translation of Freud's Beyond the Pleasure Principle', *op. cit.*, pp. 10–11.
10. L. S. Vygotsky, *Educational Psychology*, Robert Silverman, *trsl.* (Boca Raton, Florida, St Lucie Press, 1997 [1926]), p. 249.
11. Michel de Certeau, 'Psychoanalysis and its History', in *Heterologies: Discourse on the Other*, Brian Massumi, *trsl.*, Foreword, Wlad Godzich (Minneapolis, University of Minneapolis Press, 1986 [1978]), pp. 3–16; 4.

155

160

165

170

175

180