

ARCHITECTURE AND CULTURE

Working Between and Across: Some Psychic Dimensions of Architecture's Inter- and Transdisciplinarity^[1]

Jane Rendell

Jane Rendell, Vice-Dean of
Research for the Bartlett
Faculty of the Built
Environment, The Bartlett
School of Architecture,
University College London.
j.rendell@ucl.ac.uk,
www.janarendell.co.uk

Volume 1/Issue 1
June 2013
pp125-138
DOI: 10.2752/
175145213X13756908698685

Reprints available directly
from the publishers.
Photocopying permitted
by license only.
©Bloomsbury 2012.

Recent times have seen the appropriation of the terms inter- and transdisciplinarity, grounded as they are in critique and politic debate, to deliver instrumental government policy. This article argues that in order to understand how both inter- and transdisciplinary approaches pose critiques of disciplinarity in architecture, one has to acknowledge the importance of their relational aspects. I do this here by referring to examples where humanities theorists have used terms drawn from psychoanalysis to inform debates on interdisciplinarity, for example “anxiety” in the work of Julia Kristeva and “ambivalence” in the writings of Homi Bhabha. In order to examine the potential of transversal activities for providing critiques of institutionalized relations put forward by Felix Guattari, I also briefly discuss several other relevant psychic concepts, for example, first the notion of “transitional space” put forward by D.W. Winnicott, and secondly the more elliptical phrase, “the enigmatic message,” proposed by Jean Laplanche. In the article I suggest that it is *only* by paying attention to the psychic dimensions of inter- and transdisciplinarity that we can understand how such work may operate in sites of resistance and contestation.

In recent times there has been a disturbing sense that the arena of architectural humanities-led work between and across disciplines – grounded in critical, ethical and political debate – is being appropriated and used to deliver instrumental government policy: to answer questions rather than pose them and to provide market-driven solutions rather than challenge ideological norms. This essay argues for the importance of acknowledging the more relational and emotional aspects of research and practice that operate between and across disciplines, suggesting that it is only by paying attention to the psychic dimension of such work that we can understand its transitional status and transformational potential, and so better position ourselves in today's sites of contestation.

In both academic and arts-based contexts, the prefixes multi-, inter- and trans- are often used in conjunction with disciplinarity in an interchangeable manner, but as I have previously argued with respect to the two former terms, I understand them to mean quite different things. [2] In my view, multidisciplinary 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 individuals operate between and at the edge of their discipline/s and in so doing question the ways in which they usually work. [3] Cultural critic Homi Bhabha has made a similar distinction, but using a different terminology. In discussing two different forms of interdisciplinarity in academic institutions over the past thirty to forty years, he names the first, “Interdisciplinarity 1,” where, according to Bhabha, given that different disciplines have “foundational truths,” the aim has been to put “two foundations in proximity” in order to create a “wider base.” Bhabha believes the institutions are quite comfortable with Interdisciplinarity 1, but that there is another interdisciplinary mode, which he calls “Interdisciplinarity 2.” For Bhabha, Interdisciplinarity 2 “is not an attempt to strengthen one foundation by drawing from another; it is a reaction to the fact that we are living at the real border of our own disciplines, where some of the fundamental ideas of our discipline are being profoundly shaken.” In his view, “questions to do with the indeterminate, with contingency, with intertextuality, have become central – the issue of ambivalence too,” and that this is “because Interdisciplinarity 2 is fired with a desire to understand more fully, and more problematically, that it’s posed at the point of our disciplines’ liminality, and that it requires us to articulate a new and collaborative definition of the humanities.” [4]

In exploring questions of method or process that discussions of interdisciplinarity inevitably bring to the fore, 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, [5] while Julia Kristeva has also developed a psychoanalytic understanding of interdisciplinarity, noting that “interdisciplinarity is always a site where expressions of resistance are

latent,” and arguing for the construction of “a diagonal axis.” [6] 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. And as we know from textiles, for example, woven fabric is more fluid when cut on the bias.

In 2003 I came up with the term “critical spatial practice” to describe projects located between art and architecture, and the standpoints theory offered for playing out disciplinary definitions. [7] I developed this concept further in *Art and Architecture*, in which I examined a series of projects located between art and architecture and defined as critical spatial practices since they critiqued both the sites into which they intervened and the disciplinary procedures through which they operated. I argued that such projects were located at a triple crossroads: between theory and practice, between art and architecture, and between public and private, and I was keen to stress three particular qualities. First, I proposed that the definition of the term “critical,” taken from Frankfurt School critical theory, be extended to encompass practice – particularly those critical practices that involved self-reflection and the desire for social change, that sought to transform rather than only to describe. [8] Second, drawing on the work of Michael de Certeau and Henri Lefebvre, I made a distinction between those strategies (for de Certeau) or representations of space (for Lefebvre) that aimed to maintain and reinforce existing social and spatial orders, and those tactics (for de Certeau) and spaces of representation (for Lefebvre) that sought to critique and question them, defining the latter as “critical spatial practices.” [9] Third, I was most interested in practices which desired to investigate the limits of their particular disciplinary procedures and to explore the interdisciplinary processes at work in between them. This questioning can occur when one individual’s work moves from one discipline to another, and it can also occur when individuals from different disciplines work with one another so that they become closely engaged in the procedures and ideologies that structure each other’s research modes and practice paradigms. Elsewhere I have described the patterning of this kind of work in terms of processes that tend to operate horizontally – surveying a field, examining the fissures and boundaries, the folds and overlaps, the tears and rips, the points where disciplines fall apart and come together – rather than vertically, where the techniques of in-depth focused research might be favored. [10]

But if interdisciplinarity is concerned with working in a place between disciplines in order to question their edges and borders, the term transdisciplinarity is more often described as a horizontal movement, concerned with moving across disciplines, transversally. Derived from the Latin preposition “trans,” meaning “across, to or on the farther side of, beyond, over,” the term can be used to give the sense of “across, through, over, to or on the other side of, beyond, outside of, from one place, person, thing, or state to another.” [11] Gary Genosko has described how, for philosopher Félix Guattari, the interdisciplinarity (of

1968) was compromised: it relied too much on the disciplines between which it was located, and served to strengthen rather than question their dominance. [12] For Guattari, it is transdisciplinarity that holds the potential of radical critique, linked in his own philosophy to transversality, an “unconscious source of action” that carries a group’s desire, “a dimension opposite and complementary to the structures that generate pyramidal hierarchisation.” [13] For Guattari, “transversality” is “explicitly a creature of the middle,” [14] where the “trans” is capable of transversal actions, which, in cutting across existing territories of knowledge, allows them to be experienced differently, thus providing new positions and perspectives.

Guattari, in his essay of 1964, “The Transference,” notes that “in the transference there is virtually never any actual dual relation.” [15] He argues that dual relations are always triangular in character, noting that “there is always in a real situation a mediating object that acts as an ambiguous support or medium.” [16] As Genosko points out, Guattari relies to a certain extent on both D.W. Winnicott’s notion of the transitional object and the potential space between mother and child as a third entity (to which I shall return) and Jacques Lacan’s *object a* as that which provokes the institution’s desire. As Genosko puts it, for Guattari, “it is with the triangle and threes that micropolitics begins.” [17] According to Genosko, a key early question for Guattari concerns what becomes of transference in the institutional setting of the hospital, and it is transversality which for him provides the possibility of critiquing the “institutional context, its constraints, organisation, practices, etc., all those things and relations which normally exist in the background.” [18]

It is precisely for this reason that I am a passionate advocate for inter- and transdisciplinarity. Because such projects bring to the fore many of the invisible mechanisms that order the set-up of the work we do, the approach is therefore critical, ethical and political, but it is also emotional: inter- and transdisciplinary work is difficult, not only materially and intellectually, but also psychically, because it often involves coming up against invested positions situated at the heart of institutional power structures. And if that were not demanding enough, then we also have to consider the affects of exchanging what we know for what we do *not* know and the surrender of competence and specialism for the fear of inability and the associated dangers of failure. It is hardly surprising, then, that this potentially transformational experience of inter- and transdisciplinary work also produces a potentially destabilizing engagement with those existing power structures, allowing on the one hand the emergence of fragile forms of new and untested experience, knowledge and understanding, and on the other those more unwelcome feelings of anxiety and ambivalence.

Given the recent appropriation of the terms inter- and transdisciplinarity, and in the meta-discourses of academe and higher education, where the words are most recently being used in place of multidisciplinary, it seems important to distinguish the particular qualities of an approach that is inter- and/or transdisciplinary. I suggest

that the aim of such work is to question dominant processes that seek to control intellectual and creative production, and to instead generate new resistant forms of research and practice. In following a desire to imagine and invent new processes and approaches through critique, this kind of activity requires emotional as well as mental and physical energy – this is why I suggest that it needs to be positioned within the context of psychic experience, particularly in connection with psychoanalytic concepts concerning transitional processes and the relational spaces between subjects.

The focus of the theory of object relations created and developed by the Independent British Analysts is the unconscious relationship that exists between a subject and his/her objects, both internal and external. [19] Winnicott introduced the idea of a transitional object related to, but distinct from, both the external object, the mother's breast, and the internal object, the introjected breast. For Winnicott, the transitional object, or the original "not-me" possession, stands for the breast or first object, but the use of symbolism implies the child's ability to make a distinction between fantasy and fact, between internal and external objects. [20] This ability to keep inner and outer realities separate yet interrelated results in an intermediate area of experience, the "potential space," which Winnicott claimed is retained and later in life contributes to the intensity of cultural experiences around art and religion. [21] Winnicott discussed cultural experience as located in the "potential space" between "the individual and the environment (originally the object)." In Winnicott's terms, for the baby, this is the place between the "subjective object and the object objectively perceived." [22]

It is the potential space offered by interdisciplinary work that I believe is such a strong attractor, where another discipline, as yet unknown, offers the chance to "lose control." [23] And if interdisciplinarity can be defined as the making of relationships between one discipline and another – through subject *and* object relations – then we might argue that the very work of interdisciplinarity is configured around the process of making relationships, continuously confronting the question of what it means to relate to, and therefore recognize, an "other." As psychoanalyst Jessica Benjamin writes, this question of "how is it possible to recognize an other?" has been a key concern of feminism, [24] while in her view the central task of psychoanalysis is the "double task of recognition: how analyst and patient make known their own subjectivity and recognize the other's." [25] Benjamin's interest is in pushing beyond reversal, "by contemplating the difficulty of creating or discovering the space in which it is possible for either subject to recognize the difference of the other." [26] Grounded in the object relations theory of Winnicott, Benjamin argues that psychoanalysis requires both an intrapsychic focus to examine relations between the self and the internalized other as object, and an intersubjective approach to explore the relationship between subjects and externalized others. [27] Indeed, according to Benjamin, once we start to think in

terms of relationships between subjects, or subjectivity, we have no choice but to consider these intrapsychic mechanisms of relation, most importantly identifications: “Once subjectivity is embraced,” she says, “we have entered into a realm of knowledge based on identifications, hence knowing that is intrapsychically filtered.” [28]

Feminist theorist Diane Fuss also explores processes of relating, and for her the focus is identification: she states that identification is “a question of relation, of self to other, subject to object, inside to outside”; [29] it is, she writes, “the psychological mechanism that produces self-recognition.” [30] Fuss outlines how identification involves the interrelationship of two processes, each working in different directions: introjection, the internalization of certain aspects of the other through self-representation, and projection, the externalization of unwanted parts of the self onto the other. Visual theorist Kaja Silverman, meanwhile, has explored identification in terms of cannibalistic or idiopathic identification, where one attempts to absorb and interiorize the other as the self, and heteropathic identification, where “the subject identifies at a distance” and in the process of identification goes outside his/herself. [31] This tension that operates between obscuring and so losing the other, and/or being engulfed or lost within the other, is perhaps the key experience of interdisciplinary work and its qualities of imagination and mystery, fantasy and seduction.

Psychoanalyst Jean Laplanche is probably best known for his reexamination of Sigmund Freud’s controversial abandonment of the seduction theory, and his turn to the child’s fantasy to explain seduction – thus at some level, according to Laplanche, avoiding thinking through the complex interplay of inner and outer worlds between the child and what Laplanche calls “the concrete other.” [32] Laplanche maintains that this early scene of seduction is of key importance to psychoanalysis as it works to de-center the position of the subject in its articulation of the formation and role of the unconscious. For Laplanche, it is the embedding of the alterity of the mother in the child which places an “other” in the subject; this other is also an other to the mother – as it involves her unconscious. Thus, the message imparted to the subject by the other – in Laplanche’s writings, the mother or concrete other – is an enigma both to the receiver and also to the sender of the message: the “messages are enigmatic because ... [they] are strange to themselves.” [33]

In Laplanche’s discussion of the enigmatic message, he suggests that transference – or the work of psychoanalysis – doesn’t occur first in the psychoanalytic setting to be applied in culture, but the other way around: “maybe,” he writes, “transference is already, ‘in itself,’ outside the clinic.” [34] For Laplanche, the analyst or recipient subject is involved in a two-way dynamic with the enigmatic message: s/he is “caught between two stools: the enigma which is addressed to him, but also the enigma of the one he addresses, his public.” [35]

More recently, Laplanche has supplemented his concept of the enigmatic message with an account of seduction that emphasizes the

importance of inspiration, or the role of the other as muse. [36] In this investigation, Laplanche inverts the traditional model of creative self-expression outlined in Freud's "Creative Writers and Daydreaming" (1908), arguing that the "moment of address" should be inverted from its narcissistic aspect – where it moves from the creator's self-expression to a receptive public who are expected to provide a beneficial response – to a public whose expectation provokes the creative work: "it is the public's expectation, itself enigmatic, which is therefore the provocation of the creative work" [37]

In recognizing the importance of transference in cultural activities that take place outside the clinic – the potential and often inexplicable resonances produced by the enigmatic and seductive qualities of "messages": their strangeness, the ways they inspire, the manners in which they excite expectation – the writings of Laplanche are key to conceptualizing processes of relation in inter- and transdisciplinarity in terms of creativity. [38] It is interesting to consider his understandings of the seductive qualities of the enigmatic other in parallel to Winnicott's notion of transitional space, with its qualities of potential-ness as the place of relation between two entities. The role that psychic processes – intrapsychic and intersubjective, including identification, recognition, transference, seduction and inspiration – play in structuring the complex emotional space of interdisciplinary work needs to be acknowledged in order to allow us to realize the care and time required to research and practice in this way. In order to generate a culture of mutual respect in these times of appropriation, skills of trust and concern are needed to balance the ever-present more destructive passions such as jealousy and suspicion, as well as to help work through the often-debilitating aspects of anxiety and ambivalence.

If my work on critical spatial practice has to date appeared to prioritize the role of the interdisciplinary, defined as *a place between* disciplines, in order to provide a critique of existing methodologies – including artistic projects which adopt architectural processes, architectural works which draw on fine art approaches and art/architectural collaborations – I would like to conclude this essay by wondering how the *between* of interdisciplinarity might relate to the *across* of transdisciplinarity. [39] If the *between* is always related to the points from which it is separated, or overly defined by those disciplines that it sits between, according to Guattari, then perhaps the *across* is more focused on the movement between these points. [40] However, although inter- and trans- are two distinct and spatially different prefixes attached to disciplinarity, this in itself is not necessarily reason enough for them to define two entirely distinct approaches with respect to criticality, or for us to assume that, because the latter has appeared more recently to replace the former, this has occurred because the former has failed. Rather it seems to me that the imperative to critique disciplinary procedures remains a shared objective, but the ways in which this might be more effective has had to change, not only because the disciplines themselves and the educational and research practices

associated with them are constantly evolving due to economic and political shifts, but also because the very act of naming a practice which signals the desire to question existing power relations makes such a term vulnerable to the process of recuperation. This means that to work critically – against the grain – in art and architecture involves operating in a constantly changing manner, between *and* across the disciplines. Working *between*, in Bhabha's words, requires the adoption of an "ambivalent" attitude and a recognition of the edge or border of a discipline, while working *across*, in Guatarri's transversal mode, necessitates a critique of institutional contexts, activated by an anti-hierarchical attitude. Following Kristeva, working these two together might involve the construction of a "diagonal axis," a mode of operating which cuts across and, as with fabric when one cuts on the bias, provides a strength through flexibility.

At the moment of writing, government initiatives in higher education are increasingly focusing on financial objectives. On the one hand, the practice of teaching is being pushed towards a phase of deepened alienation, with the removal of public funding denying equality of access to education on financial grounds, while at the same time revaluing the acquisition of knowledge in solely monetary terms. On the other, research funding is being directed to favor enterprise and impact – with the commodification of concepts, experiences and emotions as well as the promotion of more obvious object-like artifacts, patents and prototypes, tipped towards their potential sale value in the marketplace. In such an atmosphere, the value of architectural humanities research and practice, with its rich history of politically driven interdisciplinary work, is in grave danger of becoming unhinged from its ethical underpinnings and history of critical theory, becoming attached instead to industrial applications and problem-solving agendas. Against our protestations, we are seeing, almost daily, the marginalization of those areas of research and practice that do not demonstrate short-term economic benefit, while we are also witnessing the stealthy creep of recuperation – the use of terms such as interdisciplinarity, which derive from the arts and humanities and stand for critical, ethical and political ways of working – to support non-principled agendas and pragmatic delivery techniques.

When the focus on creativity is driven by "application," it is less usual for an artist/designer/writer to operate in an interdisciplinary way, to make a "problematic" artifact that questions the context of application and adopts another discipline's perspective in order to reflect critically on the ideological assumptions which underpin its own methods. As the agenda of UK teaching and research increasingly heads to market, we need to protect work that values self-questioning over more positivist models, often self-congratulatory, of short-term implementation and financial benefit. Interestingly, it might be that the very emotional register of such work, which I have argued here lies at the heart of inter- and transdisciplinary approaches, may be a site of

potential strength due to its vulnerable nature. In resistance, the ability to be subtle, to know how to care for fragility, to be able to make fluid and tensile relationships as well as take more oppositional stances to the critique of concepts, practices and methods, may be vital in building alternatives. The ethics of inter- and transdisciplinarity – the fascination of one for the other – configured as respect for difference, certainly allows for the exploration of boundaries and transitional processes. Yet, as well as the use of these abilities to reveal the workings of power in disciplinary structures of knowledge, and expose strategies of appropriation and recuperation, right now such skills are being put to action in the formation of new social movements. We need to take courage from these initiatives and nurture the emergence of marginalized forms of research and practice that are at once questioning of dominant ideological and economic systems *and* capable of constructing new forms of relation and proposing futures other than those envisaged for the short-term by neo-liberal capitalists in pursuit of immediate financial gain.

Jane Rendell is a writer, art critic and architectural historian/theorist/designer, whose work explores interdisciplinary intersections between architecture, art, feminism and psychoanalysis. Her authored books include *Site-Writing* (2010), *Art and Architecture* (2006) and *The Pursuit of Pleasure* (2002), and she is currently working on a new book on transitional spaces in architecture and psychoanalysis. She is co-editor of *Pattern* (2007), *Critical Architecture* (2007), *Spatial Imagination* (2005), *The Unknown City* (2001), *Intersections* (2000), *Gender, Space, Architecture* (1999) and *Strangely Familiar* (1995). Recent texts have been commissioned by artists such as Jasmina Cibic, Apollonia Susteric and transparadiso, and institutions such as FRAC Centre, Orléans, and Hamburger Bahnhof, Berlin. She is on the editorial board for *ARQ (Architectural Research Quarterly)*, *Architectural Theory Review*, *The Happy Hypocrite*, *The Issues*, *Journal of Visual Culture in Britain* and *Ultime Thule: Journal of Architectural Imagination*. She is Professor of Architecture and Art and Vice-Dean of Research at the Bartlett, UCL.

Bibliography

- Benjamin, Jessica. 1990. "An Outline of Intersubjectivity: The Development of Recognition." *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 7: 33–46.
- Benjamin, Jessica. 1998. *Shadow of the Other: Intersubjectivity and Gender in Psychoanalysis*. London: Routledge.
- Benjamin, Jessica. 2000. "Response to Commentaries by Mitchell and by Butler." *Studies in Gender and Sexuality*, 1: 291–308.
- Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bhabha, Homi K. 1995. "Translator Translated," interview with W.J.T. Mitchell, *Artforum*, 33, no. 7 (March): 80–4. <http://prelectur.stanford.edu/lecturers/bhabha/interview.html> (accessed May 3, 2013).
- Caruth, Cathy. 2001. "An Interview with Jean Laplanche." <http://www3.iath.virginia.edu/pmc/text-only/issue.101/11.2caruth.txt> (accessed May 3, 2006).

- Certeau, Michael de. 1988. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Doucet, Isabelle, and Janssens, Nel (eds). 2011. *Transdisciplinary Knowledge Production in Architecture and Urbanism: Towards Hybrid Modes of Inquiry*. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1959 [1908]. “Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming.” In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume IX (1906–1908): Jensen’s “Gradiva” and Other Works*. Translated under the general editorship of James Strachey, 141–54. London: The Hogarth Press.
- Fuss, Diane. 1995. *Identification Papers*. London: Routledge.
- Genosko, Gary. 2002. *Félix Guattari: An Aberrant Introduction*. London: Continuum.
- Genosko, Gary. 2003. “Félix Guattari.” *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*, 8, no. 1: 129–40.
- Geuss, Raymond. 1981. *The Idea of Critical Theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guattari, Félix. 1984 [1964]. “Transversality.” In Félix Guattari, *Molecular Revolution: Psychiatry and Politics*. Translated by Rosemary Sheed, 11–23. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Guattari, Félix. 1996 [1964]. “The Transference.” In Gary Genosko (ed.), *The Guattari Reader*, 61–8. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kohon, Gregorio (ed.). 1986. *The British School of Psychoanalysis: The Independent Tradition*. London: Free Association Books.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1998. “Institutional Interdisciplinarity in Theory and Practice: An Interview.” In *The Anxiety of Interdisciplinarity, De-, Dis-, Ex-*, edited by Alex Coles and Alexia Defert, vol. 2. London: Black Dog Publishing.
- Laplanche, Jean. 1989. *New Foundations for Psychoanalysis*. Translated by David Macey. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Laplanche, Jean. 1992. “The Kent Seminar, 1 May 1990.” In *Jean Laplanche: Seduction, Translation and the Drives*, edited by John Fletcher and Martin Stanton, 21–40. London: The Institute of Contemporary Arts.
- Laplanche, Jean. 1997. “The Theory of Seduction and the Problem of the Other.” *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 78: 653–66.
- Laplanche, Jean. 1999 [1992]. “Transference: Its Provocation by the Analyst.” Translated by Luke Thurston. In *Essays on Otherness*, edited by John Fletcher, 214–33. London: Routledge.
- Laplanche, Jean. 2002. “Sublimation and/or Inspiration.” Translated by Luke Thurston and John Fletcher. *New Formations*, 48: 30–50.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Nixon, Mignon. 2005. “On the Couch.” *October*, 113 (Summer): 39–76.
- Petrescu, Doina. 2005. “Losing Control, Keeping Desire.” In *Architecture and Participation*, edited Peter Blundell James, Doina Petrescu and Jeremy Till, 43–64. London: Spon Press.
- Rendell, Jane. 2003. “A Place between Art, Architecture and Critical Theory.” In *Proceedings to Place and Location*, 221–33. Tallinn, Estonia.
- Rendell, Jane. 2004. “Architectural Research and Disciplinarity.” *ARQ*, 8, no. 4: 141–7.
- Rendell, Jane. 2006. *Art and Architecture: A Place Between*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Rendell, Jane. 2010. *Site-Writing: The Architecture of Art Criticism*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Rendell, Jane. Forthcoming. “The Transitional Space of Interdisciplinarity.” In *Speculative Strategies In Interdisciplinary Arts Practice*, edited by Daniel Hinchcliffe, Jane Calow and Laura Mansfield.
- Rendell, Jane. Forthcoming. “Cut on the Bias: Relating Art and Architecture through Interdisciplinarity and Transdisciplinarity.” In *Art et Architecture*, edited by Marie-Ange Brayer. Orléans: HYX editions.
- Rushton, Richard. 2005. “The Perversion of The Silence of the Lambs and the Dilemma of The Searchers: on Psychoanalytic ‘Reading.’” *Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society*, 10, no. 3 (December): 252–68.
- Silverman, Kaja. 1996. *The Threshold of the Visible World*. London: Routledge.

134/135

Working Between and Across
Jane Rendell

- Stack, Allyson. 2005. "Culture, Cognition and Jean Laplanche's Enigmatic Signifier." *Theory, Culture & Society*, 22, no. 3: 63-80.
- Winnicott, D.W. 1953. "Transitional Objects and Transitional Phenomena: A Study of the First Not-Me Possession." *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 34: 89-97.
- Winnicott, D.W. 1967. "The Location of Cultural Experience." *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 48: 368-72.
- Winnicott, D.W. 1969. "The Use of an Object." *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 50: 711-16.
- Winnicott, D.W. 1991. *Playing and Reality*. London: Routledge.

Notes

- 1 Earlier versions of this argument and research are still in the process of being published as Jane Rendell, “The Transitional Space of Interdisciplinarity,” in *Speculative Strategies In Interdisciplinary Arts Practice*, ed. Daniel Hinchcliffe, Jane Calow and Laura Mansfield (forthcoming), and Jane Rendell, “Cut on the Bias: Relating Art and Architecture through Interdisciplinarity and Transdisciplinarity,” in *Art et Architecture*, ed. Marie-Ange Brayer (Orléans: HYX editions, forthcoming).
- 2 See Jane Rendell, “Architectural Research and Disciplinarity,” *ARQ*, 8, no. 4 (2004): 141–7.
- 3 See Jane Rendell, *Art and Architecture: A Place Between* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2006), 11–12.
- 4 “Translator Translated” (interview with cultural theorist Homi Bhabha) by W.J.T. Mitchell, *Artforum*, 33, no. 7 (March 1995): 80–4.
- 5 Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994), 163.
- 6 Julia Kristeva, “Institutional Interdisciplinarity in Theory and Practice: An Interview,” in Alex Coles and Alexia Defert (eds), *The Anxiety of Interdisciplinarity, De-, Dis-, Ex-*, vol. 2 (London: Black Dog Publishing, 1998), 5–6.
- 7 I first introduced the term “critical spatial practice” in Jane Rendell, “A Place Between Art, Architecture and Critical Theory,” in *Proceedings to Place and Location* (Tallinn, Estonia, 2003), 221–33 (published in English and Estonian) and later consolidated and developed the concept in Rendell, *Art and Architecture*. Since that time, the same term has been taken up by individuals such as Judith Rugg in her seminars at the RIBA, London, from around 2008; Eyal Weisman to describe activities as part of the MA: Research Architecture at Goldsmiths College of Art, London; and most recently by Marcus Miessen to identify the MA: Architecture and Critical Spatial Practice launched in 2011 at the Städelschule, Frankfurt.
- 8 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 Walter 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. See Raymond Geuss, *The Idea of Critical Theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).
- 9 See Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991) and Michael de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).
- 10 See for example Jane Rendell, *Site-Writing: The Architecture of Art Criticism* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2010), 72.
- 11 <http://oed.com/view/Entry/204575?rskey=0uUZXL&result=2-eid> and <http://oed.com/view/Entry/204575?rskey=KjaYsa&result=2&isAdvanced=false-eid> (accessed June 1, 2012).
- 12 Gary Genosko, *Félix Guattari: An Aberrant Introduction* (London: Continuum, 2002), 24. In many ways the problems of the interdisciplinarity of 1968 as recounted by Genosko, in terms of being “team-based,” adopting “brain-storming” and the “growing influence of the marketplace,” resonate both with the characterization of multidisciplinary as I have described it above and Homi Bhabha’s definition of interdisciplinarity 1 as discussed earlier. However, to really interrogate the relation between these three pairs of distinctions would need a much longer piece of research thoroughly embedded in the material conditions of these two historical periods and locations: the late 1960s in France and the mid–late 1990s in the UK and the USA.

- 13 Félix Guattari, "Transversality" [1964], in Félix Guattari, *Molecular Revolution: Psychiatry and Politics*, trans. Rosemary Sheed (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984), 11–23, 22.
- 14 Genosko, *Félix Guattari: An Aberrant Introduction*, 74.
- 15 Félix Guattari, "The Transference" [1964], in *The Guattari Reader*, ed. Gary Genosko (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), 61–8, 63.
- 16 Guattari, "The Transference," 63.
- 17 Gary Genosko, "Félix Guattari," *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*, 8, no. 1 (2003): 129–40, 132.
- 18 Genosko, *Félix Guattari: An Aberrant Introduction*, 71.
- 19 Gregorio Kohon (ed.), *The British School of Psychoanalysis: The Independent Tradition* (London: Free Association Books, 1986), 20. The British School of Psychoanalysis consists of psychoanalysts belonging to the British Psycho-Analytical Society; within this society are three groups, the Kleinian Group, the "B" Group (followers of Anna Freud) and the Independent Group.
- 20 D.W. Winnicott, "Transitional Objects and Transitional Phenomena: A Study of the First Not-Me Possession," *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 34 (1953): 89–97, in particular 89 and 94. See also D.W. Winnicott, "The Use of an Object," *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 50 (1969): 711–16.
- 21 Winnicott discussed cultural experience as located in the "potential space" between "the individual and the environment (originally the object)." In Winnicott's terms, for the baby this is the place between the "subjective object and the object objectively perceived." See D.W. Winnicott, "The Location of Cultural Experience," *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 48 (1967): 368–72, 371. See also D.W. Winnicott, *Playing and Reality* (London: Routledge, 1991).
- 22 Winnicott, "The Location of Cultural Experience," 371.
- 23 For an intelligent and moving account of what it means to lose control in collaborative and interdisciplinary architectural practice see Doina Petrescu, "Losing Control, Keeping Desire," in *Architecture and Participation*, ed. Peter Blundell Jones, Doina Petrescu and Jeremy Till (London: Spon Press, 2005), 43–64.
- 24 See for example Jessica Benjamin, *Shadow of the Other: Intersubjectivity and Gender in Psychoanalysis* (London: Routledge, 1998), 25 and 80 in particular, and Diane Fuss, *Identification Papers* (London: Routledge, 1995), 2–3.
- 25 Benjamin, *Shadow of the Other*, xii.
- 26 Benjamin, *Shadow of the Other*, see also Jessica Benjamin, "An Outline of Intersubjectivity: The Development of Recognition," *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 7 (1990): 33–46, especially 34–5, and Jessica Benjamin, "Response to Commentaries by Mitchell and by Butler," *Studies in Gender and Sexuality*, 1 (2000): 291–308, 302.
- 27 Benjamin, *Shadow of the Other*, xiii and 90.
- 28 Benjamin, *Shadow of the Other*, 25.
- 29 Fuss, *Identification Papers*, 3.
- 30 Fuss, *Identification Papers*, 2.
- 31 Kaja Silverman, *The Threshold of the Visible World* (London: Routledge, 1996), 23–4.
- 32 Cathy Caruth, "An Interview with Jean Laplanche," <http://www3.iath.virginia.edu/pmc/text-only/issue.101/11.2caruth.txt> (accessed May 3, 2006). Laplanche notes that Freud uses the terms *der Andere* and *das Andere* to distinguish the other person from the other thing. See Jean Laplanche, "The Kent Seminar, 1 May 1990," in *Jean Laplanche: Seduction, Translation and the Drives*, ed. John Fletcher and Martin Stanton (London: The Institute of Contemporary Arts, 1992), 21–40, 25.
- 33 Caruth, "An Interview with Jean Laplanche."
- 34 Jean Laplanche, "Transference: Its Provocation by the Analyst" [1992], trans. Luke Thurston, in *Essays on Otherness*, ed. John Fletcher (London: Routledge, 1999), 214–33, 222. See also Jean Laplanche, *New Foundations for Psychoanalysis*, trans. David Macey (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1989), 152–4.
- 35 Laplanche, "Transference: Its Provocation by the Analyst," 224.
- 36 Jean Laplanche, "The Theory of Seduction and the Problem of the

- Other,” *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 78 (1997): 653–66, 665.
- 37 Jean Laplanche, “Sublimation and/or Inspiration,” trans. Luke Thurston and John Fletcher, *New Formations*, 48 (2002): 30–50, 49. See also Sigmund Freud, “Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming” [1908], in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume IX (1906–1908): Jensen’s “Gradiva” and Other Works*, translated from the German under the general editorship of James Strachey (London: The Hogarth Press, 1959), 141–54.
- 38 The work of Laplanche has been taken up in film, literature and art history. See Richard Rushton, “The Perversion of The Silence of the Lambs and the Dilemma of The Searchers: On Psychoanalytic ‘Reading,’” *Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society*, 10, no. 3 (December 2005): 252–68; Allyson Stack, “Culture, Cognition and Jean Laplanche’s Enigmatic Signifier,” *Theory, Culture & Society*, 22, no. 3 (2005): 63–80; and Mignon Nixon, “On the Couch,” *October*, 113 (Summer 2005): 39–76.
- 39 My initial conceptualization of the “between” drew on the radical move offered by Jacques Derrida’s deconstruction as a critique of binary structures, to think “both/and” rather than “either/or,” in order to invent a new term, like “critical spatial practice,” which operates simultaneously as both of the binary terms, and yet exceeds their scope. Yet I also drew inspiration from Gilles Deleuze’s notion of the relay as important for thinking about the relation of theory to practice. See Jane Rendell, *Art and Architecture*, 9–10.
- 40 Although current debate is full of references to multi-, inter-, trans- and postdisciplinary research and practice, there are very few accounts which attempt to define the terms, or discuss on what basis an account of their differences might proceed. Isabelle Doucet and Nel Janssens have suggested that transdisciplinary knowledge in architecture and urbanism is distinguished by three features: the relation of discipline (theory) to profession (practice), an ethical dimension, and the experimental quality of design. See Isabelle Doucet and Nel Janssens (eds), *Transdisciplinary Knowledge Production in Architecture and Urbanism: Towards Hybrid Modes of Inquiry* (Heidelberg: Springer, 2011), 2. Although I find this attempt to define the term helpful, it does not in my opinion go far enough, and I would welcome an inquiry conducted on philosophical grounds, which might, for example, start with the prepositions themselves, starting with a more developed understanding of the role of prepositions and prefixes in language and practice. I have made a tentative start on this in my site-writing project in which, inspired by the work of Michael Serres and Luce Irigaray, I have experimented through practice with what it means to take a positioned and relational approach to criticism, where instead of placing an object *under* critique one might write *to* or *as* an object. See Jane Rendell, *Site-Writing*, 6–7. Another way of researching the distinctions between inter- and transdisciplinary approaches would be to conduct a historical and cultural analysis of the use of the terms as suggested in note 12 above.