How should we raise the question of social and environmental justice to become a mainstream political objective?

Is there a sexual specificity in relation to space?

How can feminism, within and about architecture, engage effectively with our politically unstable times?

Do public planning need feminist separatist groups to change the norm? To exclude to be able to include?

How could the concerns of feminism be infiltrated in the conceptualisation of architecture, as an active component of the discipline but without its differentiation as activism?

How to implement feminist work practices and research into the architectural profession?

How can we improve wages and childcare support for women in the profession to ensure more women are able to develop their careers in architecture?

There is an urgent need for “rethinking the social in architecture” in late modernistic housing areas. In relationship to that I’m interested in posing the question of how feminist city planning could develop a method not only involving the citizens in social pre-studies, but bringing the process further into the design- and conventional planning phase?

There is a need for new types of social places that could change the public sphere, that in many examples are dominated by men – but certainly not are attractive to women.

Women do not have time to spend in public; they are occupied in domestic life. Is it possible to create ‘hybrid’ spaces with another type of necessary actives, taking more important roles in everyday life in comparison to cafés, shops etc.? One example is Stepwells in India. Could we mix playgrounds with restaurants, laundry with cafés? Or could we take this spatial challenge even further? Could a method be developed to give a strong motif that collaboration between feminism and architecture generates an important tool for “rethinking the social in architecture”?

Simply: How to and why make feminism a mainstream topic in architecture?

How can feminism continue to affect our everyday practice and ethics within architecture?

Is it about the articulation of difference (feminist spaces, practices, etc.), or is it about equal rights?

How do we engage those who consider Feminist issues totally irrelevant to Architecture?

How does the privatisation and neo-liberalisation of universities impact on feminist teaching and research in architecture schools?

As our society shifts in values, how do you address the patriarchal nature of much of the pre-existing built environment?

To what extent is it possible/desirable for tools and modes of practice informed by feminist theory in architecture to find space within mainstream structures?

In which context and scale is it possible to act and who can make supply decisions?

How can we challenge the fundamental male dominance in the building industry (that is, as the architecture profession becomes more gender balanced, the building industry at large is characterised by inertia and non-transparent structures), and what could be the result of a balanced field of practice and production?

How is a feminist architecture to develop responsible and caring approaches to transforming/making the world in such a way that it will welcome and host all living beings and all existing, imaginable and still-to-be-invented forms of life?

Is a nomadic feminist practice that actually affirms different notions of spatiality and subjectivities possible within architectural practice?
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Making Trouble to Stay With:
Architecture and Feminist Pedagogies

Torsten Lange and Emily Eliza Scott with contributions from Lila Athanasiadou, Harriet Harriss, Andrea Jeanne Merrett, Seyed Hossein Iradj Moeini, Jane Rendell and Rachel Sara

Architecture is, at its most basic, about imagining desirable futures. Yet, despite growing awareness of the lasting and extensive effects that design decisions have in the world, many people remain inadequately represented (or entirely unrepresented) by the profession, which lacks diversity. The faction of those who hold the power to design is still, by and large, comprised of a relatively homogenous group of middle-class white men who dominate not only the profession but also architectural education, even though there is now—in most places—near gender parity among students. How, then, might we—as educators committed to forms and practices of architecture that are inclusive, progressive, egalitarian, socially and environmentally just, and so on—implement and promote feminist pedagogies? Together, this set of short responses by young as well as established figures in the field, begins to sketch the outlines of an approach to architectural education rooted in feminist politics. Our goal is to offer possible tools at our disposal, from revisionist architectural history to site-specific, community-based spatial projects to gender-centered design studios.
If the architectural profession is to play an incisive role in current and future world making, we believe that the discipline must fundamentally change. How “architectural” knowledge is produced and reproduced in the academy, first and foremost through teaching, matters a great deal in this regard, and calls for urgent and radical reconfiguration. Engaging adequately with entangled, promiscuous and inevitably messy realities requires forms of knowing and doing that place emphasis on collaboration and cross-disciplinary exchange, on interdependency as well as contingency. Yet architecture, a notoriously conservative discipline with roots in the long nineteenth century, all too often clings to traditional notions of individual mastery, genius, and autonomy, while also maintaining deeply hierarchical and patriarchal structures.

Feminist thinkers such as Donna Haraway and bell hooks have, by contrast, championed diverse practices that hold the potential to “trouble” such prevailing models, while furthermore providing fruitful alternatives to normative forms of knowledge production. For example, Haraway stresses that all knowledge is situated as opposed to objective or universal, encouraging the persistent acknowledgement of positionality with regard to any given problem or claim. She furthermore advocates experimental forms of research and expression – including what she calls “speculative fabulation” – that are grounded in the world, while, at the same time, recognizing their potential to make worlds otherwise. Meanwhile, hooks highlights the emancipatory potential of education, espousing pedagogical practices that transgress the limits of the classroom. With particular sensitivity to gender, race, and class, she aims to transform the dominant power relations that are socially reproduced through knowledge. Extending from this, our contribution springs from the question: How might we—as educators committed to forms and practices of architecture that are progressive, egalitarian, socially and environmentally just, and so on—implement and promote feminist pedagogies?

The following, collected inputs—framed by way of three loose and interrelated questions—are based upon conversations held during a roundtable panel on pedagogy at the “Architecture and Feminisms” conference hosted by the KTH Royal Institute of Technology in Stockholm in November 2016. Along with our fellow “educator-kin” and a lively audience, we discussed not only ways that feminist pedagogical strategies might contribute to meaningful “troublemaking” in the architectural discipline, but also how we might build the alliances and networks necessary to keeping that trouble productively alive. Our aim, in other words, was to further an “ecology of practices” and practitioners in architectural education that might transform the discipline in responsive and sustainable fashion.


What forms might feminist pedagogy take in architecture and who are its potential protagonists (imaginary or real)?

Andrea Merrett

Although not immediately concerned with pedagogy, the feminist architects who wrote the first histories of women in the profession provided the material to expand the canon taught to architecture students. They were part of a first generation of architects and scholars who challenged the disciplinary boundaries of architectural history to include not only female architects, but also other histories not previously told. The work of recuperating these histories is ongoing and has yet to radically alter what and how history is taught, at least here in North America.

This raises, for me, the question: what is the role of the architectural historian in a professional school? Beyond developing students’ skills in research, the synthesis and analysis of texts and artifacts, and the presentation of their ideas, the historian can help students understand the context of architectural production. This includes the histories of professionalization, office practices, and construction laws. Furthermore, I believe that historians can be instrumental in countering the insularity of the architecture school around the design studio by connecting architecture to the larger social, political, and cultural forces that shape it.

Feminist scholars in the 1970s, after all, were never just interested in who the female architects were, but also the social and professional norms that contributed to the built environment. A more recent generation of scholars have extended these earlier feminist analyses to gender and spatial relations, representational strategies, text and language, and race and sexuality. Mining this work for content and methodologies goes beyond uncritically adding women to the canon to expand students’ exposure not just to the history of construction, but the construction of history, and their place in it.

Harriet Harriss

Epigraph: “A mistress is not a female mister…. nor a starlet a female star. In fact, a starlet is not a star at all.” – Sol Saporta.

That there are fewer women architects than men cannot be blamed on practice alone: schools of architecture share a burden of responsibility too. However, the gender gap between men and women within roles of academic leadership is even more acute. In the UK for example, the male to female
ratio for heads of school is 1:40. Women heads can be counted on one hand. Subsequently, it’s the “masters” and not the “mistresses” of architecture whose pedagogies pervade. Unless staffing teams are inclusively peopled, inclusive pedagogies fall flat. Feminist pedagogies are not only needed to provide a set of principles and practices for educational equality, but also to build a space in which women can inhabit educational institutions to begin with.

For a mistress pedagogue in a position of influence, explicitly promoting feminist pedagogies can often be discredited as “subjective,” “personal” and “politicizing” (i.e. actions considered “un-academic”), fueling the fear that such “activism” will worsen already poor chances of promotion and increase isolation. Yet feminist pedagogy emphasizes collective over individual action, to protect rather than expose its own. It demands that the false dichotomies that divide us are deconstructed - from student v tutor to end-user v architect – disrupting the debilitating and exhausted power relations that have served to perpetuate partitions based on gender identity, ethnicity, class, age, ability and sexuality (figs. 1 & 2).

Feminist pedagogy tackles the problem of inequality in all its forms and across architecture writ large: from how a male tutor might relate to a female student, to how the profession allows manual laborers to be treated on site. Whilst gender-sensitive pedagogies invite us to acknowledge diversity and difference, feminist pedagogies emphasize our interconnectedness: the need to share and redistribute and to work for collective good and not just individual goals. As the world outside the classroom is fast becoming increasingly inequitable, feminist pedagogy provides a working prototype for students; it helps them report, resist or reconfigure, but never to resign to the present reality. In the face of the fear-fueled crisis that previous patriarchal pedagogies have helped foster, feminist pedagogy is not the backswing of a fist but the leveling force needed to defibrillate the unfolding disaster.

---


---

Figure 1 and 2. MA architecture students working on a live project on Fish Island in Hackney, London 2014. The brief tasked students with inserting ‘meanwhile’ spaces into a disused building scheduled for redevelopment, giving the spaces a useful community purpose in the interim. Photographs by Harriet Harriss.
Which practical strategies have you employed to set an explicitly feminist agenda in your design studio teaching and how have students responded to such efforts?

Iradj Moeini

Our studio started with a series of discussions on feminism that helped students familiarise with the topic in an Iranian academic context, in which feminist views are virtually unknown. A consensus developed during these sessions that feminism is part of a broader set of ideas oriented toward unraveling historically developed forms of discrimination and exclusion.

The discussions were also focused on issues of abuse – something a typical student in Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, knows little about – and how women are affected differently, and often more severely, by it in many societies. This helped shift the common perception of fugitive abused women as being oblique, or even criminal, to one wherein they are understood to have suffered tough, discriminatory circumstances which need to be addressed with support and, if necessary, shelter.

Our studio project evolved in conjunction with readings and discussions on feminist art, women’s movements, gender and public space, feminine design, and psychoanalysis. It also included case studies of houses for abused women both in Iran and abroad, through which students explored the vulnerable situation of these women, how they feel about their various environments, and ways in which they can be better protected and cared for through architecture. Some of the design themes and strategies that students came up with were: domesticity, glamour, merging into/emerging connotations, soft materiality, and craftiness.

Most contentious was the issue of site selection. Diverging from mainstream practice in our school, students focused carefully on not only access, views, and adjacent land uses, but also the factors that might positively affect abused women’s quality of life, both in terms of giving them a sense of security and facilitating their reintegration into society. Although students’ opinions were often divided, a consensus developed that such issues have a significant gendered dimension.

In the end, a site was selected next to a women-only park called ‘Mothers’ Paradise’. This involved another series of debates as to whether or not the association between motherhood—or, to use Sara Ahmed’s words, the condition of being ‘happy housewives’—and paradise is something that should be challenged.10

By the time students reached the design stage, they had developed their individual ideas of how to address the specific issues of their users,

not only by sheltering them from further abuse, but also by designing
gender-conscious spaces.

Rachel Sara

I write this as a part of the hands-on-bristol collective,11 which acts as a
platform to bring together community members, architects, architecture
students, and academics, to work together in order to generate positive
changes within our city, Bristol, United Kingdom. I also write this as an
academic with a particular concern for the promotion of diversity – both
in terms of who is involved in education and the profession as well as what
is valued as architecture. This emphasis on diversity is underpinned by a
radical feminist and transformative pedagogy, inspired, in particular, by
bell hooks and Paulo Freire.12

Our collective has set up an ongoing practice of studio projects13 that take
design as an individual sovereign act, and into diverse, local communities
with the aim of building design projects that are collaborative, negotiated,
connected, inclusive, and empathetic.

We understand these efforts as representing a type of live community
architecture. Whereas typical live projects are often assumed to comprise “the
negotiation of a brief, timescale, budget and product between an educational
organization and an external collaborator for their mutual benefit,” and to
be “structured to ensure that students gain learning that is relevant to their
educational development,”14 we conceive of live community architecture as
a form of spatial agency which involves collaboration between a community
and architects that results to their mutual benefit and, ideally, a positive
and sustained impact on both. A feminist agenda shifts the focus towards
inclusive co-creation and participatory practices. The primary objective is
civic spatial agency, in which knowledge is generated collectively throughout
the process (rather than focused on the students’ individual learning).

Students have responded to such projects in mixed ways. Some feel
constrained by “consulting,” and hang on to their presumed positions of
expertise where possible. Others engage in ways that seek out the voices of
silenced others to challenge questions of difference and engage in inclusive
creation. The most powerful work reconceives the relationship between
all involved as something akin to a learning community, in which design is
understood as a practice of freedom that brings forth new consciousness
about the conditions that shape (a) community’s place(s) in the world.15
It furthermore catalyzes community action beyond the confines of an
academic project, so that projects become largely self-sufficient and live on
into the future (figs. 3 & 4).

---

11 See http://www.hands-on-bristol.co.uk.
12 bell hooks, Teaching Community: A Pedagogy of Hope (New York: Routledge 2003); and Paulo Freire, Pedagogy of the
Oppressed (New York: Continuum, 1989).
13 For the first year of a two year, RIBA Part II accredited Master of
Architecture course at the University of the West of England, UK.
14 Live Projects Network: http://liveprojectsnetwork.org/about/.
Which conceptual frameworks, from critical theory to activist, can be mobilized in order to articulate and extend feminist pedagogy?

Lila Athanasiadou

Within the context of architectural education, pedagogical practices tend to follow prescriptive models grounded in either inductive or deductive reasoning. The former, envious of methodologies used in hard sciences, reproduces 1:1, all-encompassing representations, reducing social complexity to a problem-solution dialectic while transforming empirical observations into axiomatic truths. The latter, fixated on styles, specific representational techniques, and idealizations of specific architectural theories, fetishizes the image of the architecture rather than the practices it affords. Both models encourage students to adopt preexisting positions rather than to forge their own, and make for a teaching practice that is based on the transference rather than the transduction of knowledge. A feminist rethinking of pedagogy, by contrast, radically reorients attention from the form of the project to the entire, process-based assemblage of educator, student, and content.

Felix Guattari’s “meta-modeling” offers a conceptual framework based on abductive reasoning, which shifts the focus from locating and reusing existing models to developing a sensibility toward their emergence. His scheme traces the formation of the subject through the relationality between patterns (models) and the crystallization of subjectivity as it transverses these relations. By abstracting the methodological movements of meta-modeling, the creative process shifts its subject matter from the things-in-themselves (understood as products) to the resonances between them and the contingencies of their formation. This design process forms in two asymmetrical registers: the foreground, as the product of the process; and the background, which encompasses non-goal oriented activities, thought-based and tangible experimentation, as well as intuition. The background process encourages an abductive reasoning based on the “hypothetical inference” preceded by a material observation that both describes something and interferes with it.

By adopting a problematic approach rather than an axiomatic one, meta-modeling as a pedagogical practice problematizes all models and preconceptions. It becomes a way of unlearning standards and conventions, questioning the means of approaching a problem as well as the problem itself. Instead of aiming to provide clear answers to clearly defined questions, it shifts the question until the answer becomes a process of how to answer a question of that nature. This operation transforms it into an action on an action, a design of the process of designing, rather than the design of mere products.

---


Making Trouble to Stay With: Architecture and Feminist Pedagogies
In 2003, I introduced the term “critical spatial practice” to define modes of self-reflective artistic and architectural practice which seek to question and to transform the social conditions of the sites into which they intervene, and test the limits of their own disciplinary procedures. At the heart of the project is a focus on the “inter” and the “trans” as places and processes that operate between and across art and architecture, theory and practice, public and private. My pedagogical approach relates closely to my practice-led research: they inform one another. The feminist aspect is palpable in the attention paid to positionality and subjectivity, and the unerring return of site-specificity, situation and situated-ness in the work.

Through writing about critical spatial practice, I came to understand criticism as a form of critical spatial practice, one I named “site-writing.” Site-writing is the pedagogical challenge I set myself annually (for around 16 years now). Each year, I offer a group of students the invitation to produce a piece of experimental writing, one that responds to, but also intervenes into, a site, conceptually and formally. Most recently, site-writing has transformed into site-reading, where texts on the “reading list” get configured and read aloud on site, participants set writing workshops for each other, and I get to go wherever I am taken!
Epilogue

As conveners of the pedagogy-themed roundtable session forming the basis for this piece, we arrived to the conversation hungry to learn from others about their insights and experiences with building feminist-oriented architectural teaching, including the strategies and references employed as well as the challenges, or even failures, encountered in the process. We were particularly motivated by our efforts to address the pronounced gender inequity at ETH Zurich, our current institutional home. Here, among other things, we are working to introduce an interdepartmental seminar in which feminism, in addition to being our subject matter, is taken up as a method and orientation through which to critically explore architecture in its various aspects, scales, and modes of operation – from design through to technology and construction, history and theory, urbanism and landscape.

In closing, we wish to emphasize that all of these discussions take place in the context of the intensifying financialization of higher education, as reflected in the growing proportion of and competition for private funding, the expectation of wildly accelerated academic production, and the rising influence of the administrative sector. This trend has significant implications for gender-related concerns. Increasingly resembling an extractive economy, the academy measures output (i.e., academic products) in ever more quantified terms. While argued to be somehow objective, metric-based evaluation has been shown, again and again – according to numerous studies on the workplace, including the academic workplace, specifically – to mask, and thereby to perpetuate, gender biases. Again, feminist scholarship has proven especially useful for negotiating these emergent conditions. A recent manifesto on “slow scholarship,” for instance, offers models for a “feminist ethics of care that challenges the accelerated time and elitism of the neoliberal university,” including its “isolating effects and embodied work conditions.”

Together, this set of short responses to questions about feminist pedagogy in architecture – by young as well as established figures in the field – begins to sketch the outlines of an approach to architectural education rooted in feminist politics as well as to offer possible tools at our disposal for achieving it, from revisionist architectural history to site-specific, community-based spatial projects to gender-centered design studios. In the end, we believe that feminism helps us to critically assess the various structures, superstructures, and everyday practices that shape architecture today, especially in this moment of extreme financialization. Perhaps more importantly, at the level of content, form, and method alike, feminism provides crucial insights into how we might help our students to develop the skills demanded to not only question the inequitable and oppressive powers at play, but also to imagine and produce architecture otherwise.

---

24 Since 2015, the Parity Group in the Department of Architecture at ETH Zurich, a grassroots initiative established by academic staff and students with which both of us are actively involved, has been confronting the lack of diversity, gender-wise and otherwise, at our institution. To this end, the group has organized two multi-day symposia, titled “Parity Talks”, one each in 2016 and 2017. During these events, we have chaired roundtable discussions about issues of gender in relation to architectural pedagogy as well as practical strategies for implementing gender-sensitive academic policies. See: http://www.aaa.arch.ethz.ch/parity.html.
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