

| The Production of Feminine Space

Introduction

| Crafting the Space of Privilege

Although crafting space is the charge of the profession of architecture, the profession maintains a subordinate position as a tool of the State. As a tool, architecture is granted authority to reproduce spatial formations. Likewise, authority over the production of female space or space primarily occupied by females does not reside with architects but with the State. The State seeks to maintain dominion over a given population by maintaining social categories promoting *différance*. *“As Derrida puts it in a well-known statement, *différance* refers to ‘the systematic play of differences, of traces of differences, of spacing by means of which elements are related to each other.’” (Lucy 26)* Through an investigation of space as a social object, we can challenge the legitimacy of formations created to exclude the bodies of women or other marginalized groups. If the crafters of space construct categories that reify *différance* concretely, then are the crafters arranging the built environment, or crafting space of privilege? If the production via construction of privilege is a truer account of the architectural task, then what is the architect’s motivation within this master/slave dialectic? In this arrangement the architect would be considered the slave and the State is master. What is at stake for the profession of architecture? Is *différance*, as articulated within social systems, fixed or mobile? How can space be neutral if spatial formations are inherently assigned non-neutral typologies, rendering them biased?

I. The Practice of Architecture

Although crafting space is the charge of the profession of architecture, the profession maintains a subordinate position as a tool of the State. “The culture industry claims to serve the consumers’ needs for entertainment, however, it conceals the way that it standardizes these needs, manipulating the consumers to desire what it produces.” (Adorno 12)

A. The Culture Industry

1. Is architecture an industry?

In order to register an understanding of architecture in relation to the concept of industry, we must define the term “industry.” It derives from the Latin word “*industria*“ which means “diligent activity directed to some purpose,” as well as the French word “*industrie*” which means “activity” and “a trade or occupation.” With this, we can begin to locate the professional practice and discourse regarding architecture. If the working definition of the term means to engage in a particular activity with some intent then, as a professional or academic endeavour, architecture can be considered an industry.

The professional industry maintains occupation over the physical production of space while the academic industry maintains dominion over the production of the architect as a viable member of the citizenry.

If we incorporate the subversive practices of the State into the working definition of industry with Theodor Adorno's concept of the "culture industry," then the industry of architecture as a cultural practice would standardize the needs of its patrons. How does architecture standardize the needs of consumers? By way of the academy, architects are produced using subversive practices. The institution of the academy alleges to teach design and technology using inter-disciplinary discourse. In reality the academy teaches neither design nor technology, but rather imposes modes of representation that serve to construct patterns of thought regarding a history and a future. The depictions used serve as the grounds upon which the produced architect's identity rests. At these moments of actualization, the identified architect asserts legitimacy. This legitimacy is not grounded in the realization of an inherent creative acumen but rather through the academy. The academy is the location of said standardization regarding the production of the architect within the brotherhood of acceptable citizens.

2. Modernity or standardization?

The practice of architecture welcomes newly conditioned members as tools to maintain a dominant architectural ideology through the standardization of production practices. The practice also standardizes criterion upon which architecture will be criticized and valued. To be labeled a modern building is to be accepted within the realm of culturally produced artifacts. Therefore, the architect as well as the architecture of said practitioners is situated as a concept of modernity.

3. Desiring architecture or the myth of the architect?

The ideal architect is a mythology that engenders status and repute through the mysterious nature of what it is "to be" an architect as Husserl and/or Heidegger would postulate. In other words the illusive identity of the architect occurs in the split that is created by negotiations between the realm of ideas and the realm of objects. The "being" of an architect is thus based upon an association with objects that are independent of the architect. The objective nature of material culture is utilized by the practice of architecture as a means to situate a collective identity within the realm of professionals.

B. Crafting an Identity

1. The academy produces architects, not buildings.

When does one become an architect? When does one become a female? These questions presuppose the existence of social systems and symbolic language that propose legal or gender

assignments. I would argue that the systems in question propose assignments because the beings being assigned the value are active. Just as architects engage in the practice of architecture, females engage in the practice of being different than males.

The subversive nature of the academy uses technologies to recruit, rear, program and sanction architecture to legitimize the identity of its members. This manner of production is similar to the manner in which the female body is recruited, reared, programmed and sanctioned as feminine within the citizenry. The female body is granted privilege only in that the subject accepts the cultural customs and traditions that signify the female. If a being of such distinction elects not to engage in the normative practices, then the female will be marginalized and treated as an object being.

2. *Objects with or without architects?*

Buildings, as objects, exist exclusive of the existence of architects just as females exist exclusive of male figures. Wherein the continued existence of females is inextricably linked to males, the connection between architects and built objects is negligible. Though personhood does not depend upon legislation to sanction its legitimacy, the social condition through which personhood exists requires a sanction via legislation. Since the identity of architects, along with the identity of females, is secured only through legislation, both remain unnatural and unstable. The instability of the figures rests within the paradigm of the cursive/recursive split as framed by Barbara Johnson, in the *“Feminist Difference.”* (Johnson 18-19) The dependency of the recursive subject, i.e. architect or female, can only exist within social systems designed to maintain them as they are. The unnatural occurrence of the dependency only serves to continually illuminate the limitations of the social rank.

3. *Architects with or without objects?*

The status of architect as a viable entity serves in kind to locate the subject within a given social rank. The subjectivity of the practice serves to deny a more suitable status beyond the existence of objects just as the category of gender serves to deny a suitable existence beyond the limited notion of the female. If privilege is the domain of those who have been sanctioned, then to deny the right or to deny access is an offensive act conducted via social, political and economic practices. Architects, like females, serve as figures of denial that readily mark the territory of deprivation that they are co-signed to occupy.

C. *Why Craft Space?*

If the primary function of dwelling objects is to protect humans from the physical environment, then all other built objects serve the desires of – not the needs of – humans. The desires of humans are

guaranteed culturally and serve to reify the identity of the occupants within and through *différance*. From an understanding of mimesis we can illustrate how identities of built objects are reified through dwelling occupants. The process through which built objects and dwelling objects become the other, locates identities of others by way of the other. Jean Baudrillard speaks of conceptual density as a product of time in space, which allows beings to locate themselves through objects. Baudrillard claims, *“Human beings and objects are indeed bound together in collusion in which the objects take on a certain density, an emotional value – what might be called a ‘Presence.’”* (Baudrillard 14) During these moments objects and beings mimic the other, thereby becoming within the space of the object.

1. Bonding buildings and beings.

The emotional value claimed by Baudrillard regarding built objects and humans are similar to the emotive relationship between female and male. Just as humans and built objects operate through a mutual dependency, gendered beings become mutually dependent. The gender dependency operates as recursive/cursive binary in which both the subject and the object serve as co-dependent figures. If this is to be the case, then both figures are mutually dependent revealing the instability of the gender dependency model. Both male and female operate as recursive beings and are thusly able to re-cast their existence unbound to the other. Because the recursive object/being embodies this agency, the exclusivity of doubling or return upon the frame forms a recursive/cursive complementary arrangement from within. The recursive doubling of the figure/ground model can account for marginalized beings, typically marginalized by race, gender and/or sexual categories.

2. The architect as subaltern.

By exploring the doubling of gender figures we can analyze the inter-disciplinary role of architect. If an architect, as a social construct, is read as a liaison operating mutually – not exclusively – within the realm of the built and the imaged, then re-locating identity beyond spatial formations is possible. Spatial formations exist relative to gender categories while architects rely upon objects. Therefore the imaged relieves both the being and the object of the assumed social fixity. Females are rendered co-habitué to male figures that wittingly accept the privileged position within society. If females are able to be what they are to be as figures operating in an imaged reality, then anything that remains for these figures is that which the female is as a cursive or recursive figure. The boundary of the male/female binary locates the male as given which is not an important argument. The argument at hand is what is the female figure beyond the register of the male? Inasmuch as the male is defined in terms of the existence of the female, the female does not have to accept recognition within the same frame of reference. The female can operate as a co-habitué and/or recursive figure that is defined as

that which "is." To be female is not to be in opposition to, but in accordance to that which the collective wills.

Similarly, architects have accepted dependency, relying on built objects because the corporeality of buildings is visible though not culturally valued. This value judgment locating the built object as viable locates the architect without the object as illegitimate. The nature of what it is to be an architect has virtually nothing to do with objects. Just as what it is to be female has very limited import upon male subjects.

II. Différance

The State seeks to maintain dominion over a given population by maintaining social categories that foster the notion différance. According to Butler, gender performance is only subversive because it is *"the kind of effect that resists calculation, which is to say that signification is multiplicitous, that the subject is unable to control it, and so subversion is always occurring and always unpredictable."* (Butler 29)

A. Performativity

1. Who is controlling the uncontrollable subversion?

The subject or co-habitué at large is the State. The State does not aggressively suppress the will of the people but chooses instead to utilize the passive technologies of bio-power, as defined by Michel Foucault, to subvert the collective will of the people. The State's use of bio-power conditions the subjects to believe that culture is natural and universal. By engaging in these practices through the use of institutions marketed as viable and just, the State attempts to craft social roles. Within this framework the limited role of the female continues to evolve and becomes unstable. This instability derives from the manufactured nature of dependency. The role of the female figure must be introduced, learned, accepted and practiced in order to reaffirm the role of the male. What then if the female figure does not accept that which has been introduced? Does not the male figure collapse into that which is beyond or the territory of queer theory? If, as Butler postulates, a vacillation occurs and beings perform while modifying themselves, then the terrain of that which is female is always in question. Can the female be understood if it can only be read through a system that requires it to be continually re-read? The moment of re-reading requires one to re-think that which has been acquired since the last interpretation(s) leading to a re-interpretation of the figure.

The existence of the female figure serves as a commodity of the State, not a commodity of male figures. Lucy Irigary postulates that women are commodities of men whom they serve either as utilitarian objects and/or bearers of value. I posit that female figures are not the commodities of males, but are commodities of the State that in turn diverts authority to males as signifying agents with no right

to power or ownership over bodies. This relationship is passively legislated in a manner similar to that which grants pseudo-authority of the built environment to architects who have no right to power or governance. That which is female, as well as that which is architecture, is socially constructed and therefore not dependent upon man but the State. Just as the female is introduced, learned, accepted and practiced, the role of the architect is produced through a similar framework using technologies of bio-power. Just as the female is a commodity of the State, the architect is a commodity of the State. Therefore architects are beholden to the State in order to assume the manufactured identity or non-identity.

The female is female in that she is not male. The duality of the term *différance*, as introduced by Jacques Derrida, serves to reveal how the female is a multiplicitous condition requiring the female figure to differ in form, as well as to defer to the will of the State through the male figure. The female figure is required to become passive not because of an inherent nature but to adhere to the standardization of roles as mandated by the State as governing body. The production of the female reveals how the architect, as a social actor, defers its identity to objects while accepting the privilege of being different within a consortium of disciplines.

2. Acting like an academic.

The academy is the appropriate location for an architect to wrestle control of his/her identity away from the State. If the discipline of architecture is to form a cursive territory from which the dependence upon objects can be relieved, then the technologies of architecture must be introduced, learned and practiced but accepted as the practice of architecture. The role of the architect as thinker, artist, poet and engineer has been challenged and usurped by State agents. The historical frame from which this challenge may emanate is likely, the “ideal” of the architect as “*master builder.*” (*Van Kijk, Hans 12-13*) Through the use of the terms master and builder, the collective notion of craft, through materiality, dislocates the identity of the architect into the realm of handicraft.

Karl Heinrich von Bötticher classifies the conditions of building and design in terms of core form and art form. For Bötticher, core form is represented by the necessities of buildings while the art form is the literal form of the built object. (*Boetticher 138-52*) This misnomer leads architects within society to consolidate conditions of building or art form with the task of building objects or core form. The task of building artifacts is distinctly different from conceptualizing various scale developmental schemes based upon scaled representational technologies. Architects craft ideas through modes of representation which are sponsored by the academy because those modes of representation have been introduced, learned, accepted and practiced by architects performing the role of instructor within the academy.

3. *Acting like a practitioner.*

The task of craftsperson is thusly appropriate for architects in practice that perform operations primary to the craft of the developmental scheme. The primary response of the practice is to ensure the health, safety and welfare of the public. These responsibilities are legislated by State agencies and have little, if anything, to do with architecture as defined herein. Practitioners are the primary occupants of the identity of the architect. The dichotomy that exists between the practice and the discipline of architecture serves to legitimize State agents inhabiting the domain of the architecture. Though marginalized by the practice, the academy serves as the primary site of the production of the architects and architecture. Just as the State sanctions the existence of male figures in order to police female figures, the State legitimizes the identity of the architect as practitioner in order to police academic figures.

The question remains: what identities exist beyond the State-sponsored recursive figure? The subversion of the signifier as site of authority reveals the grounds upon which the signified accepts a dubious identity. If we question the structure through which the field of the female and the architect are constructed, then we can question the identity of both, independent of the existing frames of reference. Again I return to the female and architect as co-habitués and/or recursive figures that are defined as that which are to be as Julia Kristeva has posited as questionable-subject-in-process.

For the architect, the question seems to rest in the viability of the title labeling those who profess to know independent of built objects. For the female, the question seems to rest in the collective effort to be independent. I would not say that this independence is an independence of dependency because that only leads down the path of feminism and into the realm of power structures that craft social practices. Independence of collective thought can lead to identities that are female and not in opposition to that which the female is. If one of the basic premises of dichotomies were to exist in opposition, then the terrain of co-habitué would seem to be the site of that which is. Just as the architect can retreat to the practice of architecture within the system at hand, the female collective can relocate to grounds upon what it means to be whilst relieving the collective self of the will to attain power. The need to attain power is the domain of the State and not the domain of males therefore an enduring opposition to unwitting male figures would seem futile.

How can I locate a female space when the breath of the feminist movement is lost to reconcile a legible composition without succumbing to fruitless arguments regarding maleness? This is the project that affects many arguments associated with the feminist movement that exists as non-existence. Because feminism is bound to a subversion that demands power, the absence of power undermines the ability to locate that which is female. This prohibition in turn renders the female collective powerless to

locate a collective will, presence and/or consortium of spaces, which is what this project seeks to reveal.

B. The production of architects.

The production of architects is entrusted primarily to NCARB, the National Council of Architectural Accreditation Boards. NCARB regulates, certifies and guarantees all professional schools of architecture in the U.S. AIA, American Institute of Architects, regulates, certifies and guarantees members within its body. Likewise IDP, the Intern Development Program, monitors the progress of subjects during a three-year professional indoctrination period. The State utilizes these organizing bodies to produce the ideal citizen or, in this case, the ideal architect. If the charge of these bodies is to enforce the will of the State as the controlling agent within a given territory, then these agencies oversee the production of the architect as well as female space. Adorno's culture industry posits the standardization of needs and desires. Therefore space, as a derivative of cultural practices is regulated, certified and monitored by the State through these bodies.

If this is a reliable assumption, then the charge of creating female space cannot and will not ever be possessed by an architect based upon a paradigm contingent on gender. How then do architecture and/or feminism begin to locate the space of the female? Or, is this an appropriate question since that which is female has been relegated to a secondary or tertiary status within existing frames of reference? It would seem that the primary supposition is close to relevant in that we are looking at the space of privilege and not an authentic female space.

III. Only with Authority

As a tool of the State, the practice of architecture is granted authority to reproduce spatial formations. Therefore, authority over the production of female space does not reside within the practice of architecture but with the State. Bio-power, is a technology of power used to manage groups *Foucault say that, "An explosion of numerous and diverse techniques for achieving the subjugations of bodies and the control of populations."* (Foucault 140)

A. Bio-power

1. Authority to reproduce space is bio-political.

If, as Foucault asserts, bio-politics is a style of government that uses bio-power as a technology to control all aspects of a given population, then spatial formations rest with the State. Subsequently the argument regarding the architect in the production of space becomes: what is the role of the architect? Our presupposition, in order to pose this question, must be that authority to craft space rests within the practice of architecture. If we accept this assumption, then we must assume that the practice is

cognizant of the power of dynamics assigned to image objects. Then we could assume that members reared through this system professing a heightened awareness of spatial reorganization would understand how built objects are used as tools to regulate bodies. As experts in the production of space and the occupancy of space, then would architects be aware of the technologies of spatial manipulation that support the State's efforts at total regulation of bodies within? If practitioners are unwittingly supporting the will of the State, then does that not support the claim that the architects are merely agents of – and not authoring – the craft of spatial practices? The plausibility of these questions would allow for the readdressing of the supposition regarding 'who' crafts the space of privilege.

Does the practice of architecture behold any investment in the assignment of spatial privilege? Or is the practice of architecture just comprised of a benevolent lot accepting the privilege assigned to the title of architect? Maybe there exists an internal diversity that allows for collective awareness and dormancy to coexist with or without tension. Perhaps this internal diversity may constitute the site of access from which the practice can become re-situated by the discipline.

What is the goal of spatial regulation? Is it, as Jeremy Bentham postulates, the goal of the State utilizing practices of architecture simply, **“a new mode of obtaining power of mind over mind?”** Is not the technology of the panopticon ubiquitous in spatial practices? Are these practices and techniques naturalized passively by unwitting practitioners or actively assumed as methodology? In either instance, what is the role of the female architect regarding the use of prescribed modes or prescribed techniques in practice? Does any agency exist for female architects or are female architects just a hapless collective occupying the title as well? More substantively, is the collectivity of female architects an advocate for the female figure?

Since the goal of the State is to regulate all aspects of human life, then to what end does the State seek to regulate a female space? One course of thought regarding the regulation of space would be to survey the bodies that occupy space. As stated by Louis Althusser, the purpose of the State is the production of and continued existence of the State. If the State is the end in-itself, then maintenance of social structures that organize bodies for that purpose reinforces the ubiquitous nature of the State. Methods of surveying bodies through techniques of bio-power serve to reinforce the existence of the State by maintaining that which exists. Because the State exists as the epicenter of power, any existing technologies of bio-power are tools of the State.

2. Mimesis and production of the feminine.

As accepted, the gender dichotomy serves to reinforce the existence of the male figures as purveyors of domination. Through this formation the *ideal* of the female is rendered subordinate to that which is male. Due to this simplistic arrangement the existence of the female is continually in the

process of mimicking that which is accepted as male. Maleness rarely addresses the multiplicity of instances where masculinity can inhabit the terrain of femininity and vice versa. Herein lays a conundrum of femininity regarding the production of that which is not a reconfiguration of the known masculine.

Why then does the collective labeled female seek to mimic forms of that which are known to institute operative forms of domination against it? Perhaps that which is female is limited to perform a reality through terms defined by the State. The same authority that grants privilege to architects may also establish the conditions that determine the existence of the female collective. Just as architects are unwitting actors within the realm of professionals, males operate under a prescription of moral authority legislated with cause. Perhaps the cause is the State, which ultimately prescribes the condition of subservience that is merely the *différance* of the male.

3. Why is authority merely technical?

If the notion of authorship as a derivative of authority granted serves to commodify spatial practices, then these techniques manage bodies. Architects are allowed to manage the realm of built objects while assuming the province of author. The uses of spatial practices as techniques to manage bodies through space are techniques of bio-power as defined herein. The use of the practice of architecture as a means to control space defines the role of the architect as a creator. If the creators of spatial environments are generators, then the use of commodified spatial environments as technologies of control would render the creator the source a technology of bio-power. Since the source is the State, the architect/author and the State/authority could both be classified as apparatuses within the existing structure.

B. Violent Subversion of the Identity of the Architect.

1. What does it mean to be an architect?

In order to locate identity we must understand the grounds upon which the realm of architecture exists. Meaning for the architect as stated herein has been defined via an association to built objects. However this does not address identity but merely obfuscates the grounds upon which identity may rest. Does this mean that identity as an architect is known, knowable, unknown or unknowable? Or does this align the identity of the architect more closely to that which is the unknowable, unknown, knowable or known female figure?

Maybe the legislated membership locates the known architect as practitioner. The practitioner has been identified by the State as a viable citizen worthy to reproduce spatial environments that reify dominant socio-political ideologies. The practitioner can be readily located while assuming the rights of

legislation granted via the title. More difficult to locate is the realm of the unknown. Or, is the unknown identity the collective resigned to a secondary status within the academy? Within the academy architects are trained to engage in the production of dwelling objects and choose to assist in the production of architects not architecture. If the goal of the architect is to conceptualize dwelling objects and the goal of the academy is to produce those who conceive dwelling objects, then would not the unknowable be those beings that reject the singularity of an existence in either the practice or the discipline? Would a practitioner well grounded in the necessities of building (core form) as well as actively engaging in the conditions of producing architects (art form), operate as an unknowable multi-form being? The multi-form existence allows beings to exist within a chasm beyond the practice while not completely being appropriated by the discipline. Is this the domain of the unknowable form, or more appropriately, the being of that which is an architect? In this form the unknowable would be unrecognizable to those existing in singularity as either a practitioner or an academic.

2. Does différence within the field make a difference?

If the field is composed of categories that exist in opposition in order to justify the existence of either/or, then différence does matter within the field. If the essence of the architect is appropriately situated in multi-form, then a complementary arrangement can allow the recursive doubling of the ground to immerge as the architect, not either the academic or the practitioner. When the identity of the architect is not allowed to flow between discipline and practice, architects become resigned to subsume a subordinate role to built objects.

C. Violent Production, Identity of the Female

1. Urbanity and the flâneuse.

Does the question of identity concerning an interpretation of the architect reveal anything useful regarding our understanding of the production of the feminine space? Can the known, knowable, unknown, and/or unknowable female identity be traced to core form and/or art form thereby providing the grounds for a re-crafted collective being via a collective agency? If the known architect were the practitioner who is sanctioned by the State then would it be appropriate to state the known female is the female that exists in opposition to the male figure? If the female exists as a commodity, as postulated by Lucy Irigaray, then we can trace the majority. Unlike the architect, the known female is denied privilege through social systems via the State. In spite of the State's efforts to conceal the known or core form female, the space of privilege denied can be accessed and challenged.

2. Sites of female production.

The space of privilege denied is actualized by way of spatial typologies such as cafes, salons, libraries, primary schools, daycares, retail facilities and restaurants that are primarily occupied by female bodies. The construction of these typologies subverts the value or cultural capital by engendering ownership of territory within the public domain. While owned territories are politically aligned to capital, the collective presence of the female within territories such as the salon represents sites of individual powerlessness. Or do these territories or art forms merely serve to subvert capital to members within that serve as agents of the State? If the collective notion of the female sponsored by the State is reinforced through these socially constructed typologies, then these sites owned and operated by individuals serve to reproduce the State. These sites create the State because the State is that which is to be produced, reproduced, and maintained.

3. *Lack of female economy.*

Do these socially constructed objects reveal the realm of the unknown female, or are the unknown identities the collectives marginalized as radical alterity, for not accepting State-situated norms? Does the unknown – social objects or marginalized object beings – constitutes the terrain of an art form. The identity of this collective is marked by a lack of collective will. The ideal of the gendered space owned and occupied by female bodies subverts the nature of capital, which flows beyond the individual occupancy of the ownership. The conditions that contribute to the construction of these environments are reproduced and maintained as technologies of the State. If this is an accurate depiction of the female, then like the architect could the unknowable female figure could be a multi-form being operating within the realm of the commodities and/or territories? Would the nature of this dual existence limit the limitless nature of the female? The unknowable does not need to comprise the binary model, but could reveal that the female is not bound to the performance of commodity and/or owner of territories. The female collective, as owner and occupant, may not understand what it is to evolve into that which is co-habitué of multiple trajectories yet to be realized.

Unlike the architect, that which is female is not bound by legislations. Therefore personhood for the unknowable female is the chasm that is beyond the essence the unknowable architect seeks to occupy in multi-form. Female economies exist in multi-form and can only become recognizable as a recursive figure dependent upon dependence.

IV. *Space as a Social Object*

Through an investigation of space as a social object we can challenge the legitimacy of formations created to exclude bodies of subalterns. Henry Lefebvre contends that in addition to being a product of humans, space is also a complex social construct. Lefebvre argues, "*Social space is a social*

product – the space produced in a certain manner serves as a tool of thought and action. It is not only a means of production but also a means of control, and hence of domination/power.” (Lefebvre 14)

A. Bodies of subalterns.

1. Defining the terms.

Defining terms upon which subalterns are limited aligns the notion of space as a social object with the known identity of our subjects herein. The collective female, as well as the collective architect, is composed of marginalized bodies that maintain a wanting existence. If, as Lefebvre asserts, space is a social product and, as Jean Baudrillard asserts, operates in collusion with humans to produce a conceptual density, then humans and objects locate the presence of a collective density or emotional value. Within this frame of reference I assert that space, as a physical and psychological being, derives legitimacy by way of occupancy and occupier. The State, as subject supreme and grantor of privilege, seeks to circumvent the actuality of this occupancy via technologies of coercion and exclusion.

2. Visibility not sensibility.

Artificial value assignments subvert the reality of currency over which the State attempts to maintain dominion. In order to control privilege the State must control the system of measures that manipulates and falsifies ideal values that are introduced, learned, accepted and practiced. Due to these practices, the bodies of subalterns (bodies and space) are subjected to a limited understanding of the self, along with the space occupying and occupied by the self. Humans and objects have been diminished as to no longer command the capacity to occupy the self beyond the visible sign.

3. The limits of space as an object of human existence.

Space, as a social object, relies upon the agency of humans in order to become that which is beyond the known object. The known object is typically signified by way of sight. Therefore these objects are limited to paradigms that restrict access, thusly producing the recursive or unknowable social space.

B. Legitimacy challenged.

1. Space is socially charged; therefore the underlying structures can be challenged.

Before one can identify and challenge, one must identify the means through which an agency may be used. If space is unknowable and only occupies agency as it is transferred from humans, then one must initially challenge the occupancy of the agency regarding the unknowable social space. As stated, in regards to the female and the architect, the unknowable typically constitutes a tangential or eccentric

space. This unknowable territory is unrecognizable because it is subverted as is the essence of social space. Is it possible that the unknowable space does not yet exist, or that the unrecognizable space exists within a conceptual imaginary? The conceptual imaginary, as stated by Jean Paul Sartre, is the being in-itself and the being for-itself. This frame of reference establishes a history or being in-itself, in relation to a future, or being for-itself, which defines the referents as a factual and possibility. If this arrangement assists in an understanding of the unknowable, then recognition of the unknowable female and architect, as a being for-itself can be possible.

2. *How do you challenge the construction of the construct?*

The challenge must be grounded in an understanding of recognition. If we are to comprehend space, the female and/or the architect, we must understand what we perceive is not only the being in-itself at the moment of recognition, but also the being for-itself. In the moment of recognition a future possibility co-exists and becomes the interpretation of the reader. The occupant of space, the female and/or the architect, continually interprets within the moment of recognition. Therefore the interpretation is the challenge to the being in-itself and for-itself or the unknowable space of legitimacy.

V. *Crafting the Space of Privilege*

If the crafters of space construct categories that reify difference concretely, then are they who arrange the built environment crafting space of privilege? “He contends that what is called women’s nature is the result of artificial cultivation for the benefit of their masters.” (*J.S. Mill X*)

A. *Crafting Space of Privilege*

1. *If this “nature” is an artificial cultivation, then the site(s) of cultural production claimed by this construction locates sites of privilege.*

How can space be neutral if spatial formations are inherently assigned non-neutral typologies, rendering them biased? “*Différance may be conceived as an underlying principle of non-identity which makes signification possible only by ‘spacing out’ both signifiers and concepts (signified) so that meaning appears merely as a ‘trace’ of other terms within or across any given term.*” (*Derrida 17*) It cannot be assumed that space is neutral if space is recognized through systems granting status in this non-neutral fashion. If the space in question is thusly biased as are the assignments of gender, then both the bodies of the subject figures and the bodies of the object buildings are crafted for access or denial of privilege.

2. *Is the space of privilege visible through physical or social structures?*

I would argue that privilege is readily recognizable through both physical and social structures.

Maybe this observation is obvious within the realm of the social, but within the realm of built objects such recognition is neither obvious nor easy. If one were to claim that a space is gendered then most practitioners of architecture would lack any sensibility to comprehend what determines a gendered environment.

3. If the sites of alleged privilege locate the non-natural, then are there sites that locate natural occurrences?

This may seem odd but it is a difficult question to answer. First one has to accept that space as understood is typically unrecognizable. Spatial practices are subjective operations that manipulate. A natural condition could not be known because recognition of would align the object within the realm of that which is social and therefore biased. All space, along with spatial objects, is unnatural because said designed territories are socially aligned.

VI. Motivation of Architects

If the production by means of construction of privilege is a truer account of the architectural task, then what is the architect's motivation within this master/slave dialectic? *“Whatever has value in the present world has it not in itself, according to its nature – nature is always valueless – but has rather been given, granted value, and we were the givers and granters.” (Nietzsche 301)*

A. Servitude with honour

1. Who is the master?

Who is the master of the architect the client or the State? Or, more aptly, who or what is the grantor of privilege assumed by the architect? It is typically assumed that the architect is beholden to the client who requests a service for a charge? A different line of thought would be that the architect is obliged to the State who grants the assignment of the title. By way of the title, the architect in-itself is allowed to occupy the space of privilege endorsed by the State not the client. If the State determines the title has no value for the State, then it would discontinue its sponsorship of the title. Without the legislation, regulation and maintenance of the title, would the practice of architecture exist? Would the architect be a viable member of society without legislation locating the practice within the realm of professionals?

2. Is the architect the embodiment of the prestigious slave?

The arduous task of becoming and existing an architect reaps one minimal economic gains. Servitude is defined as “the state of being a slave” or “the state of being ruled or dominated by

somebody or something.” Prestige, on the other hand, is “respect associated with high quality; honour, awe, or high opinion inspired by or derived from a high-ranking, influential or successful person or product.” If the high opinion of the practice embodied by the title is granted by rule of the State, not the exchange with clients, then would not architects be prestigious servants? Architects are honoured and honour themselves via hollow awards that reify sub-cultures of servitude. Architects are respected around the world, while the practice marginalizes and exploits the creative impute of junior members, and takes advantage of their physical energies and blind loyalty in order to validate imbalances of economy within the internal capital structure.

B. Production via construction

1. Producing identity via the legislation sanctioning the privilege to associate.

The practice of architecture as a means to locate the collective membership lobbies for legislation that renders exclusivity to title. The State, as sanctioning body, is the authority that acts along with participant members to produce the collective title, identity, prestige and internal hierarchy by way of legislation. The hollowness of the legislation rests in the legislation and reveals the limited extent of the title. The primary concern of the practice within the legal framework sponsored by the State expresses protection of bodies as “health, safety and welfare.” The State does not concern itself with notions of design and nobility directly, while indirectly funding the exclusive institutions that produce the membership. The State does sponsor design review to implement accepted standards. The State legislates health, safety and welfare via zoning and building codes while the practice honours subjective notions of beauty only understood by members that have come to value that which is valueless in-itself. In the case of architecture the in-itself is the representation not the object. The objects of architecture are Sartre’s beings for-itself that exist as images or future possibilities.

2. Producing images as representations not buildings.

The practice of architecture is associated with buildings in order to establish a concrete frame of reference from which the architect would be recognized within a given social rank. If the academy is the site of the architect’s production and within the academy representations of buildings are fabricated, then built objects are not the fundamental nature of architecture. Therefore the image or art form object is essential to architecture not the built object or core form that relies on practical means and methods.

C. Legitimate Because I Build.

1. No building, no practice, no identity?

Could one posit that the architect will remain illegitimate as long as he builds? If the essential element of architecture is not the built object, then continuing to fabricate identity consolidating core form and art form will serve to maintain the temporal dissonances. The identity of the architect is, and should promote, the art form as that which disassociates the architect from the practice of managing health, safety and welfare for the State.

2. Commodities alike are the feminine and the architect.

Irigary's assignment applies to the female as practitioner of architecture as well as the female and the architect. The nature of the architect in form is similar to the female commodity as defined by Irigary, with both having value as utilitarian objects and/or bearers of value. In this case both serve as objects of the State and reproduce for the State. Architecture conceptualizes the built environment for the State. In doing so architects are the bearers of the physical objects of the State, just as females are the bearers of the human objects of the State. Therefore the value of both relies upon their ability not to create but to re-produce. If one is to create then one could espouse authorship of one's offspring. In the case of the physical environment as well as human beings, the State usurps ownership through legislation therefore the existence of both or either is a product of productive technologies not created.

Females and architects as commodities of the State are utilitarian objects. Irigary postulates that females are commodities of males and I would posit that the female, as well as the architect, is a utilitarian object of the State. I agree with Irigary that females are utilitarian objects of males as a technology of bio-power. Through the use of biotechnology, status is granted to males who wittingly and unwittingly accept privilege granted by way of the State. In accepting the privilege granted, males continue to reproduce conditions of decadence. The conditions of depravity recognize males as privileged, which is not a genuine interpretation. Maleness, while assuming privilege within the frame of everydayness, only maintains this status as tool of the State. Therefore the collective privilege is granted not natural but naturalized. Due to the artificial nature of this arrangement the continuance of maleness relies upon acquiescence of females.

A female architect is simultaneously bearer of life and servant bearer of objects by way of the practice. Within these frames of reference a female architect is denied personhood within the profession upon performing the role of domestic servant. If a female architect becomes a bearer of life then she will be denied personhood within the profession. The access will not be denied by males but by males via the State in order to reproduce the State through *différance*.

3. Legitimate because I think?

Just as a female is legitimate because the collective is in-itself, an architect is legitimate because

of the notion of *différance*. A female can be assumed to be illegitimate because the collective differs to and remains different from the State-sponsored ideal figure. An alternate reading of *différance* would be that it legitimizes the existence of the female by locating the collective being within the composite. If, as postulated herein, the interpretation occurs in the moment of recognition, then legitimacy for the female is sponsored by the State. Therefore the apparatus that attempts to negate the status recognizes personhood for the female collective. In this regard the female could be located as an eccentric figure that constitutes an unknown, not an unknowable figure.

VII. Is *Différance* Mobile or Fixed?

Is *différance*, as articulated within social systems, fixed or mobile? *“A walk through a forest or a Japanese garden is invigorating and healing because of the essential interaction of all sense modalities reinforcing each other; our sense of reality is thus strengthened and articulated.” (Pallasmaa 30)*

A. Mobile system

1. *Locally bound, globally accepted.*

Is the question of *différance* and the location of, or negation via, the deferrals the appropriate response? Could recognition that our modalities of thought always reinforce that which exists as a negation? If we are to conclude that marginalization, negation and denial serve to oppress, we have to recognize that within the moment of recognition the bodies termed subaltern or sub-human are affirmed as being in-itself. The affirmation of existence allows for an agency to exist therefore allowing the collective female as well as the collective architect to re-craft various trajectories regarding the potential identity. If space is bound to occupancy then the existence of the female in any spatial formation concretely locates a form of privilege. Are current forms of spatial production locating female bodies sufficient? What or who has the authority to deem the environments sufficient? If current paradigms of thought are the determinants, then that which exists would be deemed insufficient due to an inherent lack of political and economic will associated with the produced forms.

2. *Globally accepted only as it is defined within the homogeneity of local practices.*

The practice of architecture has become globally integrated as a tool of the privileged. Along with globalization comes denial of privilege as well. Therefore localized practices locating the female body, which were once fixed, are strengthened and re-articulated through the use of media as global practice. In current form architectural practices and architectural modalities of thought unwittingly relocate the bodies of females into those environments that deny access to privilege as defined. Institutions that house typologies of female production (e.g. cafes, salons, libraries, primary schools,

daycares, retail facilities and restaurants) function locally to consolidate, reify and affirm the monolithic illusion of the collective female. The uses of these institutions of denial promote the notion of *différance* that serves to reinforce the existence of the State as the 'one.' In the case of the State, the 'one' would be defined as that which serves all within the realm of *différance*.

3. Mobility through sedentary bodies.

The notion of mobility is a derivative of localized practices that form networks through architectural objects. Even though architectural objects are static, these objects form social networks. Just as human beings form social networks, buildings form social networks that transfer meanings across territories. The nature of these meanings begins to operate in a performative manner similar to Judith Butler's notion of gender performativity. As Butler suggests, the nature of the performance remains only subversive with an inherent agency. Unlike human objects, built objects maintain a degree of predictability. As a result of this predictability, built objects within the social network mobilize State-sponsored agendas of domination. The State utilizes the normalization of the social categories to maintain the notion of *différance*. Through the occupancy of gender categories, built objects occupy gender roles.

B. Fixed System

1. The image does not equate to the practice.

The social practice of mobile fixity is an aspect of the subversion that seeks to normalize the standardization of culture. As suggested by Adorno, the State seeks to standardize culture by defining what it means to be an everyday practice within the spatial occurrence of the everyday. If the 'norm' only exists within a frame of reference as defined by the State, then the reading serves to cast the degree of illegitimacy upon parallel frames of reference. The 'norm' is used to deny the existence of that which is knowable. Herein lies the conundrum of the notion of 'mobile fixity' in that the ubiquity of the State relies on mobility that is typically established through static bodies. Static bodies house that which signifies the ideal and attempts to legitimize the ideal as universal. The ubiquity of occupancy is a goal of the State that is continually undermined by language formations that differ in form and content.

2. What are examples of categories that attempt to legitimize fixity?

Herein the notion of female space has been referenced within typologies such as cafes, salons, libraries, primary schools, daycares, retail facilities and restaurants because these object types are primarily occupied by feminine bodies. Within the realm of built objects these constructions serve as occupiers of State power by consolidating bodies of figures in order to subvert collective thought from

power structures meant to deny them privilege.

3. Is the stability of these categories essential to the acceptance of feminine space?

The stability of sites of female occupation is essential to the production of the State. If the purpose of the State is the production of the State in-itself, for-itself, then the continued existence of the built environments that house bodies that reinforce notions of différence must be maintained.

VIII. Who are We Without Bricks?

What is at stake for the architect as a professional? “We might therefore associate becoming with a process of adaptation and assimilation which is related to formation rather than form, but nonetheless operates through form.” (Leach 98)

A. Becoming Irrelevant – Neal Leach, “Camouflage”

1. The crisis is the business of practice not the practice as a business.

What is the practice of business? Architecture has become a business of legalities. Architects have assimilated legality as a means not only to understand who they are but also who they are to become, which is irrelevant. Architects, who are crafters of ideas written through an artful crafting of wood, have become generators of contracts intended to protect them from that which they espouse to know – buildings.

2. A history of master builders.

From this history that imaged architects as thinkers, makers and visionaries, architects have devolved into a collective of servants. Throughout the official and unofficial history of the practice, architects have endeavored to engage the world through imagery.

3. Creating sub-categories to legitimize the business.

Now architects merely create categories: academy or practice, residential or commercial, cultural or institutional, etc. These categories further fragment the practice of architecture in order to promote the business of practice. The creation of a continuum of sub-categories allows for the production of members in order to create and maintain categories. Are the categories necessary for the practice of architecture? I would suggest that categories are destructive; instead of consolidating the practice into something recognizable, categories fragment the practice.

What are we to understand through an analysis of space regarding the female? The ability of discourse to locate spatial formations of female subjugation occurs through the continued use of professional practices modeled upon structures of inequality. While architects assert political authorship and authority over the built environment, the works – buildings – endeavour to mimic, unwittingly, practices of denial.

Architecture as a practice of idealists authoring notions of grand utopian existence should not be resigned to accept the continued denial of subjectivity of female space. The continued subjugation of female space not only maintains an oppressive social order for women but also promotes inequality. Through the construction of the feminine, other figures of alterity are produced within social space. Architecture as a global practice affects personhood and space while serving to facilitate the mobility of that which constitutes equality. If personhood is to be liberated from pre-existing forms of subjecthood then space, as social object, must be liberated from illegitimate forms of the unnatural.

IX. The Practice of Feminism

What are we to understand through an analysis of space regarding the feminine?

“For many women architects, the critical point is not just the undermining of binary oppositions, but the denial of women per se. Can you play Eisenmans’s game if you’re not permitted to play, or not even recognized as a potential player? Or more importantly, can you create different games – new forms and spaces – if your very existence is denied? Must the rejection of essentialism imply absence?”

(McLeod 9)

For McLeod the denial of a collective existence is the crux of the matter not whether or not one is a woman practicing architecture. If creating a collective feminine space, then one must presuppose that the collective in question maintains a viable presence. The existence of a feminine presence can be challenged through an analysis of architectural typologies that legitimize the segregation and denial of access of women to capital.

Feminism is a social ideology, not women practicing architecture. Architecture as practice parallels the social practice of *différance* locating feminine bodies. Both practices deny select bodies the autonomy to operate without intervention. The ability of women to practice architecture will not grant any additional access to the means of spatial production due to the status of the profession as mere agent of the State.

Concerning space, the primary location for any reconciliation regarding the production of space must be located within the academy. Through inter-disciplinary discourse the hegemony that currently

serves State interests by standardizing educational institutions. The academy is currently constructed to serve the practice therefore reifying structures of différance.

If an agency exists then for whom does it exist? The agency in question is the agency that will allow females, as well as the architect, to operate as a being independent of structure, which J.S. Mill noted as being coercive and unnatural.

The inequality located through the use of the female body serves in part to legitimize maleness as a means of occupying space of privilege. The use of the female body while unique in its biology remains standardized through the use of its visible form. The legitimacy of the 'other' will remain within the continuum as long as spatial practices are used to mask crafting feminine space. Architecture as a viable practice cannot exist as merely a State sponsored agency. The State will continue to underwrite spatial practices and privileges that deny the existence of a viable feminine space and architectural space.

Architecture has become globally insignificant. The ability of global practices of standardization serves to re-introduce an integration of practices of denial. As long as the authors of these practices seek to establish a global hegemony through these practices, female space will continue to be crafted. The co-authors of these sites of denial are the very female architects who locate their identity through the practice of architecture.

In order for a female space of limited spatial bias to be crafted the crafters must relocate their identity as architects and females. Thusly, crafters seek to re-establish multiple hegemonies through the utilization of bio-power to subvert the natural and the unnatural.

| Works Cited

- Adorno, Theodor W. 2003. *The Culture Industry*. New York: Routledge. p. 12.
- Johnson, Barbara. 1998. *The Feminist Difference: Literature, Psychoanalysis, Race, and Gender*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. p. 18-19.
- Baudrillard, Jean. 1991. *The System of Objects*. Chicago: Chicago University Press. p. 14.
- The System of Objects*. p. 255.
- Butler, Judith. 1999. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge. p. 29.
- Van Kijk, Hans. "Styles and Strategies," *Architecture and Legitimacy*, Rotterdam: Nai Publishers, 1995, p. 12-13.
- Karl Heinrich von Boetticher, see Kenneth Frampton, *Boetticher, Semper and the Tectonic: Core Form and Art Form*, what in *What is Architecture*, edited by Andrew Ballantyne (London: Routledge, 2002), pp. 138-52
- Foucault, Michel. edited by Jeremy R. Carrette (1999). *Religion and culture: Michel Foucault*.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Massachusetts: Blackwell. p.14.
- Mill, John Stuart. 2005. *The Subjection of Women*. New York: Barnes & Noble. p. 301.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm. 2001. *The Gay Science*. Cambridge: University Press. p. 301.
- Holl, Steven; Pallasmaa, Juhani; Perez; Gomez, Alberto. 1994. *Questions of Perception: Phenomenology of Architecture*. San Francisco, CA: William Stout Press. p.30
- Pallasmaa, *Questions of Perception*. p.31
- Leach, Neal. 2006. *Camouflage*. Cambridge: MIT Press. p. 98.
- Ruskin, John. 2007. *The Stones of Venice Vol. III: The Fall*. New York: Cosimo. p.194
- Derrida, Jacques. "Différance," *Margins of Philosophy*, Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1982, p. 17.
- McLeod, Mary. "Everyday and Other Spaces"; *Architecture and Feminism*, p.9