

Critical Spatial Practice: Curating, Editing, Writing

Jane Rendell

With a background in architectural design, followed by doctoral research in architectural history, and then a period teaching public art and writing art criticism, my work has focused on interdisciplinary meeting points between different disciplines – between feminist theory and architectural history, conceptual art practice and architectural design, art criticism and autobiographical writing. Through collaborative and individual research, both books and exhibitions, this chapter looks at a number of curatorial and editorial projects I have been involved in from the late 1990s and how these relate to my work as a sole author of architectural history and art criticism.

In exploring issues of method or process that discussions of interdisciplinarity inevitably bring to the fore, Julia Kristeva has argued for the construction of ‘a diagonal axis’:

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

Engaging with this diagonal axis demands that we call into question what we normally take for granted, that we question our methodologies, the ways we do things, and our terminologies, what we call what we do. The construction of ‘a diagonal axis’ is necessarily a difficult business. Kristeva’s phrase ‘expressions of resistance’ suggests that the problem encountered when disciplinary procedures are questioned is related to identification, a key term in psychoanalytic theory.ⁱⁱ And in using the term ‘ambivalent’ to describe the encounter between disciplines – an ‘ambivalent movement between pedagogical and performative address’ – Homi Bhabha also points to the unconscious qualities at work in interdisciplinary practice.ⁱⁱⁱ It is precisely for this reason that I am a passionate advocate for interdisciplinarity; such work is not only critical and intellectual, but also emotional and political. In demanding that we exchange what we know for what we don’t know, and give up the safety of competence for the dangers of potential

incompetence, the transformational experience of interdisciplinary work produces a potentially destabilising engagement with dominant power structures allowing the emergence of new and often uncertain forms of knowledge.

Strangely Familiar

Strangely Familiar: Narratives of Architecture in the City – an exhibition, symposium and catalogue, whose working group included architects, graphic designers, film makers, multimedia artists – was produced as a response to an invitation to curate and design an architectural exhibition. The curatorial and editorial team, comprising Iain Borden, Joe Kerr, Alicia Pivaro and myself, choose to critique the notion of architectural history written only by architectural historians, consisting of boards on walls describing the work of famous architects.^{iv} Instead we invited academics from disciplines outside as well as inside architecture, such as cultural studies and geography, to provide a narrative (a thousand-word text), several images and an object related to a specific site in a city. The catalogue comprised an edited collection of these visual narratives, while the exhibition took the form of a mini ‘Manhattan’ built of coloured plinths, one for each contributor including their narrative and related object. [fig. i]

Each interpretative stance revealed a place that was ‘strangely familiar’, familiar because certain aspects were already known, strange because they were revealed in new ways. The contributions investigated a diverse range of subjects and adopted a variety of interpretive and analytical procedures. From these *Strangely Familiar* identified three editorial and curatorial themes for engaging with public space: memory and remembering; domination, resistance and appropriation; experience and identity. We adopted these themes as organisational strategies that worked to give the catalogue a conceptual clarity and the exhibition an aesthetic coherence using different colours to indicate one of the conceptual themes. Yet in hindsight the strong visual identity of both catalogue and exhibition made it difficult for the more complex, subtle and often unrecognizable tactics of urban resistance to emerge.^v In order to develop further the dialogue between design intention and user occupation, for *The Unknown City*, the book that followed *Strangely Familiar*, we extended our editorial invitation to contribute essays to practitioners as well as theorists, asking artists, writers, film-makers and architects, to comment on how they understood the relationship between the production and experience of the city.^{vi}

Intersections

In my view, the edited book is an invaluable site for developing both multi- and interdisciplinary debates. The editorial process has for me, often involved identifying a new area of study, one located at the meeting point between previously distinct and separate areas of thought. This was the case for *Gender, Space, Architecture: An Interdisciplinary Introduction*, where we, myself along with co-editors Iain Borden and Barbara Penner, brought together over 30 seminal texts relevant to studying the relationship between feminist theory and architectural space. We organised the book into three sections, the first and the third parts both followed a historical trajectory which explored the development of feminist theory over the past 30 years, through gender and women's studies in the former, and architectural design, history and theory in the later. In the middle section we adopted a spatial rather than temporal attitude to our editorial role, and selected essays drawn from a number of related fields, from anthropology to philosophy, to indicate the broad range of disciplinary procedures pertinent to the study of gender and space. For *InterSections: Architectural Histories and Critical Theories*, a set of specially commissioned essays, which I co-edited with Iain Borden, we took a different approach to our editorial role and approached architectural historians and theorists, asking each author to address the relationship between critical theory and architectural history in their own work and to develop an essay which explored their own research processes and the development of their conceptual thinking as integral to the subject matter of the chapter.^{vii}

At the same time as working on these edited volumes in my own individual research I was investigating the interdisciplinary meeting point between feminist theory and architectural history, specifically examining the ways in which feminist theory questions the methods of architectural historical enquiry, the subjects and objects we choose to study and the ways in which we study them. For *The Pursuit of Pleasure*, I was seduced by two texts, one a feminist polemic, the other an urban narrative.^{viii} These two texts created places of methodological struggle – dialectical sites where questions of spatial and historical knowledge were raised – where I was located between theory and history. It was the intellectual labour involved in sketching out this theoretical context for conducting feminist architectural history in my individual research that enabled me to locate the key works on gender, space and architecture in numerous disciplines and realize that there was a need to bring them together in one edited volume.

A Place Between

It is also possible for individual research and collaborative research to work the other way around, for an edited project to establish themes, which can then be explored further through an authored book. When I was invited to guest edit an issue of *The Public Art Journal*, I asked a number of theorists and practitioners to reflect on my proposition: in what ways could public art be thought of as social space. I was interested in how various forms of ‘spatial practice’ carried out by public artists engaged with the kind of issues developed through ‘spatial theory’, in the writings of cultural geographers and critical theorists. The various artists and writers who contributed to the volume each addressed public art as ‘a place between’, from art and architecture collaborative muf, who discussed their work in terms of a place between people, as ‘what it takes to make a relationship to make a thing’, through to cultural geographer Steve Pile’s essay on the city as a place between what is ‘real’ and what is dreamed.^{ix}

For several years after the publication of the journal, I continued to position myself in ‘a place between’ art and architecture, theory and practice, exploring the patterning of intersections between this pair of two-way relationships. In *Art and Architecture: A Place Between* I traced the multiple dynamics of this investigation and, in so doing, drew on a range of theoretical ideas from a number of disciplines to examine artworks and architectural projects. At its core, *Art and Architecture: A Place Between* is concerned with a specific kind of practice, one that is both critical and spatial, and that I call ‘critical spatial practice’. In art such work has been variously described as contextual practice, site-specific art and public art; in architecture it has been described as conceptual design and urban intervention. To encounter such modes of practice, I visit works produced by galleries that operate ‘outside’ their physical limits, commissioning agencies and independent curators who support and develop ‘site-specific’ work and artists, architects and collaborative groups that produce various kinds of critical projects from performance art to urban design.^x Although described as an authored book, this project could also be thought of in a curatorial sense, as the selection and arrangement of a number of artworks and architecture projects.

It is perhaps through distinct forms of selection and arrangement that the difference between editorial and curatorial practice is defined in my work. Both roles, curator and editor, work by continually developing and clarifying the relation between the establishment of a theme at an initial and general level, followed by the selection of works that indicate the range and scope of possibility inherent within a theme, concluding with particular manifestations of that theme

through the specific contributions. The degree to which the editor/curator imposes and follows through the potential offered by an initial conceptual framework varies, from those projects where the individual works, often artefacts that have already been produced (as in *Gender, Space, Architecture*), realise a pre-existing thematic, to those where the production of new works generates the final composition both materially and conceptually, often involving a critique of the initial editorial/curatorial proposal. However the activities of editor and curator differ according to the qualities, codes and processes associated with the contexts in which they operate, while texts and books traditionally prioritise sequence, where arrangements tend to be structured according to the ‘before’ and the ‘after’, objects and sites allow for more spatial possibilities in arrangement, allowing multidirectional aspects of production and reception to come to the fore particularly through simultaneity and juxtaposition.

Material Intelligence

In 2003, I became involved in curating an architectural exhibition, but in an informal capacity through conversations with Bobbie Entwistle who approached staff and students at the Bartlett School of Architecture to contribute to an exhibition at the Entwistle Gallery, which became called *Material Intelligence*. The works she selected for the exhibition constituted artefacts that had been produced as part of an architectural design process, for example, drawings, photographs, models and other types of object. An important discussion focused on whether the exhibits required any written or spoken explanation, for example in the form of accompanying statements drafted by the curator or narratives written by the architects. We both agreed that the exhibition was stronger visually without texts placed on the gallery walls. But in retrospect, in my opinion, this decision produced a problem. An art gallery setting expects and effects specific conditions, positioning all objects within its physical parameters as ‘artworks’ *Material Intelligence* was no exception. As a result the artefacts exhibited were viewed as artworks not as part of architectural design process. This resulted in a tendency to consider them as isolated objects when they had been fabricated not as solo entities but with an imagined other in mind – an architectural design, in some cases an intended ‘building’. An accompanying narrative might then have worked, not to explain the artefacts on display, but to situate them in relation to the objects to which they implicitly referred, and to architectural design discourse as well as fine art. [fig. ii]

Spatial Imagination in Design

During 2005, as director of a research cluster, ‘Spatial Imagination in Design’, funded by the EPSRC and AHRC as part of *Designing for the 21st Century*, I had the opportunity to work with

colleagues Peg Rawes and Penelope Haralambidou in an editorial and curatorial capacity, and much of the project description that follows is drawn from as well as developed out of the editorial introduction to the project co-authored with Rawes.^{xi} Our cluster was composed of fifteen members, drawn from architecture, exhibition, product and interactive design; fine and public art; psychotherapy, history, economics and philosophy; structural engineering and construction management, with project partners Kate Trant of CABE (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment) and Greg Cowan of the RIBA (Royal Institute of British Architecture). Through a series of three workshops, each one devised and led by different cluster members, we explored the spatial imagination as a mode of perception and tool of production in the experience and design of space, through particular design processes of: 'modeling', 'writing' and 'drawing'.

From the outset it was the group's intention to develop their understandings of the spatial imagination through the production of artefacts. The site chosen for the exhibition of these works, The Domo Baal Gallery, housed in an eighteenth-century house in Clerkenwell, London, provided an important context for the development of the research – this was a location that provoked the spatial imagination of all members of the cluster, both through the architectural features of the original design, but also through patterns of historical and contemporary occupation.

Designed between 1730 and 1750, the textured edge and central rose of the white ceiling in the main first floor room of the gallery were the most evocative manifestations of the delicacy of spatial imagination in the rococo, an architectural style connected with this historical period. The initial occupation of the building as a family home and a solicitor's office had left traces, for example in the form of a double door, hinting at the complex negotiations between domestic and institutional space which continue in the building today, where the everyday and private life of a family coincide closely with the ongoing and public activities of an art gallery.

This space provided an opportunity for each cluster member to make a new work which drew on collective understandings gained from previous conversations, visits and walks, yet informed by each individual's own particular interest in the spatial imagination. The final works exhibited as *Spatial Imagination* took the form of proposals and exhibits – including sound pieces, texts, drawings and models – that operated across the disciplines of art, design and architecture and communicated the spatial imagination through a configuration of material designs. [fig. iii]

Out of the production of these art and design works, three key preoccupations emerged: first, an interest in the use of the imagination in the operation of political power – both as a tool of oppression and of resistance; second, an understanding of imagination as a space of ambiguity between designer and user, and third a desire to combine the traditionally separated design processes of drawing, writing and modelling in new hybrid forms of art, design and architectural practice. For example, artist Brigid McLeer’s ‘writing-as-drawing’, located in the gap between the double doors, in re-writing Alain Robbe-Grillet’s novel *La Jalousie* (1957), which explored how the emotion of jealousy heightens the perception of space between individuals. In placing the architectural model she produced as a design tool for curating the exhibition in the corner of the gallery, architect Penelope Haralambidou’s ‘drawing-as-model’ demonstrated the extent to which the imagination produces multiple space-times, producing a *mis-en-abyme* or a space within a space [fig. iv]. In repeatedly writing the word ‘purdah’ (a word which refers to a screen or architectural element as well as a veil or item of clothing) my own work transformed the first floor window to the street – an architectural site of visual connection – into a screen – one of separation. Where the definition of purdah in certain versions of the Koran, demands covering as a response to female embellishment, ‘An Embellishment: Purdah’, suggested that artifice structures rather than decorates divisions in the gendering of space [fig. v].

Each piece was an example of the materialization of the spatial imagination in action, drawing attention to the important role practice-led research plays in critiquing the traditional methods of academic research as well as the conventions of architectural design. As physical statements, the exhibits did not seek to be understood as demonstrations or applications of pre-existing theoretical ideas, but rather as provisional works, which registered the importance of discovery in the process of art, design and architecture. The accompanying catalogue played a key role in providing a view of the works in progress. In the editorial we offered a framework for thinking about the ways in which the cluster’s research interests ran through the different practices, methods and works in the exhibition. And through image and text, each cluster member contributed their own perspective on the various ways in which the spatial imagination is both a tool for investigation and proposition in the design of objects and spaces.

Critical Architecture

Over the past two years, I have also been working on another collaborative project, *Critical Architecture*, with Mark Dorrian, Murray Fraser and Jonathan Hill, this time a conference, a

special issue of *The Journal of Architecture* and a co-edited book.^{xii} *Critical Architecture* brings together essays and projects that examine the relationship between criticism and critical practice in architecture, exploring architectural criticism as a form of practice and considering the different modes of critical practice that comprise architectural design – buildings, drawings and texts – as forms of criticism. The division of criticism and design in architecture hinders the production of innovative work, and so we decided to locate the themes of *Critical Architecture* at four different intersections between architectural criticism and architectural design:

‘Criticism/Negation/Action’ (Mark Dorrian), ‘The Cultural Context of Critical Architecture’ (Murray Fraser), ‘Criticism by Design’ (Jonathan Hill) and ‘Architecture-Writing’ (Jane Rendell). These conceptual strands structured the conference and the special issue of *The Journal of Architecture* and will be used to frame the debates in the co-edited book. The themes reflect issues of concern to practitioners and theorists alike, and allow the relation between criticism and design to be negotiated by contributors in varying ways.

‘Architecture-Writing’, my own particular theme, explores the new ways of writing architectural criticism produced when criticism is considered a form of critical practice. Discussions in art criticism concerning art-writing have begun to introduce questions of subjectivity, positionality, textuality and materiality in new critical writing practices and re-think the relationship between criticism and critical practice in the visual and performing arts.^{xiii} I am interested in how the issues this debate raises might allow us to speculate upon the relation of creative practice in architectural and spatial criticism.

Recently in my own writing as an art and architectural critic I have explored the position of the author, not only in relation to theoretical ideas, art objects and architectural spaces but also to the site of writing itself. This interest has evolved into a number of ‘site-writings’ that investigate the limits of criticism, and ask what it is possible for a critic to say about an artist, an architect, a work, the site of a work and the critic herself and for the writing to still ‘count’ as criticism. Elsewhere I have outlined in more detail the conceptual framing of this project;^{xiv} here I will briefly summarize these concerns before ending this chapter by presenting a piece of ‘site-writing’.

Site-Writing

Feminists in visual and spatial culture have drawn extensively on psychoanalytic theory to further understandings of subjectivity in relation to positionality, making connections between the spatial

politics of internal psychical figures and external cultural geographies.^{xv} I am interested in how art criticism can engage with this work in order to investigate the spatial and often changing positions we occupy as critics materially, conceptually, emotionally and ideologically.^{xvi} Such a project involves rethinking the terms of criticism, specifically judgment, discrimination and critical distance.^{xvii} ‘Site-writing’ takes up this challenge and by repositioning the artwork as a site, starts to investigate the spatiality of the critic’s relation to a work, adopting and adapting both Howard Caygill’s notion of strategic critique,^{xviii} as well as Mieke Bal’s exploration of the critic’s ‘engagement’ with art.^{xix} Current discussions concerning relational aesthetics^{xx} and dialogic practice^{xxi} continue to position the critic ‘outside’ the artwork; I suggest instead that the position the critic occupies needs to be made explicit through the process of writing criticism. Rather than write *about* the artwork, I am interested in how the critic constructs his or her writing in relation *to* and in dialogue *with* the artwork. The focus on the preposition here allows a direct connection to be made between the positional *and* the relational.^{xxii}

Theoretical explorations in literary criticism of the author’s different subject positions in relation to the text, as multiple ‘I’s’ as well as ‘you’ and ‘s/he’ are of relevance here,^{xxiii} as are the writings of post-colonial critics who have woven the autobiographical into the critical in their texts, combining poetic practice with theoretical analysis to articulate hybrid voices.^{xxiv} To consider questions of voice in criticism, in connection to relation, dialogue and encounter, involves objective and subjective, as well as distant and intimate positions. From the close-up to the glance, from the caress to the accidental brush, such an approach can draw on spaces as they are remembered, dreamed and imagined, as well as observed, in order to position and re-position critic and reader in relation to a work and challenge criticism as a form of knowledge with a singular and static point of view located in the here and now.

‘Site-writing’ is what happens then, when discussions concerning site-specificity extend to involve art criticism, and the spatial qualities of the writing become as important in conveying meaning as the content of the criticism.^{xxv} My suggestion is that this kind of criticism or critical spatial writing, in operating as mode of a practice in its own right, questions the terms of reference that relate the critic to the artwork positioned ‘under’ critique. This is an active writing that constructs as well as traces the sites between critic and writer, artist and artwork, viewer and reader.

An imagined place as the site of critical writing was something I had theorised but not fully engaged with until I wrote ‘Everywhere Else’.^{xxvi} This catalogue essay written for the group show *Ausland* develops my interest in imagining the spatial memories of others. Each of the three artists included in the exhibition engages with forms of architectural and spatial representation – Martina Schmid produces foreboding mountainous landscapes on folded paper from doodles scribbled while daydreaming, Silke Schatz draws large scale architectural perspectives of places she remembers in fine coloured pencil, while Jan Peters works in video presenting narratives of his experiences in labyrinthine buildings. I describe the sites materially present and those places I imagine the artists might have encountered and remembered in producing their work. The text is written as a detailed empirical account, moving between the artworks and the sites they refer to, as well as the location of the gallery itself. [fig. vi]

Everywhere else

The cat’s paw is large enough to cover the mountain crest; his tail is as long as the sunlit gully. But look more closely you can see that the mountain top is the edge of a dense cluster of loops drawn on a sheet of cartridge paper, folded many times. And the cat, having walked across the mountain range, has been sent on his way, relieved that his paw did not leave a mark on the paper.

Three figures sit cross-legged on the floor in a room whose function is unclear. Two windows frame views onto a London street and the door in the wall opposite opens onto a kitchen that stretches the width of the house. At the kitchen table a girl sits, her sulky head is bent over a book. Mounted on the wall behind her is a piece of cartridge paper, folded many times, covered in hundreds, thousands of tiny little loops, drawn in ink. Beside the drawing, on the mantelpiece is another drawing, smaller, this time perched rather than hung. This one is made of tiny lines drawn in pencil over a painted surface. A horizon line splits the canvas, creating on the mantelpiece, in the foreground, a smoother profile, more hilly than the rugged mountain range that lurks behind in the alcove.

As she draws, she daydreams, different voices weave in and out, stories on the television, conversations in the room. She is in a state of almost mindless concentration, at any moment her attention can wander. She slips to a summer meadow high up in the German countryside. Sitting there in the afternoon sunlight, just before the shadows of the surrounding mountain peaks fall across her lap. She wonders how she can feel a stranger in her own country. When the room

comes into focus again, she is in another place. The paper on her lap is covered in many patches of tiny loops. How will they ever meet? When the joins are invisible, you can lose yourself in the middle; when the upper edge is neat, you can journey along the horizon.

The walls in this room look like they are covered in loops too – but up close it is possible to see that these are figures, lots and lots of small numbers. These are financial indices, specific quantities with particular functions, which appear here as surface ornament. In the opposite corner, two sofas are placed at right angles to one another. On the floor between them sit three women, a cat and one half of a pair of shoes. On one sofa art catalogues and CVs spill across the cushions. Behind the other sofa is a long box containing a large drawing, rolled up. This is a drawing of another room, by another hand, drawn from memory.

This is a room that matters, but that she was never quite part of. It was his room really, a room that he lived in before she entered his life, a room in which he may have loved others. To draw it is to conjure it into existence, to try to hold it down, to remember it as it was for her. The lines she draws are clear-headed and precise. She draws in a light hard pencil, sometimes in graphite, sometimes in colour. She draws in perspective with the certainty of an architect. But the point of convergence never holds still. From where she is looking, the room shifts in her memory, her focus changes. Looking back into the past, there are many places where eyes might meet.

Between the two sofas, a second door leads out into the hallway, where an elegant staircase winds its way upstairs, to a room overlooking the garden. This room will soon contain one of her large perspective drawings. There is talk of a tent filled with her cushions to be placed in the centre of the room, where you can lie back and watch him talk of his journey.

He travels hard, day after day, moving through corridor after corridor, to try and understand the geometry of the place. But no one on the inside will tell him where he is. If he doesn't know where he is, how will he know who he is? So he draws himself a map on the palm of his hand to remind him of where he has been, to remind him that 'he is in the house'.

She too has been on many journeys, back from where she has come. Sometimes she uses the folded paper as a diary, one square per day. To remember days and places, she makes marks, one after another, slowly filling up the paper. Sometimes she records a now distant journey, marking all the squares at once, with no sense of sequence. If you fold and unfold the paper you can read

one place next to, rather than before or after, another. In the patches of light and shadow she has made over time you can see the horizon of a mountain which you might have visited last summer.

In Hanover, this time, not London, three figures face a mirror. A man with wet hair is seated in the foreground bending his head downwards, only half his face is visible in the mirror. Behind him a woman leans forward with a pair of open scissors in her hand. She is cutting his hair. (Years down the line, cross-legged in the room full of numerical figures, we will see her profile again.) There is a third person, the face obscured by a camera, two hands adjust the lens; a photograph is taken. The photograph shows three artists, who today live somewhere else.

The light from the window hits her face in profile. She sits next to me on the floor, cross-legged. A third woman sits opposite, her back to a sofa. We talk of where we have come from. She was born in Russia, or was it Poland, or perhaps she said Australia? It is hard for me to remember her story, but it was also hard for her to tell. She comes from somewhere between fact and fiction. I tell them I was born in Dubai, but have moved from place to place so many times that London is my home, simply because it is not everywhere else.

My critical intention here has been to question the constitution of a legitimate subject or object for art criticism, and to expand the possibilities of criticism by suggesting that the critic can move beyond the works themselves to discuss the places imagined or remembered by the artists as well as the gallery, or site of their economic exchange. The building in which the Domo Baal Gallery is located, a Georgian terraced house in Bloomsbury, London, is also the curator's home. As a critic you have access to the administration spaces or rooms 'supporting' the gallery and also to the private and domestic rooms of the house. Artworks can therefore be found in a number of different settings, exhibited in the gallery, stored under sofas, propped up on the kitchen mantelpiece, suggesting that as a critical spatial practice criticism needs to expand its si(gh)tes

figures

fig. i View of *Strangely Familiar* exhibition, (London: The RIBA Gallery, 1996). Photograph: Iain Borden.

fig. ii View of *Material Intelligence* exhibition showing the work of Neil Wenman in the foreground and Caroline Butterworth in the background, *Spatial Imagination*, (London: The Entwistle Gallery, 2003). Photograph: Matthew Bowles.

fig. iii View of *Spatial Imagination* exhibition showing the work of Peg Rawes to the left, Katja Grillner to the right, and Rory Hamilton in the distance, *Spatial Imagination*, (London: The Domo Baal Gallery, 2006). Photograph: David Cross of Cornford & Cross.

fig. iv Penelope Haralambidou, '3 John Street, 1:50', *Spatial Imagination*, (London: The Domo Baal Gallery, 2006). Photograph: David Cross of Cornford & Cross.

fig. v Jane Rendell, 'An Embellishment: Purdah', *Spatial Imagination*, (London: The Domo Baal Gallery, 2006). Photograph: David Cross of Cornford & Cross.

fig. vi View of *Ausland* showing the work of Jan Peters in the foreground and Martine Schimid in the background. *Ausland*, (London: The Domo Baal Gallery, 2003). Photograph: The Domo Baal Gallery.

Notes

ⁱ Julia Kristeva, 'Institutional Interdisciplinarity in Theory and Practice: an interview', Alex Coles and Alexia Defert, eds., *The Anxiety of Interdisciplinarity, De-, Dis-, Ex-*, v. 2, London: Black Dog Publishing, 1997, pp. 3-21.

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

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

^{iv} Iain Borden, Joe Kerr, Alicia Pivaro, Jane Rendell, eds., *Strangely Familiar, Narratives of Architecture in the City*, London: Routledge, 1996.

^v In Michel de Certeau's discussion of practices, he uses the terms tactic and strategy. For de Certeau, strategies seek to create places that conform to abstract models; tactics do not obey the laws of places. See Michael de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988, p. 29. For Henri Lefebvre, spatial practices, along with representations of space and spaces of representation, form a trialectical model where space is produced through

three inter-related modes. See Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991. It is possible to draw connections between de Certeau's strategies and Lefebvre's representations of space on the one hand, and de Certeau's tactics and Lefebvre's spaces of representation on the other and suggest a distinction between those practices (strategies) that operate to maintain and reinforce existing social and spatial orders, and those practices (tactics) that seek to critique and question them. I favour such a distinction and call the latter critical spatial practices, a term which serves to describe both everyday activities and art practices which seek to resist the dominant social order to global corporate capitalism.

^{vi} Iain Borden, Jane Rendell, Joe Kerr with Alicia Pivaro eds., *The Unknown City: Contesting Architecture and Social Space*, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2001.

^{vii} Jane Rendell, Barbara Penner and Iain Borden, eds. *Gender, Space, Architecture: An Interdisciplinary Introduction*, London: Routledge, 1999 and Iain Borden and Jane Rendell, eds., *InterSections: Architectural History and Critical Theory*, London: Routledge, 2000.

^{viii} The feminist text was Luce Irigaray, 'Women on the Market', *This Sex Which Is Not One*, (1977), (trans. Catherine Porter with Carolyn Burke), Ithaca: Cornell, 1985, pp. 170-91 and the urban narrative, Pierce Egan, *Life in London; or, the day and night scenes of Jerry Hawthorn, Esq, and his elegant friend Corinthian Tom, accompanied by Bob Logic, the Oxonian, in their Rambles and Sprees through the Metropolis*, London: Sherwood, Neely and Jones, 1820-1. See Jane Rendell, *The Pursuit of Pleasure: Gender, Space and Architecture in Regency London*, London and New Brunswick: The Athlone Press, Continuum and Rutgers University Press, 2002.

^{ix} See Katherine Clarke of muf, 'How to: a description of what it takes to make a relationship to make a thing', in Jane Rendell ed., 'A Place Between', Special Issue of *The Public Art Journal*, issue 2, (October 1999), pp. 42-3 and Steve Pile, 'Between city and dream', in Jane Rendell (ed.) 'A Place Between', Special Issue of *The Public Art Journal*, issue 2, (October 1999), pp. 10-11.

^x Jane Rendell, *Art and Architecture: A Place Between*, London: IB Tauris, 2006.

^{xi} See Peg Rawes and Jane Rendell eds., *Spatial Imagination*, London: The Bartlett School of Architecture, UCL, 2005. See also spatialimagination.org.uk.

^{xii} The conference was held in November 2005 at The Bartlett School of Architecture, University College London, organised by Jane Rendell and Jonathan Hill of the Bartlett, in association with AHRA (Architectural Humanities Research Association) represented by Murray Fraser of the University of Westminster and Mark Dorrian of the University of Edinburgh. The conference was part funded by the British Academy and part funded by The Bartlett School of Architecture. See Jane Rendell ed., 'Critical Architecture', Special Issue of *The Journal of Architecture*, (June 2005), v. 10. n. 3 and Jane Rendell, Jonathan Hill, Murray Fraser and Mark Dorrian eds., *Critical Architecture*, London: Routledge, forthcoming 2007.

^{xiii} See for example Alex Coles, 'The Bathroom Critic', *Art Monthly*, 263 (February 2003), pp. 7-10; Michael Archer, 'Crisis What Crisis?', *Art Monthly*, 264 (March 2003), pp. 1-4; Rasheed Araeen, letter in response to 'Crisis what Crisis', *Art Monthly*, 265 (April 2003), pp. 12-3; Matthew Arnat, 'The Middle Distance', response to Michael Archer, *Art Monthly*, 265 (April 2003), p. 43; Peter Suchin, 'The Critic never Sleeps', *Art Monthly*, 266 (May 2003), p. 41; Michael Archer, 'Critical Task', letter in response to 'The Critic never Sleeps', *Art Monthly*, 267

(June 2003), p. 9; Rasheed Araeen, 'Opportunism', letter in response to 'Critical Task', *Art Monthly*, 268 (Jul-Aug 2003), p. 14; J. J. Charlesworth, 'The Dysfunction of Criticism', *Art Monthly*, 269 (September 2003), pp. 1-4. The debate then turned to the role of the artist/curator, but has recently reverted to discussions of criticism in the form of artist Dave Beech's attack on critic Julian Stalleybrass. See Dave Beech, 'Art's Debunkers', *Art Monthly*, 283 (February 2005), pp. 2-4. See also Jane Rendell, letter, 'Art Writing', *Art Monthly*, 272 (December-January 2003-4), p. 15.

^{xiv} See for example 'Architecture-Writing', in Jane Rendell ed., *Critical Architecture*, special issue of *The Journal of Architecture*, (June 2005), v. 10. n. 3, pp. 255-64. See also 'Travelling the Distance: Encountering the Other', David Blamey ed., *Here, There, Elsewhere: Dialogues on Location and Mobility*, London: Open Editions, 2002, pp. 43-54; 'Writing in place of speaking', Sharon Kivland and Lesley Sanderson eds., *Transmission: Speaking and Listening*, v. 1, Sheffield Hallam University and the Site Gallery, 2002, pp. 15-28; 'Site-Writing', Sharon Kivland, Jasper Joseph?-Lester and Emma Cocker eds., *Transmission: Speaking and Listening*, v. 4, Sheffield Hallam University and the Site Gallery, 2005, pp. 169-76; 'From Austin, Texas to Santiago Atitlan, and back again', Felipe Hernandez, Mark Millington and Iain Borden eds., *Architecture and Transculturation in Latin America*, Amsterdam and New York, Rodopi Press, 2006, pp. 43-58 and 'From Architectural History to Spatial Writing', in Elvan Altan Ergut, Dana Arnold and Belgin Turan Ozkaya, eds., *Rethinking Architectural Historiography*, London: Routledge, 2006.

^{xv} See for example, Susan Stanford Friedman, *Mappings: Feminism and the Cultural Geographies of Encounter*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998; Diane Fuss, *Identification Papers*, London: Routledge, 1995; Elizabeth Grosz, *Volatile Bodies*, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994; Irit Rogoff, *Terra Infirma*, London: Routledge, 2000 and Kaja Silverman, *The Threshold of the Visible World*, London: Routledge, 1996.

^{xvi} See Jane Flax, *Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, Feminism and Postmodernism in the Contemporary West*, Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991, p. 232; Donna Haraway. 'Situated Knowledges: the Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Knowledge', *Feminist Studies*, v. 14, n. 3, (Fall 1988), pp. 575-603, especially, pp. 583-8 and Elspeth Probyn, 'Travels in the Postmodern: Making Sense of the Local' in Linda Nicholson ed., *Feminism/Postmodernism*, London: Routledge, 1990, pp. 176-89, p. 178. See also Rosi Braidotti, *Nomadic Subjects*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1994 and bell hooks, *Yearnings: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*, London: Turnaround Press, 1989.

^{xvii} Howard Caygill, *Walter Benjamin: The Colour of Experience*, London: Routledge, 1998, p. 34 and pp. 64 and 79.

^{xviii} See Hal Foster's discussion of critical distance and identification for example in Hal Foster, *The Return of the Real: The Avant-Garde at the End of the Century*, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2001, pp. 223-6.

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

^{xx} See for example Nicholas Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics*, (trans. Simon Pleasance and Fronza Woods), Paris: Les Presses du Réel, 2002.

^{xxi} See for example Grant H. Kester, *Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.

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

^{xxiii} See for example Italo Calvino, *Literature Machine*, London: Vintage, 1997, p. 15 and Roland Barthes, *The Grain of the Voice: Interviews 1962-80*. (trans. Linda Coverdale), Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991, pp. 215-6

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

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

^{xxvi} Jane Rendell, 'Everywhere Else', *Ausland*, comprising artists Jan Peters, Martina Schmid and Silke Schatz, (London: The Domo Baal Gallery, 2003).