

Chapter Title: Anthologizing Post-Structuralism: Architecture Écriture, Gender, and Subjectivity

Chapter Author(s): Karen Burns

Book Title: The Figure of Knowledge

Book Subtitle: Conditioning Architectural Theory, 1960s - 1990s

Book Editor(s): Sebastiaan Loosen, Rajesh Heynickx, Hilde Heynen

Published by: Leuven University Press. (2020)

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv16x2c28.16>

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



This book is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. Funding is provided by KU Leuven Fund for Fair Open Access.



JSTOR

*Leuven University Press* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Figure of Knowledge*

# Anthologizing Post-Structuralism: Architecture Écriture, Gender, and Subjectivity

Karen Burns

... the majority of writers in this quasi-generation of architectural theorists are women.

Mark Wigley, *Assemblage*, August 27, 1995<sup>1</sup>

## Archives

The late 1990s rush to anthologize postwar architectural theory produced theory as an archival project. Like all archives, the anthology volumes were incomplete and “fragmentary, contingent traces of historical experience.”<sup>2</sup> The gaps in this archive – its missing boxes – and its contingency come to light when we try and search the archival filing system for boxes marked subjectivity and gender. Five mainstream architectural theory anthologies were published in English between 1996 and 1999. However, these volumes included few essays on feminism or gender studies.<sup>3</sup> This omission is surprising because during the late 1980s and ’90s, “gender and subjectivity” was hailed as one of the primary topics of the new theory formation by the editors of *Assemblage*, a key North American architectural theory journal published between 1986 and 2000.<sup>4</sup> This chapter examines the presence and absence of the category “gender and subjectivity” within the anthology archives. It sets the disappearance of gender against the intense interest in the question of the theorist’s own subjectivity in the period 1984 to 1997 and focuses on the presence and performance of subjectivity in the period’s experimental writing projects. I trace the ways in which post-structuralism’s topics of subjectivity and gender were reframed by gendered archival practices and by the presence of the neo-conservative North American “Culture Wars.” The question of

the theorist's authority and mastery remains pertinent today. Social norms of gender, race, class, sexuality, ethnicity, and religion structurally reproduce themselves in architectural theory, above and beyond the "intentions" of individual theorists.

## L'écriture

Writing was a powerful medium for staging the encounters between architecture and post-structuralist theory. Oral and written texts were experimental sites. In lecture rooms, symposia, and on the page, speakers and writers played with conventions of language, genre, and typography. By the mid-1990s, however, writing came to be excoriated and cast as a visible sign of theory's difference from building. This paper is not interested in rehearsing the binary opposition of building and writing. Rather it establishes the significance of the experimental writing medium for a range of high-profile architects and theorists. It analyses the value of this medium for metaphysical inquiries into subjectivity – including the theorist's own – and examines the subsequent marginalization and feminization of the writing genre in theory's anthology system.

An experimental architectural genre was borrowed, shaped, and emerged from post-structuralist writing originating in literature, philosophy, and psychoanalysis. "Post-structuralism" describes the reception and interpretation of new French philosophy of the 1960s and 1970s in regions outside France, particularly in North America.<sup>5</sup> Post-structuralism is a set of procedures for rethinking key metaphysical concepts, most sharply those concerned with language, subjectivity, being, and essence. Key exponents of post-structuralist French philosophy and literary theory forged a new theory genre by drawing on techniques developed in modernist texts: notably in the work of James Joyce, as well as Mallarmé, Woolf, and Dadaist writings, among other sources. This genre brings the relationship between the oral and the textual to the fore by emulating the spoken voice and unconscious on the page. Writers use stream of consciousness techniques, divergences, disruptions, and rapid changes of tone, jokes, and dialogue. By mimicking process, writing emphasizes borrowings and language conventions to reveal the subjectivity of the author who writes and the force of protocols in constructing language, "thought," and writing. Notably it is highly form driven: it is an experiment in the physical forms of writing. It is characterized by the interplay of fictional and essayistic genres, mixing fragments of autobiography and extant philosophical texts, experiments in typography, and page design. French writers developed this experimental writing genre in order to work against the metaphysical practices embedded in the very material fabric of writing.

An early architectural example can serve to illustrate the key practices of this genre. In 1984 the London-based architectural journal *AA Files* published

Daniel Libeskind's "Notes for a Lecture: Nouvelles Impressions d'Architecture."<sup>6</sup> Libeskind's essay refuses the protocols of a lecture's coherent structure, narrative, or conformity to rules of argument. His text exposes the *genre* of the lecture as a constructed, social artifact. "Notes for a Lecture" is also a theoretical investigation into the self, subjecthood, and sovereignty. The essay plays up its performance mode, collaging fragments of texts and collectibles to mimic the stream of consciousness of remembrance and personal memories from the individual lecturer's interior world. These techniques foreground the author's intellectual genealogy, revealing the over-riding force of memory and collecting in the formation of ideas. The piece undoes assumptions about the creative self as an original fount of new ideas by constructing the self as a site of texts and artifacts made by others. This lecture questions theory's attachment to the "history of ideas" genre, with its privileging of mastery and rationality as operating concepts.

Outside architecture this writing practice was sometimes described according to a problematic term devised by French writer Hélène Cixous as "*l'écriture féminine*." This designation has proved troublesome for many and remains a source of confusion in the English-speaking world. *L'écriture féminine* uses a metaphor of the feminine to describe writing that is radically different from established protocols, that speaks otherwise. The voice of *l'écriture* can belong to either male or female authors because the text is not a natural outpouring but a highly polished performance. Language mimics the interlocking operations of existing texts, including oral textual forms, all signaling to the reader that writing is a constructed artefact rather than a transparent medium of communication. The act of composition – the physical construction of the text – and the composition of authorial identity become intertwined.<sup>7</sup> Form and content are inextricably meshed.

## 1976-1993

This new writing practice began to enter the discipline of architecture around 1975 before flowering in the architectural mainstream from 1984 to 1997. The genre survives today in less visible parts of architectural writing and performance, notably in feminist works.<sup>8</sup> Fragments of architecture *écriture* first appeared around 1976, when this French writing practice jumped the channel and made its way to 36 Bedford Square, Bloomsbury, London, home of the AA (Architectural Association) school. The genre asserted its presence in the 1976-1977 studio run by Bernard Tschumi and entitled "Joyce's Garden," a project set in nearby Covent Garden, a historically significant area rescued from threats of demolition and redevelopment. Tschumi gave the students portions of James Joyce's *Finnegan's Wake* to use as briefs for sites at thirty-six locations, sites chosen randomly from the intersecting points of

an ordinance survey grid. The use of fiction and chance to select site and brief radically undermined the rhetoric of rationality as the guiding factor in architectural decision-making. Many of the project descriptions, including Tschumi's, however, are remarkably sober. *Finnegan's Wake* appears to have left few traces on the genre of design project description, with the exception of Will Alsop, who wrote: "You are invited to attend a meeting on the corner of the West Central Street and Museum Street for the purpose of arriving at a collective agreement that the proposed building for that site already exists."<sup>9</sup> Handing out briefs consisting of a piece of fiction implicitly questions the normative protocols used for brief writing. The random fictional brief challenges the technocratic function of writing and language in architecture, the assumption that writing communicates – that it exists as a vehicle for communication – and that it occupies a service function in the field of architecture.

By 1984 this writing practice began to appear simultaneously on both sides of the Atlantic. In May 1984, Libeskind's *AA Files* piece was published and in July–August 1984, a special architectural edition of the Atlanta-based *Art Papers* guest edited by Jennifer Bloomer and Robert Segrest featured Segrest's "The Perimeter Projects: Notes for Design," an essay that would be revised and included two years later in the first issue of *Assemblage*.<sup>10</sup> "Perimeter Projects" mixed fictional and factual genres, challenging authorial originality by incorporating pages of quotations and questioning the "authority" of architecture and its privileging of the object. The first issue of *Assemblage* featured a newly translated Kurt Schwitters poem, "The Onion, Merz Poem 8." By publishing the Segrest and Schwitters pieces in its founding issue, the journal declared a commitment to writing experiments and modernist literary innovation. *Assemblage* gave this writing form a long-term home for over a decade. The journal published forty-one issues in total, spanning the years from 1986 to 2000. In volumes one to thirty-two, twenty-one of the issues contained at least one example of the experimental writing genre.<sup>11</sup> From August 1997, no writing of this genre appeared again in *Assemblage* magazine, although whispers of it echoed in the final issue. By 1998, even those writers who'd been strongly associated with this genre, such as Jennifer Bloomer and Ann Bergren, were writing in *Assemblage*'s pages in a much more established (and conventional) academic voice.<sup>12</sup> The public withdrawal of this experimental writing form was unsurprising, given how strongly it had been attacked in the preceding years.

In May/June 1993 the question of architectural writing and its function was put center stage in the first issue of *Any*, whose founding issue was devoted to the question of "writing in architecture." The two editorial pieces and an accompanying diagram clearly linked writing to architectural practice. In the second editorial piece Michael Speaks asserted that "writing becomes architectural [and that is] by producing architecture."<sup>13</sup> The year 1993 was the fever pitch year for contestation over the *Assemblage* project and the new theory formation. Trenchant critiques

had been gathering. Andrea Kahn made the problem of architectural theory (or post-structuralist architectural theory) the subject of a plenary address at SUNY Buffalo in 1991. When the lecture was subsequently published in early 1994, she used the epithet “terrorist” in her analysis of Mark Wigley’s work.<sup>14</sup> By 1993 the mood was grim. The April 1993 *Assemblage* issue “Violence and Space,” featuring material on race, colonialism, class, and gender, was attacked by a *Casabella* editorial and a lecture by Peter Eisenman at Harvard, *Assemblage*’s institutional home.<sup>15</sup> In these contests writing was cast as the opposite of building; its otherness was emphasized. In 1995 Mark Wigley, a prominent theorist, noted that the “writing on trial” paradigm was about institutional control over architecture’s debate. He called out the disproportionate scale of the “wildly overdetermined reactions”: “You can count all the writers who fit the critics’ definitions of post-structuralist theory on one, maybe one and a half, hands. (...) But these people [i.e., the critics of theory] have big enough boom boxes that they can make sufficient noise for the self-appointed watchdogs of the discourse to be convinced of some kind of global conspiracy.”<sup>16</sup> These skirmishes contest the view of later anthology commentaries that the “critical project” became “exhausted.”<sup>17</sup> It was embattled, which is an entirely different historical frame.

In 1992 North American theorist Bob Somol linked the “powerful backlash against theory, a return to disciplinary rigor, of which the architectural concern of ‘making it’ is only one manifestation” to a larger “neo-conservative” project, known as “the Culture Wars.”<sup>18</sup> These issues burst the boundaries of academia and attained public prominence in 1993, with criticism from the left (in a *Harper’s Magazine* essay entitled “The Left Lost in the Politics of Identity”) and from the right in the contestations around the 1993 Whitney Biennial (exhibited from February to June 1993).<sup>19</sup> *New York Times* art critic Robert Hughes derided the exhibition as “a saturnalia of political correctness” and *ARTnews* dubbed it “The Whitney’s PC Theme Park.”<sup>20</sup> The Culture Wars were a series of conflicts over a broad swathe of progressive issues in North America, including abortion, art, affirmative action, race, evolution, family values, feminism, and pornography. Neo-conservatives frequently describe these clashes as a “battle for the soul of America.”<sup>21</sup> The increasing importance of identity – a term which refers to the categories around which social groups organize and identify, such as race or class or gender – was both asserted and contested in these battles. “Identity politics” became a major point of contention in these cultural clashes, as critics asserted that identity affiliations undermined universal categories, such as human rights, “common humanity,” or national categories.<sup>22</sup> Today, “identity politics” remains a derisive term. It is often used in derogatory ways to dismiss the usefulness of identity categories. Detractors can conflate quite different identity affiliations into a new overarching category called identity.<sup>23</sup> This homogenising category elides difference. Moreover the term

“politics” in “identity politics” shifts the focus away from analysis of specific social, systemic, and structural acts of discrimination towards *politics*, with implications of partisanship, party-based systems, lobbying, and voter choice.

The term identity politics slowly crept into architecture. In his introduction to the theory anthology *Architecture Theory Since 1968* (1998), editor K. Michael Hays notes that “there have been important developments in architecture theory not covered by this anthology,” and the footnote to this sentence reads: “Feminism and identity politics are only the most obvious of themes that have produced massive numbers of studies since 1993 not primarily concerned with reification.”<sup>24</sup> The term used by Hays in his jointly written *Assemblage* editorials was “gender and subjectivity,” but now this phrase has been replaced with the much more loaded term “feminism and identity politics.” This is a significant shift. The category of gender covers gender norms around men, women, masculinity and femininity, and gender nonconforming identities. Although feminism’s core business is the challenge to gender norms, feminism has traditionally advocated on behalf of women subjects. Now the question of subjectivity, once relevant to all theorists, has been shelved and race, a topic of burgeoning concern in 1990s whiteness studies, seems absent but perhaps veiled by the catchall term “identity politics.”

Writing a co-history of the decade would include these institutional struggles within architecture schools and journals and their intersection with the sociopolitical landscape of the culture wars. Too often, the anti-theory turn has been framed as an internal shift within the discipline of architecture. For example, the conference call for papers for the 2017 symposium “Theory’s History” locates the “crisis” of theory as a crisis internal to theory by noting the “presence of coexisting and even contradictory paradigms derived from very different epistemic domains (anthropology, philosophy, linguistics, social sciences, etc.) led to a setback of theory (...).”<sup>25</sup> (Once again the responses to extra-disciplinary forces are figured through the metaphor of difference and disciplinary outsiders.) By locating the seeds of decline inside “critical theory” itself, in pathologies of exhaustion or inner conflict, these historical narratives of internal decay elide the conflicts of power and struggles for institutional control that increasingly engulfed the post-structuralist project in architecture.<sup>26</sup>

A history of the attack on post-structuralist theory cannot be accommodated within a traditional history of ideas narrative or within an older historical paradigm of evolutionary development, where the seeds of destruction are located in an internal *telos*. Was theory responsible for its own demise, or was theory’s own historical trajectory shaped by conflicts over “the institutional control of the debate about architecture”?<sup>27</sup> Theorists had been breaking away from a service role for theory and refused, as Mark Wigley declared, to observe “the traditional and instrumental relationship between theory and practice.”<sup>28</sup> Perhaps theory (and its theorists) was exhausted, but one could argue, they were exhausted from being relentlessly

“attacked” rather than by theory’s own internal pathologies.<sup>29</sup> A history of theory in architecture is a history of institutions, networks, and places of knowledge formation, not just the peaking and succession of ideas.<sup>30</sup>

## 1998 Archiving

The anthology archives have preserved few documents of architecture’s experimental post-structuralist writing genre and, as we will see, when experimental texts were included, the genre itself was frequently ignored or minimized. My brief essay does not review all of the anthologies as I have done elsewhere;<sup>31</sup> instead I focus here on two anthologies, namely, K. Michael Hays’s *Architecture Theory since 1968* (1998) and Charles Jencks and Karl Kropf’s *Theories and Manifestoes* (1997, 2nd edition 2006) to understand how pieces were archived and framed by editorial gender practices. To understand how gender inflects editorial description and taxonomy we can compare two essays of experimental post-structuralist writing that were included in the *Architecture Theory since 1968* anthology, Robert Segrest’s previously mentioned “The Perimeter Projects: Notes for Design” and Jennifer Bloomer’s “Abodes of Theory and Flesh: Tabbles of Bower.” The two essays share many features of content and form and could be considered companion pieces, although the anthology’s chronological ordering system files them at 1984 and 1992 respectively.

Like many examples of post-structuralist écriture, the Segrest and Bloomer essays are difficult to classify under topic labels. They run wildly across multiple authorial names and ideas. Both incorporate the architectural everyday: he the suburbs, she the vernacular balloon frame. Both use Walter Benjamin and classical myth and deal with the place of writing in architecture. Importantly, both address gender, with a particular interest in the gendering of binary conceptual organizing categories; Bloomer overtly in her study of the structure/ornament pair, and Segrest more covertly in his metaphorisation of transgressive tactics in the city as a “witches’ brew” contesting relations, between the gendered binary opposition of the criminal/prostitute/transgressor and the magistrate/authority/orderer [sic].<sup>32</sup> A close reading of Segrest’s text reveals gender tropes and analyses threading through his text, in references to suburbia, Greek myths, and criminal/magistrate characters. The framing editorial glosses contain faint traces of the gendered thinking that shaped taxonomies for archiving and labeling these comparable essays. The editorial commentary on Segrest neglects to mention the gender frames in his essay and instead foregrounds Benjaminian elements, as the editor observes that Segrest works with the quotidian – “the trivia and trash of everyday life” – and other surrealist strategies such as “heretofore unintentional and irrational activities” and “a geography of incidents and necessarily decentered subjects,” thus considering “architecture as the *writing* of events.” The essay is “a



phantasmagoria of fragments no less somber than the anomie typically reserved for the damaged modernists from Piranesi to James Joyce. It is here that Segrest registers an ambiguity characteristic of architecture theory in the mid-1980s, a skeptical, transgressive kind of writing whose convulsions somehow resemble laughter.”<sup>33</sup> Segrest is placed within an avant-garde modernist lineage and the writing mode is interpreted as an intellectually skeptical position. He is a stand-in for transgressive writing.

In the anthology archive the longest analysis of the formal practices of l'écriture emerges in the *Architecture Theory* anthologization of Bloomer. In his framing remarks the editor identifies an oppositional feminist practice he calls “*architecture feminine*,” a practice that recuperates the “marginalized feminine condition” by addressing the “reduction and distortion of women’s work by ‘phallogentric codes of rationality, objectivity and hierarchy.’” The editor describes this break away from the “masculine economy” as a minor architecture, as Hays picks up on Bloomer’s appropriation of a Deleuzian term to denote the critical function of writing and thought generated by cultural insiders within a majority culture. The language becomes tangled when he attempts to explain the architectural component of this term, as he argues that *l’architecture féminine* is the inscription of the “‘marked’ sexual-textual body.” Leaving aside the problem of what that statement might mean as description of gender analysis (for it conflates gender with sex), the gloss then draws on one of Bloomer’s own references to her pregnancy. In the editor’s words her pregnancy is an inviolable feminine space that the editor claims “cannot be presided over by the male gaze.” However, Bloomer’s own textual addendum to her piece rejects the metaphor of pregnancy as a description of creativity as “inappropriate” and unequal to the task of describing the collaborative nature of the installation and textual work explored in her essay. She lists her three male and one female collaborators by name. The editor then draws the reader’s attention to the centrality of experimental writing strategy in Bloomer’s work and positions the genre in this way:

her deconstruction of boundaries between those texts and her architectural object (“theory and flesh”), refuse traditional modes of presentation and exegesis even at a stylistic level. In fact, Bloomer’s texts achieve another level of emotional and epistemological significance when she performs them in public, using different accents, even different voices (...).<sup>34</sup>

In the editor’s thematic and metaphorical pairings Bloomer is aligned with emotions, the body, sex, and performance. Robert Segrest’s body remains “unmarked” in the editor’s gloss and although Segrest explores and deconstructs gender norms, his own gendered subjectivity is not the subject of the editor’s gaze. One (male) essayist’s writing is aligned to transgression, Piranesi and Joyce, the other (female) essayist is linked to feminist theory, the body, women’s reproduction, and emotion. This focus

on the woman writer's "personal" motivation can have quite problematic effects for women by suggesting a personal "and therefore partial and non-objective analysis."<sup>35</sup>

The editor's introduction to the anthology *Architecture Theory since 1968* alludes to a larger theoretical project of rehabilitating theory according to a rationalist agenda, as Hays writes, "I have rationally reconstructed the history of architecture theory in an attempt to produce (as Louis Althusser recommended) the *concept* of that history."<sup>36</sup> Elsewhere, towards the end of the introduction, Hays notes that since 1993 there are "important developments in architecture theory not covered by this anthology" and the most important of these advances are defined in the footnote as "Feminism and identity politics."<sup>37</sup> Nevertheless he then declares that "I still believe, however, that the texts included here will then constitute the necessary history on which those new theories will be built." In the footnote Hays explains that these post-1993 developments are not concerned with reification, although a feminist would argue that reification as a form of abstraction governs the production of stereotypes of gender, sexuality, race, etc. Hays goes on to declare: "Theory is a practice explicitly ready to undertake its self-critique and effect its own transformation." These strictures make it more difficult to absorb the lessons of post-structuralist *écriture*; a writing mode that undermines the theorist's claim to self-mastery, punctures the dominance of the "rationalist" intellect with the creative and disruptive mimicry of the subconscious, and presents ongoing challenges to the authority claims of the theorist. The open questioning of authorship and authority would have complicated the anthology's claim for the continuing viability of theory in a historical moment dominated by a backlash against theory. Post-structuralism's multi-voiced mode contains challenges to theory's claim to rationalism; by feminising it and aligning it with tropes of the body, sex, and the feminine, theory sidetracked and marginalised these challenges.

L'écriture was not expunged entirely from the broader architectural anthology system, however, although its critical and political significance was frequently overlooked or disguised.<sup>38</sup> In Charles Jencks and Karl Kropf's *Theories and Manifestoes of Contemporary Architecture* anthology (1997/2006), John Hejduk's fictionalizing *Victims* text (1986) is positioned within an individualist frame rather than noted as an intellectual movement. For example, Jencks and Kropf observe, "Hejduk nevertheless showed an idiosyncrasy." The extract's title, borrowed from Hejduk's book, is "Thoughts of an Architect." Its meaning is double-edged, referring to the subject as a generator of ideas and rationalizing the fragmentary, poetic, figurative text as a series of thoughts. Here's Hejduk: "Drawings and tracings are like the hands of the blind/touching the surfaces of the face in order to understand/a sense of volume, depth and penetration."<sup>39</sup> An extract from Daniel Libeskind's *Chamber Works* (1983) was glossed in individual terms, as the editors observe: "At times gnomic in his writing, Libeskind uses juxtaposition, oxymoron and paradox as heuristic devices

to reach beyond the limits of the verbal.”<sup>40</sup> In Jencks and Kropf’s anthology, l’écriture becomes a sign of individual expression. This individualizing of the theoretical and political aims of experimental writing was consistent with the anthology commentary on Bloomer cited earlier. When individual texts are described as personal expressions, theory veils over the historical turn to experimental writing. A focus on the personal ignores the shared protocols of new writing methods that excavate the politics of subjectivity and the political structures of the discipline.

L’écriture and its many women exponents were further marginalized in secondary histories due to methods that focus 1980s and 1990s theory through the prism of the practicing architect. A prominent theory book looking backwards at post-structuralism in architecture was titled *Derrida for Architects*. As the title suggests, the book was dominated by the assumption that the function of theory in architecture is to be of use to practicing architects (i.e., those who build). This focus excluded all of the North American women theorists Mark Wigley had noted in 1995, when he observed, “the majority of writers in this quasi-generation of architectural theorists are women.” Wigley was included in *Derrida for Architects* but not his fellow *Assemblage* comrades: Bloomer, Bergren, Beatriz Colomina, Diana Agrest, or Catherine Ingraham.<sup>41</sup>

## Conclusion

This chapter has traced post-structuralist experimental writing in order to investigate gender and subjectivity as key topics in 1980s and 1990s architectural theory. The genre’s formal experiments focused on the function of writing in architecture, the role of writing as experiment rather than communication, problems of authority and mastery, and the privilege accorded to rationalism and buildings in definitions of architecture. Post-structuralist experimental writing was an experiment in form. It was sometimes accompanied by new work in architectural drawing, installations, and studio practice, and opened new areas for speculation. Post-structuralist experimental writing and its key ideas became increasingly contentious during the escalating architecture theory wars, and some of its central topics were subsequently minimized through being feminized or individualized in the theory anthology archive.

By briefly summarizing the afterlife of experimental post-structuralist writing in the anthology archival turn and in subsequent secondary histories, this chapter argues that post-structuralism’s critical account of subjectivity has not yet significantly affected the historical methods applied to the period of theory’s ascendancy. The positioning of architecture écriture in the anthology system reflects the gendering and marginalizing of l’écriture. By leaving its many practitioners out, or by transforming serious inquiry and formal experiment into a question of subjectivity as individual expression, we lose the sense of the systematic use of the writing genre

to contest metaphysical models of subjectivity. Transgressive laughter and punning might be the spoken registers of this writerly mode, but it was a serious intellectual project aimed at probing architecture's foundational paradigms. Discussions of theory's demise are still governed by long-standing historical models focused on decline and more specifically on *internal* decline. These stubborn historical archetypes need to be addressed if we are to write histories that understand post-1968 architectural theory within a complex of sociopolitical forces. Although some cast these inquiries within the terms of disciplinary insiders and outsiders (theory as "an invading force from outside"), theory's inquiry into architecture's identity and the construction of its subjects raised questions about theory's capacity for mastery, authority, and self-knowledge. These issues remain gravely pertinent.

## Notes

1. Mark Wigley, "Story-Time," *Assemblage*, 27 (August 1995): 91.
2. Antoinette Burton, *Dwelling in the Archive* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 31.
3. See Karen Burns, "EX LIBRIS: Archaeologies of Feminism, Architecture and Deconstruction," *Architectural Theory Review* 15, no. 3 (December 2010): 242-65 and Karen Burns, "A Girl's Own Adventure: Gender in the Contemporary Architectural Theory Anthology," *Journal of Architectural Education* 65 (March 2012): 125-34.
4. K. Michael Hays and Catherine Ingraham, "Editorial: On Turning 30," *Assemblage*, no. 30 (August 1996): 7 and K. Michael Hays and Alicia Kennedy, "Editorial," *Assemblage*, no. 37 (December 1998): 7.
5. The term is accepted in literary theory and its confusions and problems duly noted. See Benoit Dillet, Robert Porter, and Iain Mackenzie, eds., *The Edinburgh Companion to Poststructuralism* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013), 12.
6. Daniel Libeskind, "Notes for a Lecture: Nouvelles Impressions d'Architecture," *AA Files*, no. 6 (May 1994): 3-13.
7. The mirroring of composition and authorial identity is found in Romantic period writing. See Andrew Bennett, *Romantic Poets and the Culture of Posterity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
8. See the work of Julieanna Preston and Taking Place.
9. *AA Project Reviews 1976-1977* (London: AA Publishing, 1977), n.p.
10. Jennifer Bloomer and Robert Segrest, eds., *Art Papers* 8, no. 4 (July-August 1984) and *Assemblage*, no. 1, "Without Architecture" special issue (October 1986): 24-35.
11. Writers in this vein include the ones already mentioned, as well as Diller and Scofidio, Mark C. Taylor, Jeffrey Kipnis, Ann Bergren, Thomas Leeser, Harris Dimitropolous and LIQUID Architecture, Mark Rakatansky, bell hooks, Heidi J. Nast and Mabel O. Wilson, Silvia Kolbowski, and Judy Berland.

12. Jennifer Bloomer and Robert Segrest, "Iowa/Australia/Georgia," *Assemblage*, no. 41 (April 2000): 14. Their final *Assemblage* contribution used an interwoven set of memories rather than collage techniques. For writers associated with the technique who were writing in more conventional ways by 1998 see Jennifer Bloomer, "Pale Houses, Silenced Shadows," *Assemblage*, no. 37 (December 1998): 46-47; and Ann Bergren, "Jon Jerde and the Architecture of Pleasure," *Assemblage*, no. 37 (December 1998): 8-35.
13. Michael Speaks, "Writing in Architecture," *Any*, no. 1 (May/June 1993): 6.
14. Andrea Kahn, "Representations and Misrepresentations: On Architectural Theory," *Journal of Architectural Education* 47, no. 3 (February 1994): 162-68. See p. 166 for the terrorist reference.
15. See also Libero Andreotti, "The ANYWAY Conference, Barcelona, June 4-7 1993," *Journal of Architectural Education* 47, no. 3 (February 1994): 184. A description of the Vittorio Gregotti editorial in *Casabella* is included in Wigley, "Story-Time," 91.
16. Wigley, "Story-Time," 89.
17. See A. Krista Sykes, ed., *Constructing a New Agenda: Architectural Theory 1993-2009* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2010), 16, for her account of Michael Speaks and Robert Somol/Sarah Whiting's criticisms of 1990s "critical theory," in which she notes, "While the attitudes of their authors differ, both of these writings characterize the critical project as exhausted."
18. Robert E. Somol, "*Les liaisons dangereuses*, or My Mother the House," *Fetish. Princeton School of Architecture Journal* no. 4 (1992): 65.
19. In September 1993 *Harper's Magazine* published an excerpt from an academic essay, Todd Gitlins, "The Left Lost in the Politics of Identity," <http://harpers.org/archive/1993/09/the-left-lost-in-the-politics-of-identity/2/>.
20. Vanessa Faye Johnson, "Difference as Identity in 'The Other Story' and the 1993 Whitney Biennial" (PhD diss, University of Louisville, 2010), <http://dx.doi.org/10.18297/etd/697>, 32; 36.
21. Richard Jensen, "The Culture Wars 1965-1995: A Historian's Map," *Journal of Social History* 29 (October 1995): 26; James Davison Hunter, *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America* (New York: Basic Books, 1991); Andrew Hartman, *A War For the Soul of America: A History of the Culture Wars* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015); Roger Chapman and James Ciment, eds., *Culture Wars: An Encyclopedia of Issues, Viewpoints and Voices* (New York: Routledge, 2015); and Gregory S. Jay, *American Literature and the Culture Wars* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997).
22. See Johnson, "Difference as Identity."
23. Susan Bickford, "Anti-Identity Politics: Feminism, Democracy, and the Complexities of Citizenship," *Hypatia* 12, no. 4 (1997): 111-31.
24. K. Michael Hays, ed., *Architecture Theory since 1968* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1998), xiv, xv, footnote 8.

25. Call for Papers, for “Theory’s History, 196X-199X. Challenges in the Historiography of Architectural Knowledge” (Brussels: KU Leuven, February 6-8, 2017), 1. <https://architectuur.kuleuven.be/theoryshistory/>.
26. Wigley, “Story-Time,” 85. On p. 89 he writes, “The battle over contemporary theory is really being waged in corridors, in letters and telephone calls, rather than in the classroom or the press.”
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid., 88.
29. Ibid., 89. Here Wigley describes the events as “the attack on theory.”
30. For an exemplary instance of this kind of historical analysis see Arindam Dutta, ed., *A Second Modernism: MIT, Architecture, and the “Techno-Social” Moment* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2013).
31. See the essays referenced in footnote 3.
32. Segrest, “The Perimeter Projects,” in Hays, *Architecture Theory since 1968*, 561 (the witches’ brew); 562 (the gendered binary).
33. All quotations in this paragraph are from Hays, *Architecture Theory since 1968*, 552.
34. Ibid., 758.
35. A feminist analysis by Suvendrini Perera and Sherene H. Razack transforms subjective experience into an intellectual mode of inquiry. See: Suvendrini Perera and Sherene H. Razack, “Introduction. At the Limits of Justice: Women of Colour Theorize Terror” in *At the Limits of Justice: Women of Colour on Terror*, ed. Suvendrini Perera and Sherene H. Razack (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 6. Kate Nesbitt’s editorial gloss on Diana Agrest, as a theorist who has personally experienced discrimination as a woman, also transforms the structural experience into a personal one. Kate Nesbitt, ed., *Theorizing a New Agenda for Architecture: An Anthology of Architectural Theory, 1965-1995* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996). See Burns, “A Girl’s Own Adventure”: 128-29.
36. Hays, *Architecture Theory since 1968*, xii.
37. Ibid., xiv.
38. An exception is the feminist anthology of Jane Rendell, Barbara Penner, and Iain Borden, eds., *Gender Space Architecture: An Interdisciplinary Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2000), but the book is explicitly interdisciplinary, concerned with space rather than architecture. It is not an historical anthology of architecture.
39. Charles Jencks and Karl Kropf, eds., *Theories and Manifestoes of Contemporary Architecture*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Chichester, UK: Wiley-Academy, 2006), 285.
40. Jencks and Kropf, *Theories and Manifestoes*, 281.
41. Richard Coyne, *Derrida for Architects* (Oxon, England & New York: Routledge, 2011). Two English theorists from a later generation (Peg Rawes and Jane Rendell) are included.

