



ALEXANDRINE PRESS

Is there a Feminist Analysis of Architecture?

Author(s): JOS BOYS

Source: *Built Environment (1978-)*, Vol. 10, No. 1, Women and the Environment (1984), pp. 25-34

Published by: Alexandrine Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23286005>

Accessed: 16-05-2020 10:11 UTC

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.

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



JSTOR

Alexandrine Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Built Environment (1978-)*

Is there a Feminist Analysis of Architecture?

JOS BOYS

A feminist analysis of architecture should not only be interested in 'women's place' in society, but in gender relations, and the importance and variety of individual experience.

When I was an undergraduate student of architecture in the early 1970s there was never any question as to what constituted appropriate socialist work. Any radical architect worth his or her salt was involved in community action defending local interests against the State or Capital. For theory there was the political economy of construction and production processes. However, I soon found that this emphasis on radical *forms* of practice and on *economic* processes left, for me at least, an uncomfortable void, a noticeable silence. Like many women at that time I was increasingly finding a disjuncture between the theories of power, ideology and economics underpinning such activity and my everyday experiences of power relations between women and men. Whilst obviously vitally important, these theoretical positions did not even begin to frame the sort of questions I wanted to ask. Where was a critical analysis of the *content* of architecture, for instance, or its relationship to *social* processes? Could such a critical analysis inform radical forms of practice? Did buildings 'say' anything about women's position in society? Of course, nearly ten years on, this area of study is no longer as vacant as it appeared to me then [1], although it is still scattered across many places and disciplines. Some writers have shown the way in which the physical layout of a building can

form an object of study in understanding social processes – looking at the arrangements of boundaries, forms of categorization (what is 'kept together', what placed apart), the amount of space and other architectural investment in some categories rather than others and the perceived 'appropriateness' of space for particular activities and people. Others have shown how these physical boundaries can also reinforce a 'cognitive' boundary limiting aspirations about what is possible or desirable (Davidoff *et al.*, 1976) or define the framework of ideological debate (Williams, 1975).

Architecture, then, seems to make a physical representation of social relations in the way it organizes people in space [2]. It does this both symbolically – through imagery and 'appropriateness of place' for a particular activity – and in reality – through physical boundaries and the spatial relationships made between activities.

Although this approach to understanding architecture is becoming increasingly common and sophisticated (Girouard, 1980), there are still many problems. For instance: to what extent does architecture actually reflect social relations (that is, can literally be taken as a *map* of any society) when people obviously use any building in many different ways both at one time and throughout its history? What is the relation-

ship between architectural intention in making the building and the reality of its use? How is social 'meaning' in architecture transmitted and how interpreted? To what extent can buildings offer conflicting symbolic or spatial information [3]? And finally, to what extent is it possible to generalize about the relationship between architecture and society from the increasing number of specific critiques?

I have few answers to these questions except to look at the way in which a 'male-defined' world constructs and perpetuates one particular set of meanings in space through using some 'architectural' examples. I want to suggest that while buildings do not control our lives, architecture does work (albeit in a partial way) together with other aspects of social and economic relations to put people in their 'place' and to describe symbolically and spatially what that place is. As Dale Spender says, in describing language:

It appears to be part of the human condition to attempt to make existence meaningful but we can only make sense of the world if we have rules by which to do it. We need to know what information to select, how to piece it together, and what interpretation to impose on it, and the rules which each culture evolves for making sense of the world form the basis of these decisions. As we use these rules we confirm their validity, we make them 'come true'. Our results depend on the programme we begin with; as we pattern, select and interpret on the premise that males are superior – and of course, concomitantly, that females are inferior – we construct a view in which males continue to be seen as superior and females continue to be seen as inferior, thereby perpetuating the myth and reinforcing the justification for male power.

Each day we construct the world we live in according to these man made rules. We select, pattern and interpret the flux of events in an attempt to make life meaningful and few of us suspect how deeply entrenched and arbitrary these rules are (Spender, 1982, p. 2).

Architecture constructs this reality for women inasmuch as it contains ideas about the proper 'place' of women; about what is private and what public activity and for

whom; about which things should be kept separate and which put together; and about what are 'appropriate' behaviours for women in particular locations.

The history of architecture is a changing process where both decision-making about the built environment and the way in which people use it (or try to use it) become part of this attempt 'to make life meaningful' – often in a struggle between conflicting ideologies. To understand this history, then, we must have an understanding of ideology which accepts and includes the complexity of human social experience. As Cynthia Cockburn puts it;

Theories of ideology say little of the links that connect material circumstances with ideas, or connect the widespread philosophies that find expression in books, media, political parties and movements, with the individual making up her or his mind. On the whole the theories stay at the upper level. Yet it is the individual who experiences the dilemma and who also, in the end, takes action and makes change.

While the limits of ideological change are set by material conditions, I believe the mechanism that prompts a break, a redirection in either a person's practices or ideas, is the mechanism of *contradiction*. . . . If sociology has found it difficult to take account of contradiction, in real life people are only too painfully aware of it. People are uncomfortable when their ideas are in contradiction with their practices, or when they harbour conflicting feelings. As the tension increases so they seek to put matters right – they change what they are doing, move their position or abandon one set of ideas in favour of another. They are strictly limited in what they are likely to be able to feel or do by their class position, their sex, and perhaps also by their age, race, life experience and many other factors. But these material circumstances can never be totally determinant because they suggest conflicting meanings (Cockburn, 1983, pp. 10–11).

This acceptance of contradictions, ambiguities and complexity should work in three ways in any feminist analysis of architecture. First, research should develop from an appreciation of the wide variation in women's socialized experience, rather than from glib attempts to pin down one particular version of 'what women want'.

Secondly, it should accept the subtlety and complexity of women's oppression in this society by investigating the ways in which individual women and men attempt to make social relations make sense. Thirdly, it should mean looking at architecture not merely as something imposed from above but as a built version of a particular set of political, social and economic priorities where the resultant effects on women's position may be secondary or even unintended consequences of other decisions.

I suggest architecture is both *more* restrictive than, say, language, in the way in which it constructs a pattern for reality since its theory and practice are controlled and implemented by a minority of the population [4] and *less* restrictive because it only embodies meaning in a partial way, is less deeply bedded into our reality and can be lived in with considerable variation. This partial quality is precisely because the built environment is the *conscious* making and remaking of social relations as perceived by the architect, planner, politician or social reformer, yet also based on a separate 'professional' (and thus theoretically apolitical) body of knowledge which can consciously and subconsciously highlight, obscure or ignore the underlying spatial and symbolic patterning of capitalist and patriarchal relations by focusing on 'architectural' issues such as aesthetics or function.

For example, there seems a considerable difference between the design theory of the nineteenth century which focused on 'appropriate' spatial divisions for particular social relations [5] and architectural ideas of the twentieth century which have been more concerned with, say, ergonomics. Architect-writers such as Robert Kerr (1867) set spatial standards of privacy and segregation within the home for the middle-classes in a way that directly paralleled social change in Victorian life generally, from the family wage campaign among trade unionists to the growth of the Evangelical movement (Hall, 1979). Thus middle-class

women were very firmly 'placed' in the home by many social forces which reinforced one another. But take another period, for instance, post-1945, when the renewed shift to 'place' women at home was paralleled by an opposing trend, the tremendous expansion of women (particularly married women) into the paid workforce. This resulted in a much more ambiguous position for women. During this period architecture seems to have been used to 'resolve' these ambiguities by adapting and altering the built environment. Much of the recent history of housing, for instance, can be viewed as an architectural and political response to the contradictions between the maintenance of a protected and private home environment and the need for a large population of labour close to sites of production; or between the symbolic importance of home and the isolation for women it so often seems to generate; or between the changing nature of women's work at home and outside it.

Susan Saegert (1980), for example, looks at the way in which the symbolic dichotomies between suburban-urban and public-private are difficult for women because such ideas leave a painful gap between symbolic and lived experience, because in giving rise to particular organizations of space and time they limit real choice, reinforce a particular pattern of living and therefore can perpetuate inequalities between women and men.

Adrian Forty (1977) in his article on the history of domestic appliances shows how their design emphasized the *appearance* of labour-saving without necessarily reducing the overall amount of time spent on housework. Thus the contradiction between increasing women's work outside the home and her continuing role within it was 'resolved' by attempting to make housework appear as 'no-work'. In my work, I have looked at the contemporary architectural response to some of these contradictions in the design of public space. I argue that most architects' attempts to deal with

the contradictions of women's place actually obscure, misunderstand or ignore the realities of women's position in the family and at work, the economic inequalities between classes and between women and men and (in my example) the dominance of men in public life and public space (Boys, 1984, forthcoming).

Yet in what way is this specifically a *feminist* analysis of architecture? So far I have only mentioned the place of the profession in controlling the form of the built environment and in creating what is generally agreed to be the 'alienating', complex and contradictory physical world of the twentieth century. At first glance, this would seem to affect women and men equally. However, I have no intention of letting men off the hook. Firstly, they overwhelmingly control decision-making about our surroundings, simply because they have power and money (Darke, 1984). Secondly, women still suffer a considerable lack of access to resources in relation to men, partly because of their 'place' in production and partly because of their position within the family. Thirdly, men are socially conditioned to base their decision-making about the environment and their behaviour within it on male experience-as-norm so that even when women are present in the decision-making process 'we lumber around ungainly-like in borrowed concepts which do not fit the shape we feel ourselves to be'. As Sheila Rowbotham goes on;

Every time a woman describes to a man any experience which is specific to her as a woman she confronts his recognition of his own experience as normal. More than this, his experience of how he sees the 'norm' is reinforced by the dominant ideology which tells both him and the woman that he is right (Rowbotham, 1973, p. 35).

Thus, however partially, it is *men* who attempt to 'make life meaningful' in making the built environment, and do so on the implicit assumption that their views are unproblematically normal, accurate and obvious. Of course many men, particularly

immigrant and migrant labour, perform a similar role to working-class women in existing patterns of production and therefore also lack the access to facilities and goods that money brings. But women not only suffer from this inequality in access to resources, they also suffer a difference in *kind* in experiencing the built environment – a difference which is reinforced by men maintaining *their* position in society. Ultimately men benefit from current definitions of masculinity and femininity and their ability to perpetuate these definitions over women. Men enjoy a higher status, a higher standard of living and personal service at the expense of women [6].

I believe that what characterizes a feminist analysis of architecture is not only that it is specifically interested in 'women's place' in our society but that it emphasizes gender relations, ideologies, and the importance and variety of individual experience as much as economics. Ann Markusen (1980), for example, has shown how the dominance of the single-family detached dwelling in America, its separation from the workplace and its decentralized urban location are as much products of the patriarchal organization of household production as of the capitalist organization of waged labour. Others have made feminist critiques of both right wing and Marxist theories of architecture and town planning for their focus on manufacturing production and wage labour as causal factors in the development of towns and cities at the expense of an understanding of the relationship between changing social processes and urban growth (McDowell, 1982).

This form of analysis can then begin to deal with three levels at once. First the way in which the physical arrangement of the built environment can reinforce women's differential access to resources; secondly, the way in which the built environment simultaneously legitimizes and naturalizes that inequality; and thirdly, the way in which designers of the built environment

consistently construct their own socialized experience as 'the norm'.[7] This must be done without reducing the complexities and contradictions of the process of creating a built environment – the potential mismatch between what the intention is and how the artefact works, a possible confusion between 'physical and symbolic' arrangements of space, and a possible lack of congruence between actual social processes and their 'architectural' description.

The aim of a feminist analysis of architecture is then to unlock the male-dominated, male-as-norm patterning of the built environment; by showing how the physical fabric contains one particular set of ideas of social relations at the expense of others, by showing the mechanisms by which it perpetuates itself in this pattern by making it appear obvious and unproblematic, and by firmly revealing the problems for women, both in the discrepancies and contradictions of this male-defined world and in women's everyday experience in it.

Feminist writers have begun to show how the gender division of labour has a clear physical dimension:

Most housing isolates each individual family unit whilst ensuring the minimum privacy for its members and thus maximizes the domestic work of individual women. Land use plans continue to segregate residential development to particular areas of the city, increasing the isolation of women who do not participate in the urban labour market and presenting problems for women who combine domestic and waged labour . . .

These two types of labour characteristically take place in different parts of the city. Production based on waged labour in the marketplace is undertaken collectively in specialised locations, predominantly by men but also by women, whereas the household reproduction of this labour power, based on the unpaid labour of individual women, is undertaken in isolation in countless decentralized locations. This division not only influences the social relation between men and women but is embodied in the structure of the urban system and is given concrete expression in the built form of cities (McDowell, 1982, pp. 142–3).

The first step is taken – the built environment can now be seen to physically model society in a way which deals with women and men *differently*. [8] In what way, then, does the physical world perpetuate and legitimize these differences, and in what ways is it problematic for women? I suggest that the design of the built environment has maintained a consistent 'distancing' of women from sites of production (and for that matter from other facilities). This has combined with the general lack of access to resources suffered by women because of their social 'place' in relation to the labour market and the family, to exaggerate women's isolated position in the social structure. In a society which has been built around individual physical mobility, women are less mobile than men because they have less money, less access to transport facilities and more responsibility for other less mobile persons such as children and old people. Women's lack of relationship to the sites of production (their amount and range of choice of paid employment) is thus intensified, both by this relative immobility and by the physical distancing of home and work generated by the decentralization of dwellings. Different housing forms seem to work in a similar way to this physical distancing between home and workplaces, whether in the lifts, stairs and lobbies of high rise flats or the culs-de-sac and winding roads of suburban layouts. Physical space thus exaggerates the potentially isolating quality of taking sole responsibility for childcare and/or domestic labour in a privatized way. The spatial arrangement of high rise flats or new towns did not *create* the condition we now call high-rise or new-town blues, but in increasing the difficulties of getting out of the house with small children or transporting heavy shopping by steps and corners and endless ramps and paths, these layouts are much more likely to make childcare a pressure than a pleasure.

The story does not stop here however.

There are many other threads and directions to follow. Since the Second World War, for instance, with the rapid increase in married women entering paid employment, the ambiguities in this physical patterning have in turn had an impact on the location of production. As Friend and Metcalf show:

In 1951 the Greater London activity rate (in paid employment) for married women was 39.8% at a time when it was 17.3% for Great Britain outside the major conurbations. By 1971 the decentralization of manufacturing employment and the expansion of the service sector in the rest of the country had narrowed the gap; the London rate had crept up to 48% but the rate for the rest of Britain outside the big cities had leapt to 40%. And there is strong evidence from the intervening period that it was shortages of women workers that motivated relocations triggered by labour shortages – the Department of Industry inquiry into locational attitudes during the 1964–7 period, for example, revealed that one firm in nine considered that a shortage of female labour was the ‘outstanding’ reason for moving; shortages of male labour were rarely cited despite the fact that 40% of respondent firms cited labour shortages as a ‘major reason’ for investing in new areas (Friend and Metcalf, 1981, p. 96.)

However, even when sites of production had to, perforce, move closer to their female labour supply, the ‘localizing’ effect on women of both their lack of access to resources and their major responsibility for household labour and childcare still *maintained* and often *justified* their unequal position in relation to paid employment. To quote from a Location of Offices Bureau (LOB) report of 1977

Even though unemployment figures for office workers, at least in the South East, will reveal very few unemployed office workers, once an office moves to a town it finds a very large hidden supply of potential labour, consisting largely of married women. These are often anxious to work but need to work near home because of family commitments. Most firms found their advertisements for vacancies vastly oversubscribed and therefore were able to choose the most suitable applicants. These married women were grateful for the opportunity to work locally and thus became loyal and hard-

working employees; the older the employee the more reliable and responsible he (*sic*) is likely to be (Location of Offices Bureau (1977) quoted in Friend and Metcalf, 1981, p. 108).

Thus the ‘localizing’ effect of the physical environment combined with other economic and social pressures builds a *problem* for women, and ‘weights’ one particular solution. By reducing access to paid work of individual women, by ‘hiding’ the potential labour supply so that women appear not to want to work and by allowing only limited and low-paid employment opportunities, the built environment maps certain priorities and works against others. It is not surprising then that many women do ‘opt’ to stay at home and thereby reinforce a particular pattern of social relations – make it appear fact. Given the quality and poverty of alternatives, at least women’s control over their own working conditions may be greater in the household workplace than in a factory or service establishment (Markusen, 1980).

However, the physical distancing between home and work has not developed merely in relation to the processes of capital. Any analysis should also look to male-defined ideas about what constitutes an ‘appropriate’ environment for the home, for work – and the ‘appropriate’ behaviour of women in these two localities – particularly in relation to female sexuality. As Cynthia Cockburn says:

Men appear to have a strong need to visualize and to make meanings of women in two incompatible ways. First they need to see women as pure and unsullied beings. Women should be clean . . . A real woman is ‘someone who looks like a woman, who smells nice, you know, that kind of sexual aura, makes you feel protective towards them,’ as one [male worker] put it . . . On the other hand, however, men want women’s sexuality as free currency. They want women to be like the communal bicycles in the Amsterdam of the libertarian revolt of the late sixties; there to be picked up, ridden and laid aside by anyone at any time. This is the meaning ascribed to women in . . . workplace culture . . . The men’s relationship to each other is mediated

through the coinage of women in which women are handled and bismirched routinely. There is a cultural rape in progress much of the time. The pleasure in this process though (and it is of course only partly pleasurable, being partly a fear of women) comes precisely from the contrast between the pure and the sullied. This becomes an unresolvable contradiction for men if women share the same workplace in unsegregated occupations on equal terms, in the same room. Exposure to their own male-male discourse would damage women in men's eyes and then they would not be nice to know in any real social sense . . . *To hold in tension both of the two meanings ascribed to women depends on the separation of the spheres of home and work.* (Cockburn, 1983, pp. 185–6, emphasis added).

Thus, in this male-defined view of the world women's sexuality can be redefined by *the place in which she finds herself*. One woman in a male-dominated workplace can become 'one of the lads', an honorary man, be labelled asexual or lesbian, or maybe 'demasculate' the men and/or the work. She cannot just be a woman at work. The arrogance in this phallogocentric view is obvious. But even now men often assume that women 'want to be more like men' in their demands for equal opportunities – not understanding that women can be both equal and different.

However, both changing social processes and the challenge of feminism mean that men are finding it less and less easy to maintain this contradiction by spatial division and will therefore have to adapt and change their ideologies. Simultaneously women are well aware of the contradictory position in which they are 'placed' by such ideas. Many ambiguities appear, for instance, in the physical space between home and work, where attempts by men to maintain these two incompatible meanings (pure and sullied) are made difficult by the lack of the clear spatial and class divisions of the nineteenth century. Women learn that they must *appear sexually attractive* to men outside the home (a system supported by men's casual comments to unaccompanied women) but that they must not *attract men*

sexually since they will then be held responsible if men attack them.

Not surprisingly, a rejection of this impossible combination has been one of the major themes of contemporary feminism (with groups such as Women against Violence against Women and Reclaim the Night). In architecture, safety outside the home has also been a major concern of designers and planners, with housing layouts based on particular ideologies about community and about 'defensible space'[9] although women's fears are hardly ever mentioned. I have shown elsewhere (Boys, 1984) how contemporary Design Guides seem to build, almost physically, the ambiguities of our ideas into public space – so that public space is seen as both the site of community and social activity and the site of dangerous uncontrollable events. These designs in many cases may exacerbate women's perceptions of possible danger and heighten their sense of isolation. Such designs avoid acknowledging differential access to resources and differences of space usage across gender and class, and the mechanisms by which these patterns are maintained and justified. This is precisely why we urgently need a feminist analysis of architecture which can be critical of the contemporary content of the built environment.

Most feminist work has a double aim – to expose the ways in which the world is male-defined, and to show the ways in which women do *not* define it. The analysis that I have described so far focuses on the first – by looking at the patterns revealed in the built environment and the extent to which these are 'man-made'. Many women have emphasized the second aim and are therefore more interested in exploring the ways in which women's social experience is a notable *absence* from the built environment – and the mechanics by which this absence is perpetuated. Thus, for instance, in looking at the plans of houses, one might see the way in which changing attitudes to mother-

hood during the 1950s as described by Ehrenreich and English (1979) made very little impression on house design, but had many ramifications on how women were *expected* to use their homes.

In order to begin filling those gaps designers must start to listen to women's social experience and work with women on alternatives. When women from the feminist design and research network, Matrix, talk at meetings they are often asked what a feminist architecture might be. The speaker (usually male) seems to want an instant recipe – a way to 'adjust their social attitudes as they would do their ties'[10] on the assumption that that is enough. I believe that there are feminist ways of looking at and making architecture, but these are based on a certain approach, not a 'recipe'. This approach stems initially from an understanding that our surroundings are not neutral, that there is a relationship between the *content* of architecture and our capitalist and sexist social structure. In most cases such work develops from direct personal concerns – from a sense of dissatisfaction with current architectural and town planning practice both in its processes and in its products, maybe just with a sense of 'out-of-placeness', of dislocation from the world as it is.

Such work is then aimed at revealing both the contradictions of this male-defined world and in describing female social experience which has been previously 'hidden from history'. This can be done through a critical assessment of architectural and social history and by enabling as many women as possible to make new, female-conditioned definitions, to describe contemporary ambiguities of women's 'place' in this society and to look to possibilities for the future. Critical feminist architectural practice is therefore about providing physical examples which show the attempts of individuals and groups of women to make more 'appropriate' environments for women – socially, spatially and symbolically.

Simultaneously critical feminist architectural theory might begin to undermine the male-dominated model of socio-spatial relations by showing in all its complexity the way in which women's experience of the built environment differs from men's, the mechanisms by which it continues to do so, and the advantages and disadvantages for women of different social, spatial and symbolic patterns. Such an analysis, by highlighting the oppressions, ambiguities and contradictions in the built environment and by revealing the ways in which architecture and architects so often attempt to 'naturalize' women's inequality in this society can then begin to inform (and perhaps change) the decisions about the built environment made by individuals and groups at all levels. As Cynthia Cockburn said: 'nothing stands still for long; new decisions are always required'. Fortunately feminists may be increasingly able to influence those decisions and make a real effect on the shape of the built environment to come.

NOTES

1. There are now too many people working in this field to make a comprehensive list. However some books on the subject showing the range of material include: *Women and Space* edited by Shirley Ardener, Croom Helm, 1981. *The Grand Domestic Revolution; A history of feminist designs for American Homes, Neighbourhoods and Cities* by Dolores Hayden, MIT Press, 1981. *Buildings and Society* edited by Tony King, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981. *Homes Fit for Heroes; The Politics and Architecture of Early State Housing in Britain* by Mark Swenarton, Heinemann, 1981. *Women in American Architecture; A Contemporary Perspective* by Susan Torre, Whitney, 1977.

2. As Hillier and Hanson (forthcoming) put it: 'The ordering of space in buildings is really about the ordering of relations between people. Because this is so, society enters into the very nature and form of buildings. Buildings are social objects in a way quite incomparable to other artefacts, in that society is involved at the deepest level in determining their forms as objects. Architecture is not a 'social art' simply because buildings are important visual symbols

IS THERE A FEMINIST ANALYSIS OF ARCHITECTURE?

of society, but also because through the way in which buildings, individually and collectively, create and order space, we are able to *recognize* society: that it exists, and has a certain form.'

3. For example, when I was working towards a master's thesis entitled 'The Construction of Communism – Architecture and Society in Soviet Russia 1917–1979' it became increasingly clear that the symbolic intentions of the Constructivists, for instance, had very little connection with the underlying political programme – to build socialism through nothing less than the wholesale spatial and social reorganization of the population. What is more, neither architectural or political policies dealt with what might be thought of as one of the major 'socio-spatial' problems for women – that they were symbolically placed in two physically separated zones *simultaneously*: as a worker participating equally in the political and social life of the workplace club (key symbolic buildings in the early days of the revolution) and at home as mothers and housewives. That this has proved literally physically impossible for women has had many effects, together with other social and economic forces, both in the 'relocation' of these clubs in the 1960s and in the changing attitudes of the Soviet regime to women.

4. I have not discussed the role of the profession here. Personally, I tend to agree with Foucault (1979) when he described the ambiguous 'apolitical' role of professional workers in perpetuating the *status quo*: 'It would be a dangerous error to discount [the professional worker] politically in specific relation to a local power, on a pretext that this is an affair of specialists and doesn't concern the masses (which is doubly wrong, they are already aware of it and in any case they are implicated in it), or that s/he serves, the interests of Capital or State (which is true but also reveals the strategic position s/he occupies) or again that s/he propagates a scientific ideology (which isn't always true).'

5. See, for instance, Evans (1982) which not only describes how prison reformers were explicit in their intentions to use architecture both to spatially divide and to morally reform people but also how they got it wrong.

6. Of course men also *lose* in current definitions of female and male sexuality particularly in their 'absentee' role with children and restrictions around emotional behaviour – and can therefore learn and gain from the socialized experience of women.

7. Women from Matrix are often asked if women design differently to men. I personally feel that architectural education, like much professional education, attempts to iron out the contradictions between women's socialized experience and the physical forms they are asked to design – and that it is very often successful. What is more, design by women is often caricatured; females are meant to design round, curving buildings and men phallic towers. Women *have* opted for curving buildings and open spaces – but not because they 'naturally' prefer them. For some women curving spaces can be an expression against the rigidity of modern form as well as a symbol of 'femaleness'. It is a *social* choice and comment not a biological one.

8. For example, Gardiner, Himmelweit and Mackintosh (1976, pp. 205–6) point out that for the male worker 'production and consumption are two separate activities emotionally and physically. The former is seen as a rigidly timed necessity and goes on in the workplace; the latter is leisure, supposedly enjoyable, going on in or around the home. So for the wage earner the house is the place where he consumes but does not work and where his time is his own. For the housewife it is her place of work but she does not go elsewhere for leisure. So in her life there is no rigid work/leisure distinction either in physical location or time.'

9. Newman's book, *Defensible Space* (1973), has had considerable effect on theories about the design of building layouts. It is based on theories of 'territorial' behaviour and proposed that certain patterns of space will prevent or reduce crime and attack. Like earlier theories of community or 'village life' it legitimates the right of male control over space (territory) at the same time as it appears to be dealing with it. This book and its results urgently need a feminist critique.

10. The full quote from Peter Martin (1979) goes as follows: "Why can't a woman be more like a man?" whimpered the appalling Higgins. The modern equivalent is the stock response to self-determining women; that they only wish to be more like men. Both reactions arise out of a core male conceit, that the only condition really worth aspiring to is maleness. Witness 15 years of vigorous modern feminism and the fact that we men have had virtually nothing to say about ourselves. The very thought that we might stand in need of some serious improvement or, worse, that we might be in some deep adjacent trouble . . . perishes. We adjust our social attitudes as we would our ties and imagine that's enough.'

WOMEN AND THE ENVIRONMENT

REFERENCES

- Boys, J. (1984) Making out: the 'place of women outside the home, in Matrix Book Group (eds.) *Making Space: Women in the Man-Made Environment*. London: Pluto Press forthcoming.
- Cockburn, C. (1983) *Brothers: Male Dominance and Technological Change*. London: Pluto Press.
- Darke, J. (1984) Women, architects and feminism, in Matrix Book Group (eds.) *Making Space: Women in the Man-Made Environment*. London: Pluto Press forthcoming.
- Davidoff, L., L'Esperance, J. and Newby, H. (1976) Landscape with figures: home and community in English society, in Mitchell, J. and Oakley, A. (eds.) *The Rights and Wrongs of Women*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Ehrenreich, B. and English, D. (1979) *For Her Own Good: 150 Years of the Experts' Advice to Women*. London: Pluto Press.
- Evans, R. (1982) *The Fabrication of Virtue: English Prison Architecture, 1750-1840*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Forty, A. (1977) Housewife's aesthetic. *Architectural Review*, no. 969, November.
- Foucault, M. (1979) *Power, Truth, Strategy*. Sydney: Feral Publications.
- Friend, A. and Metcalf, A. (1981) *Slump City: the Politics of Mass Unemployment*. London: Pluto Press.
- Gardiner, J., Himmelweit, S. and Mackintosh, M. (1976) Women's domestic labour, quoted in Malos, E. (ed.) (1980).
- Girouard, M. (1980) *The English Country House*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Hall, C. (1979) The early formation of Victorian domestic ideology, in Burman, S. (ed.) *Fit Work for Women*. London: Croom Helm.
- Hillier, B. and Hanson, J. (forthcoming) *The Social Logic of Space*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kerr, R. (1865) *The Gentleman's House. How to Plan English Residences from the Parsonage to the Palace*. London: John Murray.
- Location of Offices Bureau (1977) *Case Studies of Decentralised Firms*. London: LOB.
- Malos, E. (ed.) (1980) *The Politics of Housework*. London: Allison and Busby.
- Markusen, A. (1980) City spatial structure, women's household work and national urban policy signs. *Signs* (Special issue on Women and the American City), 5(3).
- Martin, P. (1979) No deviation from the norm. *The Observer*, 11 November.
- McDowell, L. (1982) City and home: urban housing and the sexual division of space, in Evans, M. and Ungerson, C. (eds.) *Sexual Divisions: Patterns and Processes*. London: Tavistock.
- Newman, O. (1973) *Defensible Space*. London: Architectural Press.
- Rowbotham, S. (1973) *Woman's Consciousness, Man's World*. Harmondsworth: Pelican.
- Saegert, S. (1980) Masculine cities and feminine suburbs: polarized ideas, contradictory realities *Signs* (Special issue on Women and the American City), 5 (3).
- Spender, D. (1980) *Man-Made Language*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Williams, R. (1975) *The Country and the City*. London: Paladin.