Introduction

New Figurations in Architecture Theory: From Queer Performance to Becoming Trans

Robert Alexander Gorny and Dirk van den Heuvel, editors

This issue of *Footprint* aims to introduce the latest developments in the field of queer theory into the realm of architecture and urban design – and *vice versa*, to make architectural and urban design concerns an element of queer studies. Even though there may be a renewed interest, we find fairly little literature available specific to architecture. Most research into queer theory happens in the fields of cultural studies, literature and the arts and social geography, whereas a cross-disciplinary connection between architecture, urban design and queer theory seems only logical from the point of view that architecture and urban design are instrumental in the formation of social and political identities. Additionally, queer theory offers the possibility of opening up the disciplinary straightjacket of architecture. It engenders a radical reconceptualisation of the architectural discipline and its institutions. Queer theory unsettles any conception of architecture as an embodiment of essentialist categories, be it identities, forms and types, just as it disturbs the mythologies of authorship and autonomy. Instead, an understanding of architecture emerges as a field engaged in consistent transformation. Such a reconceptualisation of architecture foregrounds liminal situations, metamorphosis and transgression; it views difference not in terms of otherness, but rather in terms of relational processes and becoming. At this point, a queer perspective on architecture runs parallel with other attempts at redefining the discipline to see architecture as situational, dependent and embedded.[1] Admittedly, this conceptual shift toward situatedness has its own history dating back to the post-war decades and the debates of CIAM and Team 10, in which architecture and planning were already reconfigured in terms of 'habitat' as relational and ecological practices, yet these debates still remained within a modernist discourse and the redistributive politics of a paternalistic welfare state and concomitant family planning.

Tensions between an essentialist understanding of architecture and architecture as a process of becoming can also be observed in earlier attempts at connecting queer theory and architecture. In *Queer Space* (1997) Aaron Betsky proposed familiar gay tropes such as the closet and the interior, and hedonistic urban lifestyles as the ultimate spaces of queer identities.[2] Betsky's propositions coincided with the parallel feminist discourse of the 1990s, which focused on the sexual, libidinal dimensions of architectural production.[3] At the same time it also retained a quite problematic notion of 'otherness' – as criticised by Mary McLeod – in the way it portrayed the heterotopias of male queer space as yet another essentialist kind of space.[4] The anthology *Stud* (1996) edited by Joel Sanders had already suggested a more complicated relationship between space and gay male identities by clarifying that there is no 'queer space', only space 'put to queer use'.[5] The suggestion of 'putting to queer use' is still susceptible to essentialist notions of an autonomous architecture, by relying on a container

conception of space, rather than an interrelational reciprocity between embedded configurations of bodies and matter, or space as a dependency relation. Yet, 'putting to queer use' already anticipated the currently, widely used notion of 'queering', a capacity or agency of performance and acting out with the aim to pervert and undermine power constructs to unleash suppressed and marginalised desires.

Looking at the brief history of queer theory in architecture one can observe more of such conceptual shifts. Arguably, the critic Charles Jencks was the first to acknowledge a 'gay' presence in architecture when trying to define the parameters of postmodernism in the 1970s.[6] Speaking of among others the 'Gay Eclectic' he identified the uses of irony, parody and travesty. Semantic double coding was part and parcel of his project of abandoning the reductive and universalist claims of modern architecture and the International Style, while a number of gay architects figured prominently in Jencks's rewriting of architectural history, most notably Philip Johnson, Charles Moore and Robert Stern – clearly another example of male privilege, it must be pointed out. Yet unfortunately, Jencks did not elaborate this early proposition of a queer approach in architecture, from the Gay Eclecticists he quickly jumped to Straight Revivalism.[7] In hindsight, one might assess Jencks's aestheticist approach in various ways. One could see it as an act of cultural appropriation of the idea of difference exactly at the moment of the neoliberal shift toward the economisation of the production of difference. But at the same time, an essentialist connection between being a gay architect and a possibly gay architecture is (thankfully) uncoupled, because Jencks also shows one need not be a gay architect to promote a queering approach of irony and double coding to architecture. Robert Venturi and his ground-breaking book *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture* (1966) can serve as the case in point here.

With such earlier conceptual shifts in the development of the project for queering architecture in mind it is not surprising to find that also today various contesting propositions regarding the definition of queer and queering are competing with each other within the very field of queer studies. Especially so, since gay, lesbian and transgender identities have entered mainstream culture in western societies while at the same time the male 'gay' identity has expanded into a range of different identities, often intersecting with one another, as exemplified by the acronym of first LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender), which in the debate on maximum inclusiveness is often expanded even further to LGBTQ, LGBTQI, and other variations, with the Q standing for Queer and the I for Intersexual. Generally speaking, these propositions range from the mapping of queer identities – sometimes paradoxically as a taxonomy of 'different' essentialisms – to the idea of queering as performative acts of activist subversion and subjectivation. Regarding performativity and the construction of gender identity, Judith Butler's ground-breaking works *Gender Trouble* (1990) and *Bodies That Matter* (1993) define the whole field of queer studies. Recent debates focus on issues of intersectionality, how various power systems and emancipation struggles for equality collide with one another within the queer discourse. Hence, questions that emerge now concern among others to what extent a white, western oriented privilege has dominated the queer discourse, how a gay male perspective obscures other experiences, how class is always an important factor at play yet often overlooked, and so on. The most radical propositions of queering seek to undermine any binary, mutually exclusive opposition as in the case of heterosexist normativity and any other hegemonic discourse based on such classic structuralist 'twin phenomena' as male-female, inside-outside, centre-periphery et cetera. In this negative function as an anti-label, a 'putting to queer use' consists not only in the political exercise to uncover hitherto hidden or repressed histories and

practices as part of an agenda of inclusiveness. It also entails a specific ethical agenda, in which acts of queering resist the establishment of stable identities, while they promote transitory assemblages that are embedded within an unfolding process of so-called 'differencing', an openness that allows the emergence of difference. Other terms that are used are processes of embodying, becoming real, actualisation and individuation of virtual potentialities.

The problematic relationship between language, naming and classifying is part and parcel of the queer experience. Language as such is considered part of the systemic oppression and marginalisation of queer identities by a dominant heteronormative culture, hence the ongoing search for new terms and a new language. Naming and renaming the range of possible identities help to arrive at the proper political representation of diversity, yet each distinct identification is also a setting apart. Historically, one finds this antagonistic relationship with language with such famous precursors as Oscar Wilde and Radclyffe Hall who are by now canonised in the historiography of queer art. With queer culture entering the mainstream as part of the process of decriminilisation and even normalisation, its historiography is now in the process of being established, especially so the last couple of years in those countries where LGBTQ citizens have obtained almost fully equal rights. The United Kingdom for instance started the online heritage project 'Pride of Place' mapping the sites of queer history and identity, which is crowd sourced and curated by the public body of Historic England. Tate Britain organised the landmark exhibition 'Queer British Art 1861–1967' this year to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Sexual Offences Act of 1967 that brought a first step in the decriminilisation of gay sexuality and love.[8]

However, despite almost fully achieved judicial emancipation in Western countries today, Wilde's reference at his trial to 'the love that dare not speak its name' still holds up as a model for many queer theorists and writers who seek the salvation of the socio-historical specificity of the queer experience. In his novels Alan Hollinghurst has developed a writing style that both highlights and avoids his queer subject matter. Scholars such as Katarina Bonnevier and Jasmine Rault have focused on the work of the designer and architect Eileen Gray to demonstrate the ways she developed an architecture of postponement and privacy, in which Gray and her peers could shape their own lifestyle. Describing the Parisian circles of Gray Rault even speaks of a specific Sapphic kind of modernity.[9] Building on Eve Sedgwick's foundational analysis of the closet, the architect and curator Henry Urbach produced another elegant proposition, of the antecloset – the space in front of the actual closet as a liminal space where one decides what to wear and how to appear in public.[10]

Next to these approaches that use the queer experience itself as a method to carefully reconsider the becoming of the historical individual subjectivities at stake, there is a strong movement within queer studies that aims to universalise the queer experience as part of the ongoing political-cultural struggle to overthrow hegemonic models of heteronormativity, especially the aforementioned aspect of essentialist, binary thinking. The queer experience is used to arrive at the identification of a general condition that goes beyond the sheer production or emergence of differences. Here, a first concern is to deconstruct the 'logics' in which these differences are produced and conceptualised, the concomitant disciplinary power structures and the epistemological frameworks that sustain these logics. For these writers, Gilles Deleuze's work is of particular importance in that it offers concepts that escape the postmodernist semantic game of differences, while the notions of transformation, becoming and interrelation support new ways of 'doing' architecture, to practise it and to think it.

The work of feminist and queer philosopher Rosi Braidotti, who builds her argument on Deleuze's writings, is often used as a key reference here. Her concept of figurations unpacks the various practices and discourses to demonstrate that they are by definition situated, and take form in specific constructs. Such figurations are materially 'embodied and embedded, relational and affective' as Braidotti puts it.[11] To make difference 'operative at last', she challenges so-called male-stream thinking and its 'legacy of dualistic thinking and oppositional otherness'.[12] Any conception of difference as 'oppositional otherness' systemically reduces difference to 'being different from', which is too often equal to 'being less than'.[13] In this sense, her work champions situatedness as the potent antidote to the postmodern relativist notion of difference, through which the production of differences has moreover become the main mode of production of advanced capitalism.[14]

At this point of embodiedness, it is important to note the way in which the whole debate has only recently moved on from queering to what is called transing, the process that brings together the social construction of gender identity and body transformation. Here, authors like Paul Preciado and Lucas Crawford can be called true trailblazers in architecture theory as they started investigating the potential of transing the conceptions of architecture, thus further pushing the de-essentialisation of the architectural discipline as initiated by queer studies.[15] While queering problematised essentialist conceptions of relationships, in particular heteronormative ones, transing radically problematises any essentialist conception of bodies, that is the so-called cis-gender and cis-normative understanding of bodies as opposed to the occurrence of trans-gender bodies. Thereby, transing questions all sorts of assumptions when it comes to identity construction of which architecture and planning are two important fields.

Starting from the apparent contrast between architecture and transgender Crawford's book *Transgender Architectonics* critiques the illusion of stability that the conception of architecture relies on: 'Architecture stands firm; transgender is at heart an ethos of change… Architecture excludes and divides; transgender encompasses, includes and bends boundaries and binaries.'[16] Subsequently, Crawford suggests to rethink architectural formations as the 'shape of change'. Transing emphasises not simply 'a move from one gender or materiality to another [… but] the very ubiquity of constant transformation.'[17] In this ethos, architecture and bodies, and architecture as a body should not be conceptualised as mere neutral, accommodating containers. Instead Crawford critically takes aim at the former focus of queer and transgender theory on 'space', that neglects the physical and material dimension of architectural and human bodies.[18] By contrast, Crawford posits that 'we must ask: how do these important theories of queer space make their way into our experiences of our bodies *as* spatial matter — or do they? What kinds of architecture are our trans bodies?'[19]

While sociologists have realised that space is always produced (historically or socially), they neglected to connect this insight to the fact that bodies are so, too. In contrast to the focus on spatial practices at the basis of queer theory, trans theory proposes a radically embodied conception of architecture and the difference it can make. It is at this point that transing theory converges with the work of Braidotti and other queer feminist theorists.

Admittedly, the incorporation of transing as a conceptual tool or means to rethink architecture as a body encounters a few political-theoretical problems of quite a principal character. A first question concerns whether an architectural theory can actually do justice to the specific trans experience at this moment of the emancipatory struggle of transgender people. Unlike the queer experience,

the trans experience is not generally recognised, there is no trans historiography being written, nor are there big thematic cultural exhibitions in national museums that depict the struggle, the violence and the trauma. The political battle for equal rights is far from resolved, even with the recent coming-into-mainstream of transgender issues with such spectacular media moments as when the former Olympic champion Bruce Jenner appeared on the cover of *Vanity Fair* coming out as Caitlyn Jenner in 2015.[20] There are very awkward moments when feminist icons clash with transgender activists on the notions of womanhood and (alleged) transphobia.[21] Appropriation or domestication through metaphorisation in architecture might be the least concern in this debate.

Yet, the fierce act of self-displacement by transgender people calls our attention to the notion of trans bodies as embodied becomings. These do not simply present another spatial concept nor metaphor, but we believe it offers a new 'conceptual persona' (Deleuze), 'figuration', or 'navigational tool' (Braidotti). We consider the figuration of trans bodies as a much-needed and very welcome update to the discussions on queering spaces and the ongoing de-essentialisation of architecture, also in response to the recent rise of new materialist, matter-realist and materially embedded approaches in architecture and cultural theory. Perhaps architecture itself could be reconsidered as 'trans' in that it is a discipline of physical transformation *par excellence*. Because of its corporeal and physical dimensions architecture can be understood as one of the material interfaces and situatedness of becoming.

When we launched the call for this issue of *Footprint* in July 2016, this was initially in response to what we considered an oversimplistic, heteronormative approach to the ongoing gender debate in architecture. Especially striking were the rekindled debates around the unresolved controversy around the Pritzker prize for Robert Venturi in 1991, which failed to include his partner Denise Scott-Brown. The affair led to renewed debates criticising the continuing sexist biases in the architectural discipline. But most inept, this was done on the basis of profoundly, binary heterosexual terms pitting perceived feminine values versus their masculine counterparts.[22] Notions of queerness or transsexuality were completely absent in these discussions. Although today one might observe that the debate is becoming slightly more inclusive, it is at an annoyingly slow pace. A handful of conferences and seminars have been devoted to the subject of queering and transing architecture in the meantime, from Rotterdam to Melbourne to Princeton.[23] But this cannot conciliate the unhappy feelings regarding the overall stalemate state of architecture as an inclusive field of knowledge and practice. There is not much progress to be observed within architecture since the mid-1990s, when queer theory had its first proper moment with Sanders and Betsky's publications, and the Queer Space exhibition at the Storefront for Art and Architecture gallery in New York.[24] Once again, mainstream culture seems miles ahead of the architectural discourse, which ironically tends to think of itself as embracing progressive values.

Surprisingly enough, in the autumn of 2017, architectural discourse had its own queer moment with a couple of journals devoting their pages to queer issues.[25] *The Funambulist*, for example, has devoted a recent issue to queer and trans topics in architecture and urban planning, intersecting with non-western, feminist and migrant perspectives. *Log* magazine featured a (largely USA-focused) special section on *Working Queer*, guest-edited by Jaffer Kolb, who highlighted a shift in architecture away from the 1990s attempts at 'making queer things' (i.e. 'what?') to 'making things queerly' (i.e. 'how?').[26] Regarding this methodological shift, Betsky begins to question whether there is still a need for queer space.[27] We would like to queer this problem itself, by starting from the fact that queer

agency is luckily no longer constrained to heterotopic spaces of potential transformation. Concerned with radical inclusiveness, 'queering' and 'transing' have thus become lenses to more generally critique 'exclusive' conceptions of architecture, as well as mutually exclusive container concepts of spaces and bodies. What could architecture do, if we were to start from the de-essentialising and transformative potential of architecture?

Our own aspirations for this issue of *Footprint* were then guided by the intention to advance the queer and trans as a specific theoretical lens in order to not only address the narrowing perspective of a heteronormative gender agenda, but also to use it as the starting point for a radical reconceptualisation of the changing body of architecture and architecture theory. We believe that the various articles we received and collected during the production of this issue explore the potential of this reconceptualisation in most challenging ways. We propose to locate this potential at the intersection of the discursive and the body, between language and matter. Judith Butler famously understands the formation of gendered identities, their enactments and possible undoing as performative.[28] Performance is here located within the becoming of bodies, to understand bodies in their interrelatedness, and their interrelated being as becoming. Such interrelatedness ties in with the more ecosystemic approaches that are popular in contemporary architecture: no longer seen as given formations 'in' space or 'in' an environment, bodies are increasingly understood as historical constructs, transient figurations 'of' a material milieu, which itself is in permanent reconfiguration. Such trans-bodies are not just in a state of transition themselves; they also transform these milieus as they make a difference – a queering of spaces indeed.

To further interrogate this interrelated becoming of such trans-bodies our authors point to many other thinkers, such as Karen Barad and Jane Bennett to grasp the full implications of the embodiedness of identities and how they are performed.[29] Interestingly, many of these issues tie in with some recent reinterpretations of architectural form based on Baruch Spinoza's challenge to understand bodies in term of what they (can) do – instead of what they are.[30] In this regard, the notion of assemblage as introduced by Deleuze and Guattari, is crucial for understanding how the interrelatedness of bodies and architecture intersects with technologies, desire formations and power distributions; not in the operative sense of the term or through capitalist co-optation by reification, but on the contrary as a reverting, inverting or perverting of this very operativity to bring out other economic and spatial-material differentiations.

To prime the relational conception of trans-bodies and trans-architecture, Xenia Kokoula's article 'Opening up the Bodyspace' challenges the discipline to finally abandon outdated container conceptions of bodies by using the notion of 'body-space', or *Körperraum* as proposed by the German sociologist Martina Löw. Kokoula advances four interrelated theses of recent posthuman and feminist theory ('container', 'grotesque', 'stickiness', and 'alliances') that taken together offer a starting point for reconceptualising the dynamics of embodied becomings. A materialist ontology for architectural production is further explored in Athina Angelopoulou's article, which reconsiders the operativity of transversal cuts in architectural production. Angelopoulou develops a provocative material-discursive approach to architectural production, starting from the resistance and self-organizing capacities of matter. This approach is based on the notion of the 'cut' from quantum physicist turned queer theorist, Karan Barad, whose agential realist theory reconsiders the notion of performativity on an entirely material level. In foregrounding the material agency of Foucault's apparatus as material setups, the function of *dispositifs* is rethought as a 'cutting together apart': an onto-epistemological practice

of inquiring into the workings of material reality by acting upon it.

This resonates closely with Tim Gough's reflection on the possibility of a 'trans-architecture', and the way it could further de-essentialise the very ontology of architecture (what architecture is), to what it can do. His assemblage-theoretical approach highlights how trans-bodies radically differ from 'hybrid' conceptions, through which architecture remains stuck in a binary machine. By focusing on London gay club experiences Gough probes the constitutive intermixture of bodies and situations in temporary, immersive environments.

Such a 'shared deterritorialisation' is also described in Daniel Snyder's analysis of Louis Sullivan's love for male beauty in architecture as a 'becoming-object' in his encounter with the writings of Walt Whitman. Through a close reading of Sullivan's library and writings, Snyder demonstrates how binary oppositions of self and other, male and female, heterosexual and homosexual dissolve into more fluid, fused and eroticised identities, even pointing to consubstantiation as the ultimate form of becoming.

Various authors approached these arguments and stories as personal stories, quite like the depicted self-identification of Sullivan with his architecture, and more so than one conventionally finds in architecture theory. It concerns a specific setting oneself apart, as to reconnect; the production of a specific queer or transversal genealogy. The psychological effects of this process are captured in Andreas Angelidakis' description of the fragile construction of an architectural identity. New narrative and design methods are integral to his project. In 'Me as a Building', we find the queer proposition of an anti-oedipal architecture combined with the oneiric quality of *Hypnerotomacchia*-realness. Another way to deal with the conflicted nature of queer architecture manifests itself in Colin Ripley's contribution 'Strategies for Living in Houses'. For Betsky queer space was inherently domestic space. Given the degree to which domestic space is built in the image of highly gendered and heterosexist spaces, Ripley by contrast problematises the very possibility for queer inhabitants to appropriate, and thus queer these spatial units in their very arrangement. Territorial contestation re-emerges in Joel Sanders's contribution 'Stalled! Transforming Public Restrooms' in which he challenges the exclusionary nature of the gender-segregated restroom. It is no coincidence that this space has repeatedly come to the fore as the main site in which (and around which) transgender debates have arisen. Continuing his methodological observations,[31] Sanders shows how a trans-inclusive approach allows rethinking and redesigning the architecture of restrooms.

Our issue concludes with an interview with our colleagues from the KTH Stockholm: Katja Grillner, Hélène Frichot, Katarina Bonnevier and Brady Burroughs. At the KTH Stockholm they set up a innovative approach to teaching and researching from a queer-feminist perspective, which includes new educational practices and formats, among others in terms of performance, re-enactments and creative writing. They end this issue of *Footprint* not with a concluding summary, but instead with a set of open questions that centre on a simple, yet highly complex pedagogical problem: how can feminist, queer and trans perspectives help transition the male-dominated, hetero-normative, and cis-gendered body of architectural knowledge from an exclusive logic of 'oppositional otherness' to a radically, and generously inclusive activity?

Notes

1. See for instance, Nishat Awan, Tatjana Schneider and Jeremy Till, *Spatial Agency: Other Ways of Doing Architecture* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2011); see also Isabelle Doucet and Kenny Cupers eds, *Footprint* 4 'Agency in Architecture: Reframing Criticality in Theory

and Practice' (TU Delft, 2009).

2. Aaron Betsky, *Queer Space: Architecture and Same-Sex Desire* (New York: William Morrow & Company, 1997).
3. Betsky himself made a contribution to this discourse with his book *Building Sex: Men, Women, Architecture and the Construction of Sexuality* (New York: William Morrow, 1995).
4. Mary McLeod, 'Everyday and "Other" Spaces', in *Architecture and Feminism*, ed. Debra Coleman, Elizabeth Danze, and Carol Henderson (Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996), 1–37.
5. George Chauncey, 'Privacy Could Only Be Had in Public: Gay Uses of the Streets', in *Stud: Architecture of Masculinity,* ed. Joel Sanders (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996), 224.
6. Charles Jencks, *The Language of Post-modern Architecture*, (London: Academy Editions, 1978 [1977]).
7. Ibid, 93.
8. For Pride of Place visit: historicengland.org.uk; the catalogue of the exhibition Queer British Art 1861–1967 is edited by Clare Barlow, (London: Tate, 2017).
9. Jasmine Rault, *Eileen Gray and the Design of Sapphic Modernity: Staying In* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2011); Katarina Bonnevier, *Behind Straight Curtains: Towards a Queer Feminist Theory of Architecture* (Stockholm: Axl Books, 2007).
10. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Oakland: University of California Press, 1990); Henry Urbach, 'Closets, Clothes, disClosure', in *Assemblage* no. 30 (August 1996): 62–73.
11. Figurations, Braidotti says, are not 'figurative' ways of thinking but existential conditions that translate into a style of thinking. They are 'navigational tools'. See Rosi Braidotti, *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 1; see also Braidotti, *Transpositions: On Nomadic Ethics* (Cambridge: Polity, 2006), and Braidotti, *The Posthuman* (Cambridge: Polity, 2013).
12. Braidotti, *Nomadic Subjects*, 118; 146–67, here 160; see also Rosi Braidotti, *Metamorphoses: Towards a Materialist Theory of Becoming* (New York: Wiley, 2013), 12.
13. Rosi Braidotti, Opening lecture of the Dutch Philosophy Olympiad 2017. Available online at https://youtu.be
14. Rosi Braidotti., 'Posthuman, All Too Human I: Memoirs of a Posthumanist', 2017 Tanner Lectures on Human Values this spring at Yale's Whitney Humanities Center. Available online at https://youtu.be, 00:46:15.
15. Paul B. Preciado, 'Pharmaco Pornographic Politics: Towards a New Gender Ecology', *Parallax* 14, no. 1 (2008): 105–17; Preciado, 'Architecture as a Practice of Biopolitical Disobedience', Log 25 (2012): 121–34; Preciado, Testo junkie: Sex, Drugs, and Biopolitics in the Pharmacopornographic Era (New York: The Feminist Press at CUNY, 2013). Lucas C. Crawford, 'Breaking ground on a theory of transgender architecture', Seattle Journal for Social Justice 8, no.2 (2010): 515–39; Crawford, Transgender Architectonics: The Shape of Change in Modernist Space (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015).
16. Crawford, *Transgender Architectonics*, 2.
17. Ibid., 14.
18. Ibid., 19–20.
19. Ibid., 25 (emphasis in original).
20. See Buzz Bissinger, 'Caitlyn Jenner: The Full Story', with a photoshoot by Annie Leibovitz. Available online at: https://www.vanityfair.com.
21. Notorious is the case of Germaine Greer who criticised transgender women by resorting to an essentialist understanding of 'real' women; see among others the interview in *The Guardian*, 11 April 2016: https://www.theguardian.com.
22. For instance, the special issue of *Architectural Theory Review* 17, nrs. 2–3 (2012).
23. Het Nieuwe Instituut, 'Queering Architecture, Through Queer Eyes', 15 September 2016; Princeton School of Architecture, 'Stand by Your Monster and Some Queer Methods', 4 March 2017; and Melbourne Design Week, organised by MADA, Monash etc., 26 March 2017.
24. Joel Sanders (ed.), *Stud: Architectures of Masculinity* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996); for the 1994 exhibition Queer Space, see the website

of Storefront for Art and Architecture: http://storefrontnews.org

25. Léopold Lambert (ed.), *The Funambulist* no.13 (September–October 2017) is a thematic issue on 'Queers, Feminists and Interiors', and *Log* 41 (2017) included a special section, 'Working Queer', edited by Jaffer Kolb.
26. Jaffer Kolb, 'Working Queer', in *Log* 41 (2017): 63–66, here 63.
27. Aaron Betsky, in interview with Jaffer Kolb, 'The End of Queer Space?', in *Log* 41 (2017): 85–88.
28. Besides her *Gender Trouble*, in which the theory of perfomativity was originally explored, see especially Butler, *Undoing Gender* (New York/Abingdon: Routledge, 2004): 198–231.
29. Jane Bennett, *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009); Karen Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007).
30. Andrew Ballentyne, 'Deleuze, Architecture and Social Fabrication', in *Deleuze and Architecture*, ed. Hélène Frichot and Stephen Loo (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013): 182–196, and Cameron Duff, 'The Ethological City', in ibid.: 215–229; Hélène Frichot, Catharina Gabrielsson, and Jonathan Metzger, 'What a City Can Do', introduction to Frichot, Gabrielsson and Metzger (eds.), *Deleuze and the City* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2016); Andrej Radman and Heidi Sohn (eds.), *Critical and Clinical Cartographies: Architecture, Robotics, Medicine, Philosophy* (Edinburgh: Edinburg University Press, 2017); Hélène Frichot, Catharina Gabrielsson, and Helen Runting, *Architecture and Feminisms: Ecologies, Economies, Technologies* (Abingdon/New York, Routledge, 2017); Zuzana Kovar, *Architecture in Abjection: Bodies, Spaces and their Relations* (London/New York: Tauris, 2018).
31. Joel Sanders, 'From Stud to Stalled!: Architecture in Transition', *Log* 41, 145–54.

Biographies

Dirk van den Heuvel is associate professor with the Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment, TU Delft, and he heads the Jaap Bakema Study Centre at Het Nieuwe Instituut in Rotterdam. Books he co-authored include *Team 10: In Search of a Utopia of the Present 1953–1981* (2005) and *Architecture and the Welfare State* (2014). He is also an editor of the publication series *DASH, Delft Architectural Studies on Housing* and was an editor of the journal *Oase* (1993–1999). Van den Heuvel was curator of the Dutch national pavilion for the Venice architecture biennale in 2014. In 2017 he received a Richard Rogers Fellowship from the Harvard University Graduate School of Design.

Robert Alexander Gorny is currently a guest teacher and PhD candidate at the Chair of Methods and Analysis, Department of Architecture, TU Delft. He is founder of relationalthought, a nomadic architectural practice that operates at the intersection of theory and practice. It aims at contributing to a new materialist understanding of historical formations and machinic approaches to the ecologies of architecture, which he puts forward in his doctoral studies on 'a genealogy of apartments'. He joined the editorial board of *Footprint* in 2016.