

UDK BROJEVI: 72:316(94) ; 141.72(94)
ID BROJ: 179515660

Bronwyn Hanna
Heritage Branch, New South Wales Department of Planning

THREE FEMINIST ANALYSES OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Abstract:

This paper addresses the diversity of academic feminist analyses of the relations between sex/gender/ bodies and space/ place/ design. This is approached through categorizing feminist approaches into three main groupings, that have been named: 'liberal humanist feminist'; 'critical theory feminist' and 'postmodern feminist'. The paper outlines the main elements which constitute these three categories, and illustrates each one with examples of analysis, firstly, of certain issues of design and secondly, of problems that women encounter in the profession of architecture.

Key words: feminism, women's groups, environment, sexist design, phallocentrism, Sydney Opera House, Australian Institute of Architects

Introduction

The mid-1990s in Australia has been the site of burgeoning interest and activity around the conjuncture of women with the built environment – both academically and within industry.¹ In this paper I address the diversity of academic feminist analyses of the relations between sex/gender/ bodies and space/place/design. This is approached through categorizing feminist approaches into three main groupings, that I have named: 'liberal humanist feminist'; 'critical theory feminist' and 'postmodern feminist.' The paper outlines what I consider to be the main elements of these three categories, and illustrates each one with examples of analysis firstly of certain issues of design and secondly of problems that women encounter in the profession of architecture.

I must emphasize that these three categories are presented only as a device for making sense of the vast array of feminist analyses currently available. They are somewhat arbitrary and completely debatable. In fact most feminists in their writings as in their everyday lives would pick and choose modes of analysis and strategies from all three categories. Nonetheless I think that to divide them up in this way can provide a useful framework for exploration and discussion.

Liberal humanist feminism

Liberal humanist feminism is the longest established and widely accepted feminist approach to discussing women's issues, especially in the mass media. Characterizing what is now called 'first wave feminism,' it can be summarized as the attempt to reform institutions so that they extend all rights equally to women and men. The suffragette movement of the late 19th and early 20th centuries is an example of liberal humanist feminism, in which women demanded that governments recognize women as citizens equal to men by giving them the right to vote. This right was not only symbolic and political but also led to economic improvements in women's social positioning, so that, for example, women came to be recognized as legal entities, capable of owning their own property and entering into contracts. As a result of the hard struggles of these early feminists, 20th century women in western countries have become legally capable of acting as professionals and operating businesses.²

This approach is 'liberal' in that it admits pluralism and seeks equality in the mode of the Enlightenment project³, and 'humanist' because it assumes a normative humanity common to all citizens, which becomes the basis for equal human rights.⁴ Liberal humanism, however, is considered problematic by some commentators because, as Elizabeth Grosz has argued, it assumes that women "could only be regarded as variations of a basic humanity. The project of women's equal inclusion meant that only women's sameness to men, only women's humanity and not their womanliness could be discussed... In other words... women began to assume the role of surrogate men".⁵

The key terms used in the liberal humanist feminist approach are words like 'equality,' 'rights' and 'interests' and feminist activity here focuses on progressive changes to legislation, education and all types of social organization to ensure that discrimination against women is obstructed.

Liberal humanist feminism addresses social institutions as if they were rationally organized and well intentioned, but flawed in some details. It advocates skilled (and/or militant) lobbying of people in power to remedy such flaws, and implies that reform of a basically good system is desirable and possible. If this approach projects an image of society, it is one of a complex machine of many parts which is fundamentally sound, that requires vigilant maintenance, adjustments and improvements, but which is continually improving and progressing.

A major mode of analysis of liberal humanist feminism is the identification of 'sexism' or acts of discrimination against women. In relation to the built environment, the liberal humanist feminist approach would point out issues of sexist design and sexist discrimination in the professions and advocate for change and reform.⁶

To illustrate with examples, a liberal humanist feminist approach would criticize as sexist design the failure to provide women's toilets in a workplace – which is then used as a reason for not employing women. Leonie Matthews' study of women architects in Western Australia notes that as late as 1947 Vida Wright was discouraged from enrolling at the school of architecture at Perth Technical College because, as Wright explains, "they didn't have toilet provisions for women... When Margaret Pitt Morison became a teacher there of course they did put some facilities in... [The principal] let me know that he didn't think it was the right profession for a woman... That only made me more determined I'm afraid".⁷

The liberal humanist remedy for the lack of women's toilets is quite straightforward, if occasionally expensive: to build or designate women's toilets in all workspaces – this in fact has already been largely achieved in Australia. Liberal humanist feminism is also largely responsible for the anti-discrimination legislation which ensures that principals may no longer safely voice the opinion that women or any other sorts of people are not 'right' for a profession.

Looking at the architecture profession more generally, a liberal humanist analysis might examine questions of access and participation. For example, it has been repeatedly pointed out that the profession is male dominated numerically. Judith Brine's 1989 study noted that the Royal Australian Institute of Architects had a membership of only 7% women, and also that woman constituted only 7% of tenured academics (i.e., teachers in secure, permanent jobs) in Australian architecture schools.⁸ There is room to hope that these figures are currently improving as the proportion of women architecture graduates has recently risen dramatically, from 9,3% in 1974; 19% in 1984; 31% in 1989 to nearly 50% today in some schools.⁹ However there has been a marked tendency historically for many women trained as architects never to join the profession, and a further problem that many who have done so have progressed far more slowly than their male counterparts in terms of responsibilities, prestige and income levels.¹⁰ Areas of possible discrimination include employers refusing to give women jobs, or if they do, not giving them equal types of work, or allowing sexual harassment to go unchecked. Liberal humanist feminists typically collect factual statistics to corroborate their claims of discrimination, and call for an end to practices which openly discriminate against women.

Critical theory feminism

The group of analyses I am referring to as 'critical theory feminism' would include much of the work that has gone under the titles 'socialist feminism' and 'radical feminism,' developed in 'second Wave feminism' of the 1960s and 70s. 'Critical theory' usually refers to the Frankfurt School developments of Marxism by writers like Theodore Adorno, who introduced psychoanalysis and theories of mass media to help explain the ideological effects of twentieth century capitalism. I am co-opting the term because these feminist approaches also transpose many el-

ements from the Marxist framework – criticizing modern society as systematically or structurally exploitative, in an analysis also typically expanded by psychological and cultural theory.

Where Marxism focuses on 'class' as the main area of oppression within the social economic system called 'capitalism,' critical theory feminists address 'biological sex' and/or 'gender' as the main area of oppression within a system called 'patriarchy'¹¹. Their image of society is not a complex machine but more like cold war, where different groups of people, be they workers



SYDNEY OPERA HOUSE, 1959-1975 (2005)

and owners, or women and men, are struggling in a relationship based on exploitation of one group by the other – but exploitation often covered up by social niceties. Critical theorists tend to present their sophisticated analyses as scientific in character, as allowing them to see through ideological false illusions to the social 'truth' or 'reality.' Marxism also posited the important notion of a historical dialectic, that the system of conflict must progress by collapsing and evolving into a higher state of evolution. The Marxists imagined this higher state to be socialism or communism, while the feminists in their way called for 'Women's Liberation.'

Critical theory feminists see the problem as being that men and women are born differently sexed (i.e., male and female) and that those sexes are socialized differently into genders (i.e., masculine and feminine) in a system where maleness and masculinity is empowered by patriarchy and femaleness and femininity is exploited. They argue that women are disadvantaged by their biology – relegated to reproduction and childrearing – and furthermore socialized to be docile and passive, confined to the private domain of the home, while men are socialized to be aggressive and active, and empowered by their dominance of the public world of work and politics.

Critical theory feminists tend to call for women to shed their 'false consciousness' and seek equality in the male dominated spheres of the public world. Shulamith Firestone, for example, suggested that one way of "freeing women from the tyranny of their biology" would be to arrange for childbearing to be "taken over by technology".¹² Such approaches, however, have been criticized for the rigidity of the 'patriarchy' model they espouse,¹³ for the scientific assumption of an objective viewpoint that failed to take in account the social positioning of the critic (and thus tended towards ethnocentrism and 'classism'),¹⁴ for the tendency towards 'essentialism,' and also, paradoxically, for sometimes derogating femininity. On the other hand, critical theory feminists have provided an array of astute critiques of contemporary society.¹⁵

Critical theory feminists see sexist acts of discrimination not as isolated flaws but as symptomatic of the wider structures of inequality and exploitation between the genders. They would make a call to change the patriarchy rather than reform individual quirks, calling for revolutionary change to the whole system, including our psychological make-up as well as social and economic norms. Examples of the critical theory feminist analysis of the built environment would include a critique of sexism that is wider than that of the liberal humanists, a critique of designs and institutions which ignore women's interests or needs as a distinct social group. By assuming that all users are men, such designs or organizations end up discriminating against women for their femininity.

An example of this expanded notion of sexist design would be the forecourt of the Sydney Opera House, where the pavement is made up of huge blocks of granite separated by 2 cm gaps to allow rain water to drain away. These gaps, however, also act as traps for women's high heeled shoes. In the one place in the city where a woman is likely to be wearing her most expensive and impractical shoes, she encounters a surface which endangers her health by catching and breaking off narrow heels and twisting ankles. This critique of sexist design calls for radical change: not just ripping up the pavement and replacing it, but replacing the all-male design team (as it apparently was) with a composite team of men and women designers all trained in gender-awareness, so that a feminine perspective would become part of the design process. Critical theory feminists might also attack this problem from the other end, and call for shifts in women's fashion, so that women didn't feel tempted to dress in 'sexy' but dangerous clothing like stilettos. This would involve radical change to the political economy of fashion and mass media representation of women's sexuality.

The example of the lack of women's toilets in the workplace might be given wider significance by critical theory feminists as symptomatic of the sexual division of labour under patriarchy. This division assumes that because women biologically bear babies they must also take responsibility for the rearing of children, and that this work is to be done separately from the waged labour of men, be unpaid and performed in the private domain of the home. Critical theory feminists might argue for the radical dissolution of this division of labour so that men and women have equal opportunity to work for wages and to bring up children, that both forms of work be equally economically valued, since caring for children and workers is central to the reproduction of labour power. Thus, to allow men and women such equal work opportunities would require not just the construction of toilets for women in the workplace, but also major structural changes to the legal and economic system, to the spatial design of our cities (so that home and work are not so separated) as well as major changes in our cultural understanding of the public and the private.

The critical theory feminist approach might argue that it is not enough simply to have more women practising in the profession, but that it is also important to re-educate the profession so that it becomes more aware of gender issues in all areas of design. Critical theory feminists would also note the systematic obstacles that women face in their career as architects, obstacles that can't be addressed in equal opportunity legislation: informal mechanisms that exclude women, like 'old boys' networks and mentor systems that favour men in professional development. One strategy for countering this is the practice of starting women's own societies for addressing women's issues, such as Constructive Women in Sydney, which has been very successful both in increasing the participating women's 'consciousness' and their networking.

Another structural problem for women in the profession who choose to be mothers is that having children interrupts careers not only at the time of pregnancy but also in the long-term

because of the division of priorities for women who often carry the principal child-care and housework burdens at home added to the demands of their paid work. Critical theory feminists might thus call for inexpensive and widely available childcare, for more flexible availability of part-timework without loss of professional status, for professional societies to meet at times which don't conflict with childcare responsibilities, and for husbands to share the domestic load more evenly. Moreover, critical theory feminists might argue that mothers have special skills to offer to the profession, for example, being more aware of the problems of a wider community than businessmen are, being able to juggle many responsibilities at once, etc. In a related strategy, some radical feminists have argued that in fact women are better designers than men because they are better listeners and communicators, more flexible and more prepared to compromise their design to meet a client's wishes, more inclined to be concerned with the complex functioning of a building than its appearance, and more likely to take ecological issues into account.¹⁶ Such an analysis substitutes a masculine-favoured hierarchy with a feminine-favoured one, though leaving unquestioned the problems of gendered design attributes, competitiveness and hierarchies.

Critical theory feminism might address the question of women's low participation rate in the profession of architecture by suggesting that this is just evidence of women's good sense. Architecture, far from being a heroic artistic practice, more closely resembles accounting insofar as it operates primarily as a service industry to maximize profits for its clients. If many women are disappointed by their encounters with the profession and prefer to serve the wider community in more socially accountable ways, they may be seen to have quite reasonably voted with their feet in seeking other areas of work they find more fulfilling. An alternative model of work practice inspired by critical theory feminism was developed by Matrix, a cooperative firm of designers founded in London in the early 1980s to provide architectural services at inexpensive rates to poorer client groups.¹⁷



THE "HOME BUILDING SECTION"
GRAPHIC DEPICTING FLORENCE
TAYLOR, C. 1907

Postmodern feminism

This most recent feminist approach has largely developed since the mid-1980s by academics informed by post-structuralism.¹⁸ I would suggest that whereas liberal humanist feminism focused on sexist acts, and critical theory feminism focused on structural exploitation, postmodern feminism is more concerned with language and representation, with the ways that meanings about women and our culture are produced discursively.

Whereas the first two feminist categories of analysis discussed here could be characterized as 'feminism of equality,' this third approach should be characterized as 'feminism of difference.' Rather than trying to become more like men, this approach suggests that women should be recognized and appreciated for their differences, both as a group and amongst themselves. Rather than assume either sex or gender as givens, postmodern feminism tends to focus on the 'body' as a site of contestation, particularly in relation to subjectivity – addressed largely through psychoanalysis, but also as related to the complexities of race and multiculturalism, sexual orientation, disability and age.

A key term used in this approach is 'phallogentrism,' which Elizabeth Grosz explains as „a form of logocentrism in which the phallus takes on the function of the logos. The term refers to the ways in which patriarchal systems of representation always submit women to models and images defined by and for men. There are three forms phallogentrism generally takes: whenever

women are represented as the opposites or negatives of men; whenever they are represented in terms the same as or similar to men; and whenever they are represented as men's complements".¹⁹

Elizabeth Wilson's definition of 'phallocentrism' emphasizes its characteristics as "production, property, order, form, unity, visibility, erection... [It] operates through the domination of stability and solidity, at the expense of difference, reciprocity, exchange, permeability or fluidity".²⁰ Rather than visualizing power as oppressing women from above, this approach is more likely to draw on Foucault's notion of power as operating in a 'capillary' fashion, to emphasise "the more fluid and local contexts in which power and gender operate", and to embrace "ambiguity, complexity and partiality".²¹ Postmodern feminism suggests that women are not innocent victims, but are complicit in power relationships in all directions of our lives, and this is particularly so for feminist academics, who have become painfully aware of the problems and pitfalls in attempting to speak for 'the other,' including other women.²² Thus a postmodern feminist image of society is not that of a machine or cold war but might rather resemble an image of blood circulating through a body, always moving through resistances, in complex and ever-changing if often limited ways.

A major criticism of postmodern feminism is that it seems to have lost its political way. It has become so sophisticated that its basic categories of analysis, like the word 'woman'²³, have become confused, and has thus lost its ability to direct action.²⁴ My understanding is that the politics of postmodern feminist analysis is about diversity and the tactics to be employed in very particular historical



FLORENCE TAYLOR AS PART OF A TOWN PLANNING DELEGATION TO THE PREMIER OF NEW SOUTH WALES, 1929

times and places. It is no longer a strategy thought to be led by a 'vanguard,' but a matter of tactics practised by everyone as they struggle through the complexities of their everyday lives.

In relation to the examples of sexist design in the built environment, a postmodern feminist analysis would admit that while it was sexist to design the Sydney Opera House pavement with gaps that trip up women, it is phallocentric to ignore women's criticism of the pavement or to suggest that women shouldn't be wearing high heels anyway. The fact that the pavement is still there, even after a recent major refurbishing of the forecourt, is evidence of phallocentric trivialization of women's concerns.

A postmodern feminist analysis might approach the issue of toilets in the workplace as a question of attribution of meaning rather than one of physical provision. Why are toilets designated for men considered so 'sacred'? Why can't some be designated unisex or switched over for women's use? There may be the obvious considerations of modesty, especially around the urinals, but these could be shielded from view. The postmodern feminist might further speculate about the toilets as a 'special place' in the workplace which is linked to bodily functions, a place where people may examine their appearance, seek 'time out' from work pressure, smoke a cigarette, even a place for the exchange of informal information. These activities probably operate in quite different ways for women and men. The 'men-only' toilet is surely a metonym for the entire workplace as 'men-only': the problem to be addressed is not merely physical but symbolic.

In examining women's participation in the profession, postmodern feminism is less likely to seek new statistics on discrimination and more likely to analyse discourses like journals and history books, to examine the ways that value and meaning are attributed in architecture, often in ways shown to be highly problematic. Denise Scott Brown has written impressively about what she calls the 'star system' in architecture, the system that creates male 'gurus' like her partner Robert Venturi, and in the process disregards the complexities of their actual practice and the shared authorship of their work.²⁵ My research on Australia's first woman architect, Florence Taylor, has shown that contemporary commentators consistently failed to discuss her design work but emphasized her feminine appearance and frivolous hats.²⁶ An excellent recent study by Joan Eveline suggests that in our current era of antidiscrimination legislation and affirmative action, women are still discouraged from entering traditionally defined male areas of work by discursive means, by stories of the "heavy, dirty and limp".²⁷ Such analyses suggest that improvements for women workers may be dependent on challenging the very nature of the profession's discourse.

Conclusion

All three of these feminist approaches have useful analyses to offer us. I consider it appropriate to use whatever tools come to hand; that it is worth learning from, respecting and helping each other's efforts and tactics; and that there is no one feminism that is 'correct,' but rather a great diversity of strategies and feminisms.

Endnotes:

¹ There are currently numerous PhDs being researched and completed in this topic area around Australia, including, for example: Sue Best, University of Sydney; Bronwyn Hanna, University of NSW; Cathy Keyes, University of Queensland; Marijana Lozanovska, Deakin University; Bette O'Brien, ANU; Susan O'Grady, Monash University; Susan Shannon, University of Adelaide; Susan Thompson, University of NSW; Deborah White, University of Adelaide; Julie Willis, University of Melbourne. In Sydney alone there are four active women's groups: the National Association of Women in Construction; Constructive Women; the Women's Issues Committee of the RAJA; and the Women's Forum of the Master Builder's Association.

² For a useful summary of improvements to British legislation concerning women during the 19th and 20th centuries, see Hannah Gavron, "Legal and political changes," *The Captive Wife*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968.

³ This useful point was made by Adrian Snodgrass in paraphrasing this paper. A. Bullock and O. Stallybrass (eds), *The Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought*, London: Fontana, 1977, p. 327, s.v., 'Liberalism,' explains that „liberalism in its most characteristic expression emphasizes the importance of conscience and justice in politics, advocates the rights of racial and religious minorities, and supports civil liberties and the right of the ordinary individual to be more effectively consulted in decisions which affect him”.

⁴ Bullock and Stallybrass, *Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought*, p. 291, s.v., 'Human Rights', say: "Natural or human rights are those which men (sic) are conceived to have in virtue of their humanity and not in virtue of human fiat or law or convention. Such rights have therefore been frequently invoked in the criticism of laws and social arrangements”.

⁵ Elizabeth Grosz, "Conclusion: What is Feminist Theory?" in C. Pateman and E. Grosz (eds), *Feminist Challenges*, Sydney, London and Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1986, pp. 191-2. These issues are discussed at greater length in another article in this excellent collection by Merle Thornton, "Sex Equality is not Enough for Feminism."

⁶ For examples of this approach see Deborah White, "Women in Architecture: A Personal Observation," *Meanjin*, 34, 4, (Summer 1975): 399-404; Susanna Torre, (ed), *Women in American Architecture*, New York, Whitney Library of Design, 1979; S. Allan, A. Darvall and S. van Klaveren, *Women in Architecture: Missed Opportunities*, Occasional Student Research Paper No.92/1, Melbourne: Dept of Planning Policy and Landscape, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, 1992.

⁷ Leonie Matthews, "An Exploratory Study of Women in Western Australian Architecture 1920-1960," unpublished B.Arch. Dissertation, Perth, Curtin University, 1991.

⁸ Judith Brine, "Survey of Women Working in the Field of the Built Environment in Australia," unpublished paper given at the "Claiming Space: Gender and the Built Environment" Conference, Canberra, October 1989.

⁹ Royal Australian Institute of Architects Committee on the Status of Women, "Towards a More Egalitarian Profession," unpublished report, 1991.

¹⁰ My analysis of the Sydney University Calendar, in its reports on the first twenty years of graduates of the Architecture Faculty between 1922 and 1942, indicates that out of a total of 128 graduates, there were 38 women, or 30% of all early graduates. While only a minority of these women sought a full-time career in architecture, many did practise part-time over many years, but few gained prominence within the profession within their own time and none have yet been given historical credit for their contributions.

¹¹ Socialist feminists tried to combine their critique of patriarchy with the Marxist critique of capitalism, largely unsuccessfully. See Michelle Barrett, "Introduction," *Women's Oppression Today*, 1988 (second edition of her classic text of 1980).

¹² Shulamith Firestone, *The Dialectic of Sex*, London: Bantam & Morrow, 1971, p. 238. This radical feminist text transposes Marxist analysis to construct a theory of women's oppression under patriarchy, understood to be largely caused by their biological status as reproducers.

¹³ For an excellent discussion of the history of the term 'patriarchy' and its critics, see Rosemary Pringle, "Destabilising Patriarchy," in R. Pringle and B. Caine (eds), *Transitions*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1995, pp. 198-211.

¹⁴ Feminists of colour have provided many serious critiques along these lines. See, for example: Patricia Collins, *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment*, London: Routledge, 1990; Angela Davis, *Women Race and Class*, New York: Vintage, 1983; bell hooks, *Yearning: Race Gender and Cultural Politics*, Toronto: Between the Lines, 1990; Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (eds), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, pp. 271-313.

¹⁵ Further examples of this feminist approach to critiquing the built environment may be found in: Leslie Weisman, *Discrimination by Design*, Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1992; Deborah White, "Half the Sky But No Room of Her Own: Women in the Built Environment," *Transition*, 25, (Winter 1988): 23-32. White suggests the following examples of sexist discrimination in the built environment: mothers with strollers who are effectively barred from certain places; domestic design which burdens housewives with high expectations of comfort; public housing which socially segregates single mothers and other low income women; zoning which institutionalises the separation of home from childcare and other economic functions; the stereotyping of men's and women's roles in the workplace and around the house.

¹⁶ The classic statement of this argument is made by Margrit Kennedy, "Towards a Rediscovery of 'Feminine' Principles in Architecture and Planning," *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, 4, 1 (1981): 75-81. It is the type of argument forwarded by Eve Laron, "Designing From the Inside Out," *Artlink*, 11, 4 (1991): 33-35.

¹⁷ They also put out an excellent edited collection of articles on "women and space": *Matrix, Making Space: Women and the Man Made Environment*, London: Pluto, 1984.

¹⁸ Two brilliant and generous introductions to this most recently developing strand of feminism are: Rosalind Deutsche, "Boys Town", *Environment & Planning D: Society & Space*, 9, 1 (1991): 5-30; and Vicky Kirby, "Viral Identities: Feminisms and Postmodernisms", in N. Grieve and A. Bums (eds), *Australian Women, Contemporary Feminist Thought*, Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1994. A useful collection of essays may be found in L. J. Nicholson (ed), *Feminism/Postmodernism*, New York: London, Routledge, 1990. An excellent collection attuned more specifically to issues of space is Beatrix Colomina (ed), *Sexuality and Space*, New Jersey: Princeton Papers on Architecture, 1992.

¹⁹ Elizabeth Grosz, "Glossary: Phallogocentrism," *Sexual Subversions, Three French Feminists*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1989, p. xx. In this glossary, Grosz defines 'logos' and 'logocentrism': "These terms designate the dominant form of metaphysics in Western thought. The logos, logic, reason, knowledge, represent a singular and unified conceptual order, one which seems to grasp the presence or immediacy of things. Logocentrism is a system of thought centred around the dominance of this singular logic of presence. It is a system which seeks... an access to concepts and things in their pure, unmediated form. Logocentric systems rely heavily on a logic of identity which is founded on the exclusion and binary polarisation of difference".

²⁰ Elizabeth Wilson, "Knowing Women: The Limits of Feminist Psychology" in Pringle and Caine, *Transitions*, p. 37, quoting Luce Irigaray, "Is the subject of science sexed?" *Cultural Critique* 1, 1.

²¹ For example see Vicky Kirby, 'Feminisms, Reading, Postmodernisms': Rethinking Complicity, in S. Gunew and A. Yeatman (eds), *Feminism and the Politics of Difference*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1993.

²² Pringle, "Destabilising Patriarchy," p. 199, quoting geographer Geraldine Pratt, "Reflections on Poststructuralism and Feminist Empirics, Theory and Practice," *Antipode*, 25, 1 (1993): 51-63.

²³ Denise Riley, *Am I That Name? Feminism and the Category of 'Woman' in History*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.

²⁴ For example, Linda Alcoff, "Cultural Feminism Versus Post-structuralism: The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory," *Signs*, 13, (1988): 405-436.

²⁵ Denise Scott Brown, "Room At the Top? Sexism and the Star System in Architecture," in E. P. Berkeley (ed), *Architecture, A Place for Women*, Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1989.

²⁶ Bronwyn Hanna, "Florence Taylor's Hats," *Architecture Bulletin* (journal of the NSW Chapter of the Royal Australian Institute of Architect), October 1994, pp. 4-5.

²⁷ Joan Eveline, "Stories of the Heavy, Dirty and limp: Protecting the Institution of Men's Work," *Administration Compliance and Governability Program Working Paper 27*, Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University, December 1995.

Bronvin Hana

Ogranak za nasleđe, Odeljenje planiranja Novog Južnog Velsa

TRI FEMINISTIČKE ANALIZE IZGRADNJE ŽIVOTNE SREDINE

Sažetak:

Tekst se bavi osnovnim razlikama u interpretaciji odnosa pola/roda/tela i prostora/mesta/dizajna u metodologiji nekoliko akademskih feminističkih pristupa, kroz njihovu kategorizaciju u tri vodeće grupe, definisane kao: "liberalno-humanistički feminizam", "kritičko-teorijski feminizam" i "postmoderni feminizam". Cilj rada je uočavanje glavnih elementa oko kojih su konstituisane navedene kategorije i njihovo pojašnjenje primerima, kako vezanim za konačna rešenja tako i za probleme sa kojima se žene u Australiji susreću baveći se arhitekturom.

Cljučne reči: feminizam, ženske organizacije, životna sredina, falocentrizam, Opera u Sidneju, Australijski arhitektonski institut

(KATEGORIJA ČLANKA: NAUČNI ČLANAK – ORIGINALAN NAUČNI RAD)