

Introduction

Autor(en): **Lange, Torsten / Schaad, Gabrielle**

Objektyp: **Preface**

Zeitschrift: **gta papers**

Band (Jahr): **7 (2022)**

PDF erstellt am: **22.07.2024**

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

Introduction

Torsten Lange and Gabrielle Schaad

Torsten Lange is a Cultural and Architectural History Lecturer at the Lucerne School of Engineering and Architecture (HSLU).

Gabrielle Schaad is a postdoctoral researcher at the Chair for Theory and History of Architecture, Art and Design at the Technical University of Munich (TUM).

Care work is at once omnipresent and invisible. It permeates our most important relationships and commitments, encompassing all forms of socially necessary – or reproductive – labor: raising children, cooking, cleaning, shopping, looking after the ill and elderly, and many other tasks typically performed by women daily at home and within society. In general, care revolves around work that aims at the well-being of people. It allows for and sustains productive labor, including architectural labor.

Capitalist accumulation relies on discounting care. Regardless of its social, material, and monetary value, care work remains mostly unpaid. It is also – perhaps due to a kind of collective bad conscience – frequently pushed out of sight. Its performance by women is often naturalized by alluding to the allegedly more caring, nurturing female character or body. As the Swiss economist Mascha Madörin points out, care work has never been of interest to economic theory; only feminist economists have taken up the topic. ¹ Even today, regardless of cultural differences, most care work, paid or not, is done by women.

The gendered division of labor is one of the biggest obstacles in thinking and developing economic theory concepts and terms that could lead to relevant political-economic insights into the care economy. At the same time, in spite of its relative invisibility, the care economy has been in tremendous flux. Much of the Western world has undergone a transition from the “family wage” model that underpinned postwar state-managed capitalism to the “two-earner family” ideal of contemporary globalizing financialized capitalism. While the former institutionalized “androcentric understandings of family and work, [and] naturalized heteronormativity and gender hierarchy, largely removing them from political contestation,” the latter caused a “crisis of care” as debt-driven economies are “systematically expropriating the capacities available for sustaining social connections.” ² This issue of *gta papers* argues that, in light of the current “crisis of care” brought about by neoliberal financialized capitalism, ³ it is high time for architecture and the architectural humanities to turn to care. Doing so requires reorientation. As the philosopher Sara Ahmed reminds us, orientations matter. What and whom we attend to, we tend to. What we consciously perceive in front of us is determined by the things and actions that affect us and that we value. But do we attend to those who tend to us? Ahmed illustrates this by describing the domestic setting from within which Edmund Husserl’s phenomenological thinking about our directedness toward the world unfolds. ⁴ Starting from his writing desk, an

¹ Mascha Madörin, “Die Logik der Care-Arbeit – Annäherung einer Ökonomin,” in Ruth Gurny and Ueli Tecklenburg, eds., *Arbeit ohne Knechtschaft: Bestandesaufnahmen und Forderungen rund ums Thema Arbeit* (Zurich: Edition 8, 2013), 128–45, here 131, https://www.denknetz.ch/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/arbeit_ohne_knechtschaft_madoerin.pdf (accessed February 12, 2022). See also Ina Praetorius, *The Care-Centered Economy: Rediscovering What Has Been Taken for Granted*, Economy + Social Issues Vol. 16 (Berlin: Heinrich Böll Stiftung, 2015), https://www.boell.de/sites/default/files/the_care-centered_economy.pdf (accessed August 25, 2022).

² Nancy Fraser, “Contradictions of Capital and Care,” *New Left Review*, no. 100 (July/August 2016), 99–117, here 111, 115–16.

³ Fraser, “Contradictions of Capital and Care,” 104.

⁴ Sara Ahmed, “Orientations: Toward a Queer Phenomenology,” *GLQ: A Journal of Gay and Lesbian Studies* 12, no. 4 (2006), 543–74, here 547.

object placed immediately in front of him and located within the topography of the home, Husserl faces only certain things, while others remain “known” in the background. The latter remain underserving of any specific attention (determining what is rendered visible and invisible in this process). Ahmed names “domestic work” that which allows for Husserl’s desk to be kept clear and turned into a philosophical object. ⁵ Ahmed’s observations about the situatedness of intellectual work may sound familiar to architects, perhaps even more so after the experience of working from home in the context of COVID-19. Given the extent to which architecture creates and establishes the spatial conditions for care work to take place, Ahmed’s observations bear critical relevance for those tasked with designing the built environment. Tending to the back of architecture can offer a necessary corrective to our discipline’s obsession with the “front of the house.”

⁵ Ahmed, “Orientations,” 547.

Since the 1990s, political scientists Joan Tronto and Berenice Fisher have worked on definitions and terminology to analytically grasp an “ethic of care.” ⁶ As a result of the close ties of care to everyday practices of the domestic sphere and its division of labor, Tronto and Fisher note that public acknowledgment tends either to understate care almost exclusively as an emotional and intellectual act, and hence to undervalue the amount of active work that goes along with it, or to “overemphasize ... care as work at the expense of understanding the deeper emotional and intellectual qualities.” ⁷

⁶ Berenice Fisher and Joan C. Tronto, “Towards a Feminist Theory of Caring,” in Emily Abel and Margaret Nelson, eds., *Circles of Care: Work and Identity in Women’s Lives* (Albany NY: SUNY Press, 1990), 35–62, here 35.

The goal of this issue of *gta papers* is not to provide a false sense of an overview but to highlight how deeply entangled the discourses of care and architecture are. With few exceptions, architectural history as a discipline has not afforded much attention to reproductive labor, the ceaseless efforts of maintaining human and more-than-human life-worlds. Indeed, most of the discipline’s (white male) protagonists have celebrated architects as the autonomous inventors of likewise autonomous stable structures, forms, styles, and so on. However, “[g]iven the degree of brokenness of the broken world,” as Shannon Mattern writes, a shift in public discourse is necessary: away from the dominant paradigm of innovation—including the modern focus on economists, engineers, and policymakers—toward practices of maintenance and “the collective project of repair.” ⁸ The essays assembled here offer points of departure in this direction. In this introduction we do not try to address all the perspectives contained in the issue—this would hardly be possible—but a few strands can be brought forward.

⁷ See Joan C. Tronto, “An Ethic of Care,” *Generations: Journal of the American Society on Aging* 22, no. 3 (1998), 15–20, here 16, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44875693> (accessed February 12, 2022). Tronto points out four ethical elements of care: attentiveness, responsibility, competence, and responsiveness.

To begin pragmatically, architecture needs care, repair, and maintenance. Maintenance, or “the back half of life,” ⁹ as artist

⁸ Shannon Mattern, “Maintenance and Care,” *Places Journal*, November 2018, <https://doi.org/10.22269/181120>.

⁹ Cited in the program notes to the exhibition *Mierle Laderman Ukeles*, Matrix 137, September 20—November 15 1998 (Hartford, CT: Wadsworth Atheneum, 1998), 2.

10 Mierle Laderman Ukeles, "Manifesto for Maintenance Art 1969! Proposal for an Exhibition CARE" (1969), in Andrea Phillips and Markus Miessen, eds., *Caring Culture: Art, Architecture and the Politics of Public Health* (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2011), 137–44.

Mierle Laderman Ukeles calls it, has been a lens to look at her artistic and spatial practice in urban and institutional environments. Half a century after issuing a "Manifesto for Maintenance Art 1969!," her critique, initially aimed at institutions, affects and stretches the architectural discourse in direct and indirect ways. ¹⁰

The enactment of maintenance and its performative potential are what guides the curatorial project *The Power of Mushrooms: Berta Rahm's Pavilion for the Saffa 58* by Milena Buchwalder, Sonja Flury, and Dorothee Hahn. In their article reflecting on this project, the authors underline the role of collaboration and care in reevaluating historic women architects by rescuing and tending to a material object. Their commitment to an almost derelict pavilion architecture designed and built by the neglected Swiss architect Berta Rahm (1910–1998) for the 1958 *Swiss Exhibition for Women's Work (SAFFA 58)* is instrumental to the reevaluation of the architect who made it. We are familiar with the idea that historical monuments and buildings require care for their preservation. But performative preservation can also constitute a kind of curatorial activism. In the case of Rahm's SAFFA pavilion, the expression of care becomes a manifesto for the assertion of value. Tending to the material object draws attention to the pavilion's history and the impact of women architects. Because the pavilion was repurposed to house the canteen of a mushroom farm over the years, the maintenance performed through its transfer and restaging at gta exhibitions at ETH Zurich loosely revolved around the mushroom, both as actual and intellectual nourishment or thought model. In this context, mycelia's entangled and persistent lives became an emblem for the ecologies of care the pavilion itself created and continues to unfold. The curators both exceeded the classical activities of preservation specialists and transcended the frame of a conventional architecture exhibition, ultimately projecting different futures – not only for the pavilion they set out to reconstruct (at a location still to be found) – but also for women and LGBTQIA+ architects in the profession following in Rahm's footsteps.

Tethered to the question of maintenance is the question of who does the maintaining. Architecture establishes separate spheres and enclosed spaces within which labor is performed, and this contributes to the invisibility of care work; indeed, makes it literally structural. Such spaces range from the domestic sphere to environments of institutionalized care. The built environment structures relations between bodies; places caregivers and care receivers in specific, often separate, environments; and, just as it denies care as work, often denies those providing care work any space of their own within which they do not have to work. Care

is thus closed off from productive labor and public discourse, physically as well as symbolically.

Theorists like Silvia Federici were already denouncing the feminization and concomitant undervaluation of all the necessary and life-sustaining activities of the domestic sphere in the 1970s.¹¹ For years, such remarks left the field of architecture untouched. Then, in the early 1980s in her now legendary essay “What Would a Non-sexist City Be Like?”¹² Dolores Hayden drew a concrete connection between urban design, architecture, and care (work). Hayden’s historical analysis uncovered the radical proposals of nineteenth-century “material feminists” for revolutionizing the domestic sphere through the commoning of reproductive labor,¹³ directly informing her recommendations for redressing the gendered and racialized spatial inequalities produced by US postwar suburban housing. To challenge and change the established relationship between private life and public responsibilities, with their false opposition between “home and work,” she envisioned the creation of collective services to support the private household. Communal childcare, cooking, washing, and transportation were all part of a new system of small participatory organizations to be tested through experimental residential centers that she called HOMES (Homemakers Organization for a More Egalitarian Society).¹⁴

Meanwhile, in much of the world, the outsourcing and monetized transfer of care work within the neoliberal care economy has resulted in the precarious conditions encountered by caregivers — often racialized women — and care receivers alike.¹⁵ Architecture may not affect these “external” factors, but it operates within them. Valentina Davila’s contribution to this issue illustrates how architecture can provide a lens for the critical examination of these conditions. Her article focuses on the *quinta*, an upper-middle-class housing type in Venezuela whose extensive footprint and material comforts demand constant maintenance. Their owners’ lives depend on the extraction of care work from impoverished, often indigenous, rural migrant domestic workers, who are frequently confined to tiny, meager back rooms adjacent to the service area of the house, rooms that are kept small as much for symbolic as for practical reasons. Davila traces the workers’ discretely performed daily duties through her ethnographic practice, redrawing the proximate yet hidden spaces within the *quinta* to capture some trace of those who perform this care work.

The blindness within today’s architectural discipline to unregulated domestic work is in part attributable to the influence of the lively debates and technical inventions of the early twentieth century — debates around domestic reform, household

11 Silvia Federici, *Wages Against Housework* (London: Power of Women Collective; Bristol: Falling Wall Press, 1975), 1.

12 Dolores Hayden, “What Would a Non-sexist City Be Like? Speculations on Housing, Urban Design, and Human Work,” *Signs* 5, no. 3 (1980), 170–87, here 174.

13 Dolores Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1981), 3–29, here 3.

14 Hayden, “What Would a Non-sexist City Be Like?” 181.

15 Arlie Russell Hochschild and Barbara Ehrenreich, *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2003), 1–14, here 2.

engineering, and labor-saving devices – spawned by what was then called the “servant problem.” Frequently informed by Taylorist thinking, as well as an unshakable faith in technological fixes, the work of influential American household scientist Christine Frederick and the German economist Erna Meyer conceived of household labor as a form of work open to rational analysis and improvement. ¹⁶ The design and material construction of domestic space, amplified by the discourse of hygiene and cleanliness, was discussed not only by women reformers but also by critical proponents of modern architecture such as Bruno Taut, whose 1924 book *The New Dwelling* addresses women as “creators” of domestic space, albeit in their role as modern housewives. ¹⁷ Barbara Penner’s short article makes a significant contribution here. It points away from these canonized examples of streamlined modern design envisioned for urban homemakers, turning instead to an unknown history of experimental plans for farmhouse kitchens in the American West. The requirements of busy farm women drastically differed from women who lived in the city. Penner notes how, in contrast to the disembodied silhouette that determined the scale of the modular kitchen and its mass-produced appliances, farmhouse women were encouraged to alter the standardized plans for farmhouse kitchens developed at Oregon State College to fit their own bodies. She thus unearths a hitherto unexplored prehistory of ergonomics.

The contemporary built environment works as an effective system of prosthetics for the standard human body (read: healthy, adult, male), but less so for everyone else. Judith Butler and Sunaura Taylor demonstrated this point succinctly by going for a walk in San Francisco. Navigating curbs and steps (Taylor is dependent on a wheelchair), they discussed the concept of interdependence. Responding to each other’s thoughts and observations, they noted that the “idea that the able-bodied person is somehow radically self-sufficient” is itself something of a myth. “Disability” could be defined as a “social organization of [embodied] impairment” or “the disabling effects of society.” ¹⁸ Only when we organized a roundtable discussion on spaces for interdependent care relationships between people with disabilities and their caregivers at ETH Zurich’s Department of Architecture in 2018 did we become aware of the (invisible) administrative and physical constructional hurdles of the venue. Disability rights activist, performer, and scholar Nina Mühlemann advised us, the authors, on the organization of the event. Even though we all constantly depend on ergonomic support structures, society, politics, administration, and sometimes even architects declare assistance for non-normative bodies to be disproportionate.

¹⁶ See Mary Nolan, “Housework Made Easy: The Taylorized Housewife in Weimar Germany’s Rationalized Economy,” *Feminist Studies* 16, no. 3 (1990): 549–77, here 549. See also Susan R. Henderson, “A Revolution in the Woman’s Sphere: Grete Lihotzky and the Frankfurt Kitchen,” in Debra Coleman, Elizabeth Danze and Carol Henderson, eds., *Architecture and Feminism* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996), 221–53; and Ruth Schwartz Cowan, *More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to Microwave* (New York: Basic Books, 1983), 107.

¹⁷ Bruno Taut, *Die neue Wohnung: Die Frau als Schöpferin* (Leipzig: Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1924), 58.

¹⁸ Judith Butler with Sunaura Taylor, “Interdependence,” in Astra Taylor, ed., *Examined Life: Excursions with Contemporary Thinkers* (New York: New Press, 2009), 185–230, here 195 (based on *Examined Life*, directed by Astra Taylor [Sphynx Productions, 2008], 1:28:00).

Think, for example, of the accessibility of emergency exits. As Mühlemann explains, because making space accessible “is deemed excessive and unreasonable,” the use of an emergency exit “almost always involves a lot of extra labor from the side of the disabled person.”¹⁹ Disability studies scholar Margaret Price further specifies that justifications for lack of access — “this building was built before access standards were in place” or “we did the best we could” or “there is an accessible bathroom, just not on this floor” — shift the focus from the excluded disabled person onto those who are “doing their best” or onto the semi- or inaccessible spaces themselves.²⁰ Disability does not exist in a vacuum. It exists intersectionally with other markers of identity and with the surroundings that produce the social and political meaning of disability. The researcher Aimie Hamraie reminds us in this vein how “ugly laws,” segregation politics, and the ideology of able-bodiedness have shaped public space by determining who accesses and hence inhabits it: “Denying non-normative access to shared space created the illusion of [the] nonexistence [of non-normative bodies], resulting in less-accessible environments.”²¹ The absence of non-normative bodies thus constantly feeds into how we imagine and project our environment. Physical access leads in turn to social access and the acceptability of “misfits.”²²

Architect, activist, and theorist Jos Boys is one of the pioneers among the growing number of designers attempting to confront and unbuild the disabling effects of the built environment. In her contribution to this issue of *gta papers*, Boys explores “how disability (and other corporeally framed identities) can be reframed, not in simplistic binaries but as a complex, intersectional, situated, and dynamic patterning of enabling and disabling practices and spaces.”²³ By focusing on “difference as a creative generator,” Boys’s project seeks to reset how the built environment is taught and practiced. In collaborative drawing and mapping workshops, she reorients students and professionals to ideas of interdependent care that see access not as a service illiberally offered but as reciprocal generosity. Disability-led buildings in Berkeley, California, including the Ed Roberts Campus, serve as case studies to understand how the adaptation of a building can happen from the bottom up, sometimes even circumventing rules and regulations. In this process, the involved parties drop the assumption that the “needs” of different impairment groups “somehow add [up] to produce a ‘universal design’” and privilege creative design solutions instead.

Whereas the work of disability scholars and crip practitioners confronts the disabling effects of the built environment, Meredith TenHoor’s article highlights ways to conceive of space as

¹⁹ Nina Mühlemann, “Disability, Space, and Support” (paper presented at *Interdependent Bodies: Making Non-normative Spaces for Care*, panel discussion, October 29, 2018, ETH Zurich).

²⁰ Margaret Price, “Un/shared Space: The Dilemma of Inclusive Architecture,” in Jos Boys, ed., *Disability, Space Architecture* (New York: Routledge, 2017), 155–72, here 157.

²¹ Aimi Hamraie, “Normate Template: Knowing-Making the Architectural Inhabitant,” in *Building Access: Universal Design and the Politics of Disability* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017), 19–39, here 26.

²² Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, “Misfits: A Feminist Materialist Disability Concept,” *Hypatia Special Issue: Ethics of Embodiment* 26 (2011), 591–609, here 595.

²³ For this and further citations in this paragraph, see in this issue Jos Boys, “Care as Active Practice.”

“enabling” — that is, as supporting the healing process of mental healthcare patients and easing their gradual return to social life. At the heart of her study is the pioneering 1963 design by French architect Nicole Sonolet for l’Eau Vive, a residential psychiatric hospital in Soisy-sur-Seine, a suburb of Paris, and Sonolet’s later research into spaces for care conducted in collaboration with the psychiatrist Philippe Paumelle. Working in the context of institutional psychotherapy, a movement with origins in mid-twentieth-century decolonization theory and supported by key French intellectuals such as Frantz Fanon and Félix Guattari, Sonolet and Paumelle’s goal was to “decarceralize” the old, centralized asylums with local, community-based care provision. Core to Sonolet’s proposals were nonsegregated spaces where patients, rather than being closed off by walls or medication, could maintain close relations to others. Furthermore, such spaces should facilitate the transition into more independent forms of therapy whenever residents felt ready. Sonolet’s project informed not only the 1967 discussions within the Centre d’études, de recherches et de formation institutionnelles but also later community-based care in Europe, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Underpinning Sonolet’s designs was a nonmechanistic understanding of architectural spaces, resisting standardization and calculability, as TenHoor stresses in her contribution. The bodies of patients and carers were expected to always establish new and evolving relations with one another, as well as with the spaces surrounding them.

Max J. Andrucki’s article — “Ceramics, Sex, and Sublimation” — takes its departure from the urban geographers who published groundbreaking studies of gay neighborhoods in the 1980s. Those researchers investigated the “material networks of infrastructure that enable queer life,” a covert web of bars, clubs, saunas, and other meeting points that ultimately facilitated the emergence of a public political movement. Andrucki extends this discussion by talking about the subtle way in which the gay male body has always functioned as the definitive infrastructure of the neighborhood: a body that served, liberated, or desired the other bodies that it met, as part of a libidinal economy that permitted the desublimation of individual and radical notions of service. Intense sex, Andrucki argues, is also a kind of civil infrastructure. As a culmination to his account, Andrucki raises the example of two artists in London whose practice emphasizes relational aesthetics. The dual role of ceramics, both a material of public infrastructure and a familiar material of domesticity, comes into play in the artists’ events. In a recent, key event — *Midsommar* — a seemingly innocuous garden party held at the end of the coronavirus lockdown, they demonstrated the extraordinary capacity

of queer hospitality to offer renewal, solace, and conviviality in a time of isolation.

The questions “Who cares?” and “Who is cared for?” are complicated further when we move beyond anthropocentric scales. The environment, often conceived as a backdrop for human concerns, has in living memory become increasingly the object of them. Publications and exhibition projects such as Elke Krasny and Angelika Fitz’s *Critical Care: Architecture and Urbanism for a Broken Planet* attest to the fact that the concept of care has become a central concern in architectural debates. ²⁴ Demographic changes, growing mobility, environmental crises, and climate change increase the urgency for architecture to reflect upon its role in planetary questions. Natasha Baranow’s study of terrariums persuasively reminds us that our consciousness of such questions now pervades our relationships even with miniature, isolated spaces – that is, anxiety has become inescapable. The realization that the construction industry is dependent on resource extraction at vast scales, leading to a scarcity even of sand, has become impossible to ignore, and some voices even controversially propose “a global moratorium” on new buildings to force us to take stock of the existing built environment. ²⁵ On a planetary level, architecture not only finds itself entangled with the Anthropocene but also with geopolitical and economic interests, the result of asymmetrical struggles between what is usually abridged as the “Global North” and the “Global South.”

Affective labor figures in different ways – and with a historical twist – in Alla Vronskaya’s research. She unearths an overlooked figure in Soviet architectural history crucial in designing ideological and educational spectacles. Her article sheds light on Betty Glan, who – among other things – was vital in shaping Soviet spaces for leisure by conceiving and realizing the design of Moscow’s Gorky Park (the Moscow Park of Culture and Leisure) while its director from 1929 to 1937. Vronskaya traces Glan’s burning commitment to communism throughout her winding, decades-spanning career. In Vronskaya’s account of Glan’s life we might recognize glimmers of Héléne Frichot’s “exhaustion as a methodology,” theorized in her 2019 book *Creative Ecologies* as “offering a way of practising from the midst of the spaces and temporal paces of exhaustion.” ²⁶ Drawing on Gilles Deleuze’s essay titled “The Exhausted,” Frichot stresses that exhaustion is not to be confused with tiredness and that it can lead to forms of creativity. Glan understood “sacrificing one’s life to the life of others” as the ultimate heroic gesture for a humanist member of the collectivist Soviet society. ²⁷ Despite years of exile, prison, and forced labor, Glan retrospectively idealized her life as

²⁴ Elke Krasny and Angelika Fitz, eds., *Critical Care: Architecture and Urbanism for a Broken Planet* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2019), 25–43.

²⁵ See Charlotte Malterre-Barthes (interviewed by Alexander Stumm), “Wer definiert die Standards und zu welchem Zweck?,” *Bauwelt* 16 (2021), 42–44.

²⁶ Héléne Frichot, *Creative Ecologies: Theorizing the Practice of Architecture* (London: Bloomsbury Visual Arts, 2018), 69.

²⁷ See Alla Vronskaya, “Affective Productivism” in this issue.

A Movable Feast. This leads Vronskaya to muse over the rhetorical tropes of romance and satire. In her romanticized autobiography, the cultural mediator and educator Glan imaginatively reclaimed what had been repeatedly revoked or put into question: the supposed rewards for the dedicated and unconditional care for others. Her commitment to the needs of school children, factory workers, and comrades went beyond the common demand for revolutionary enthusiasm, reaching something closer to an eschatological celebration of self-sacrifice. Glan appears to fully realize the longed-for political utopia only in the simultaneous experience of martyrdom by and for the party.

Science historian Donna Haraway paved the way for academic writing that allows the personal and private to enter the frame. She calls this “situated knowledges.”²⁸ Haraway encourages writing that makes the researcher’s subjective position traceable, allowing them to acknowledge their knowledge as partial, potentially biased through personal privilege, entangled in complex or asymmetrical power relations, or limited through resources and access, without surrendering the desire for knowledge in the process. Looking at one’s research through the lens of care supports this type of writing by highlighting the temporal, spatial, and positional entanglements among researcher, researched subjects, and their respective working environments. Doing so requires the substitution of the modern Western individual subject for an interdependent human being that lives with and thinks with other body-minds. A narrative only partly sustained by historical testimonies, based primarily on one’s horizon of personal experience, may be dismissed by some as unscholarly or as “first-person research.” However, in stories of care, these tentative and self-critical contributions are necessary to clarify that the primary incentives, tribulations, and even fates of productive labor lie in the inseparable entanglement of our thinking bodies with built and social-emotional commitments that henceforth cannot be excluded from the picture without distorting it beyond any resemblance to “reality.”

The contributions collected from the Society of Architectural Historians’ workshop “Caregiving as Method” — convened by Annoradha Iyer Siddiqi during the global pandemic in 2021 — all acknowledge the affective dimension of our work as architectural historians, in contrast to the feigned detachment of scholarship. In preparing these oral accounts and testimonies for *gta papers*, the authors further developed and sharpened the methodological insights and conclusions presented during the event. An in-depth review of the workshop by Siddiqi and the other moderators introduces the individual contributions stemming

28 Donna Haraway. “Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective.” *Feminist Studies* 14, no. 3 (1988), 575–99.

from panels that revolved around the topics of "Care," "Repair," and "Method." In various ways they note the fetishism around the built object that characterizes architectural history. To us, as editors, these short contributions read as a plea for mutually engaged scholarship. They seek to create solidarity and strategic alliances between researchers and their research subjects.