

# Cross-cultural Design Studio Teaching: Avoiding the Anthropological Lens

**Author:**

Loveday, Thomas

**Publication details:**

Proceedings of ConnectED 2007 International Conference on Design Education  
9780646481470 (ISBN)

**Event details:**

ConnectED 2007 International Conference on Design Education  
Sydney, Australia

**Publication Date:**

2007

**DOI:**

<https://doi.org/10.26190/unsworks/506>

**License:**

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/au/>

Link to license to see what you are allowed to do with this resource.

Downloaded from <http://hdl.handle.net/1959.4/39693> in <https://unsworks.unsw.edu.au> on 2024-04-19

## Cross-cultural Design Studio Teaching: Avoiding the Anthropological Lens

Thomas Loveday

UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES, SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES, 2007, AUSTRALIA

### ABSTRACT

This paper is about a studio design project for third year interior architecture students, which challenges notions of cultural identity through the milieu of politics. The studio project emerged from a recognition that traditions of interdisciplinarity, especially between the discipline of anthropology and architectural theory, have contributed to generally unreflective assumptions about the cultural identity of building designers and students. These assumptions make cross cultural design teaching problematic. Investigation led to the conclusion that through risky and new approaches to studio projects anestetised interdisciplinary assumptions can be overcome. The paper focused mostly on the theoretical context for the studio rather than the processes or outcomes within the studio. In that sense, the paper is not so much educational as theoretical and so it sets the scene for the type of studio project described.

The studio design project is based on the premise that the Communist Party of Australia, in order to remain financially viable, must adopt the same policy towards capitalism as other communist parties. In short, this means that the Communist Party of Australia will have to become involved in new open-ness, private property and, in short, a commercial venture.

The premise is then that the Communist Party of Australia agrees that the only ethical possibility is a nightclub for the workers. This, of course is a western style club in which people go to enjoy each others' company while listening to contemporary musical performances.

To where would such a project lead?

At first glance, it seems worrying that politics is being treated here as light-weight, careless and stylistic. But then the issues for design begin to emerge, as follow.

The question of the role of political ideologies in everyday life emerges for each student as they move from one country to another. Countries vary considerably in their political social and economic balances. For example, the Australian Communist Party is little more than a private club for the alienated intellectual middle class. On the other hand, in countries such as China, Communism is a major and dominant feature of everyday life. The difference between countries is not only between nominal political systems, but is also between the significance of aesthetic expression in each country. The Communist Party of Australia's aesthetics are alien to most Australians whereas in other countries, such as China, this is not so.

Students in design, who have come from a range of cultural and political settings, have a vastly different view of what politics, especially the question of political ideology, is about. The project offers a way for those differences to become

apparent without the trauma of direct ideological confrontation. This takes place within a special kind of harmonious discourse that might otherwise have been impossible. The design becomes a venue for discussion in a way that cannot be done in speech or writing.

The source of ideas for each student's design is their own experience. In this project, the question of each student's background becomes significant. It is both enlivening for international students from communist countries to see that their experience is valuable for their design work in a western university, but it is also an interesting experience for local students to see that there are other forms of experience than their own, that are important sources of ideas for design.

The success of this studio relies upon the establishment of a studio culture assembled from all students' cultural backgrounds. As such the project is not only cross cultural but deals with the lived "reality" of those cultural differences, rather than seeing cultural difference through the "anthropological lens", in which difference is treated as an "object of study before an omnipotent and omnipresent "subject". Politics is a sensitive area precisely because it is important and lively. Providing a safe and enlivened way for this sensitive area to be discussed creates a truly cross cultural experience for design students. This is why politics or more precisely the culture of politics has been chosen as the milieu for this studio project.

The paper is structured by briefly tracing the effect of anthropological lens in architecture and what to look for, followed by a short explanation of an example of the project from student work. The general method for the paper is "archeological" in the sense that philosopher Michel Foucault uses in *The Order of Things*.<sup>1</sup> Argument is by association between ideas from which links and lineages are formed and new ideas exposed. At times this can seem irrational, especially where design is discussed. This is because, for the purposes of this paper and for design teaching, design is not a rational activity.

---

<sup>1</sup> Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things*, Routledge, 1970, especially chapter 1 where Foucault explains his method.

## INTRODUCTION

This paper is based on the idea that in order to effectively teach design across several cultural backgrounds, a single creative idea is needed. Such an idea is not found by examining, through the “anthropological lens”, the cultures from which students have come. Instead, an intense, attractive and engaging idea must draw each student into the studio. The studio in effect, becomes a culture.

To see how this works, the meaning of culture has to undergo a transformation. “Culture” must leave behind the image of “heritage”, of the fixed and defined set of traits adopted by small and semi-coherent groups. Perhaps the most important feature of the anthropological view of culture that must be relinquished is the idea that cultures need to be preserved or “sustained”. Instead the image of what a culture is, needs to include a beginning and, possibly more importantly, an end.

The idea for any design studio project is a scene for a struggle between forces particular to individual’s beliefs. Mostly these do not appear except as personal differences between students as if differences are only ever personal. However, the different truths that appear between students from different countries are much more than differences of individual opinion. They are, in fact, deeply different perspectives and include religious, political and sexual beliefs that threaten the successful educational outcomes in studio design projects.

Accepting these as equally powerful or “valid” perspectives requires that one also realise the deep incompatibility of some perspectives and accepts the inevitable struggle between them, as a *productive force*.

A powerful and intense idea for a design project addresses these differences, not by denying of “oppressing” them, but by embracing the effect they have for each student’s work.

## THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL LENS

Claude Lévi-Strauss opens his seminal text *Structural Anthropology*, by describing Anthropology as emerging from the break between history and sociology, a process begun by Emile Durkheim founder of the *Année Sociologique* in the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>1</sup> Lévi-Strauss then positions anthropology against other related fields with a focus on “social anthropology”, which he defines as the study of “institutions considered as systems of representation”.<sup>2</sup>

This is the anthropological lens, which is to say the frame through which the world is viewed as an anthropological system of representation. This system is subsumed within other systems such as politics, philosophy and even history and forms one the themes in theorising practices such as architecture. Under the influence of such a lens, architecture and the education of architects, become the parts of an institution that has been conceived as a system of representation.

The various interests that work through institutions then vie for access to the system of representation by claiming to “theorise” various practices such as design. The frame through which this is carried out becomes submerged in the

processes of representation rather than the representations that they produce.<sup>3</sup>

In the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, the anthropological lens has become the rational study of “culture”, as described by the anthropologist James L Peacock, in *The Anthropological Lens: Harsh Light Soft Focus*.<sup>4</sup> In this text, Peacock reveals the relationship between anthropology and other fields and produces an “holistic” definition of anthropology. However, Peacock’s definition of anthropology does not move beyond the *logic* of the word, or *logos*. Peacock only defines anthropology holistically in terms of other *-ologies*, or academic fields, such as sociology. For Peacock, academic disciplines remain truth-telling devices for the study of culture.

In parallel with this development as well as under its continuing influence, the value of truth-telling through meaning has overtaken the value of spatial effects for architectural design. Meaning, by which truth can be determined in design has for some time been more important than effect. Even students are urged to argue for the truth value in the meaning of their designs rather than for the value of the spatial effect alone. Design becomes metaphoric, metonymic or any other linguistic figure that is presented as a design method.

Of course, as Peacock points out, anthropology has moved on and is now largely aware of the theoretical problems of its own field. No longer does mainstream anthropology study “primitive” native tribes in far away jungles, according to the structures and strictures of the western European “lens”. The problem is not with anthropology as it is now but with the use of simplistic versions of various concepts found in this particular field of history.

The anthropological lens is simply the imposition of one’s own values upon the object of one’s study.<sup>5</sup> This occurs through the terms of study, which is to say the way things are grasped and arranged. It is called a “lens” because it relies on speculative (specular) models of rational precision, such as causal logic and other forms of highly disciplined argument to form “clear and distinct” thoughts (rational knowledge). The most significant feature of the anthropological lens is that it claims absolute and universal truth and that to abandon it is to leap into madness. Therefore to avoid the anthropological lens requires not only a careful critique of one’s own way of thinking; one’s own perspective, but also a creative act in relation to that critique or an effective replacement.

## THE INFLUENCE OF THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL LENS IN DESIGN

The institution of architecture conceived as a system of representation, remains the theoretical starting point, even at key moments in its development of architectural theory. This alienates the study of architectural psychology or subjectivity from theory. The architect remains within theory and practice, as an invisible, but heroic figure identified by *his* work, rather than *his* perspective.

The influence of anthropology in design fields appears in the early 1960s in texts such as Robert Venturi’s *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*.<sup>6</sup> Published a year after the English translation of *Structural Anthropology*, this text opens the question of the representational system of

institutional architecture, which, from the theoretical tone of the time, is concerned with “form”. In this text, Venturi questions what is represented by “form” within architecture, claiming that rather than the orthodoxy of modern universal and a-historical form, complexity is always represented in or by buildings. Venturi uses the anthropological lens in a subsumed and unselfconscious way to show that modern formalism is not actually what buildings represent. Venturi uses historical case studies but does so in terms of what their form represents *as meaning*, a point he makes in the foreword to the later edition.

Venturi’s text is one of the literary markers for the end of the orthodoxy of universal or “modern” thinking, for architects. However, many architects reduced the subtleties of Venturi’s shift in perspective to a simple oppositional model whereby multiplicity was presented as “postmodern” layers of “reading” from a meta-position, “above”. For many architects and theorists of the late 1960s on, postmodernism has at times been a simplistic opposition between subtle, intellectual (academic) reading and popular meaning. Eventually the academic or “intellectual” half of this opposition became a “critical” position for architects in which to offer theoretical comment on a range of topics including society, politics and of course architecture itself. The important point here was that the “critical” function of architecture is revealed discursively as design theory, but the theoretical act itself is the design of the building.<sup>7</sup>

Daniel Libeskind’s design for the *Museum of the Holocaust*, in Berlin, illustrates this point, even though it is much later than Venturi’s text. In Libeskind’s own words, the theoretical arguments surrounding the *Jewish Museum*, are a *representation of history and culture* that expresses a critique of architecture as if it were an institution.

The design of the Jewish Museum engenders a fundamental rethinking of architecture in relation to this program. The museum exhibits the social, political and cultural history of Jews in Berlin from the 4th Century to the present.<sup>8</sup>

The building, at the same time as representing a cultural effect, expresses its critique of architecture and does so in what is now a familiar way with assertive, possibly rebellious, angular geometry. The trick, that architecture has managed, is to make us, through theoretical texts, believe that expressive geometric architecture can itself be a theoretical act at the same time as responding to a client’s brief. In other words, the aesthetics of expressive geometry is claimed to have a theoretical impact for such fields as philosophy that is somehow independent from accommodation needs. In other words, the trick is to make us believe that society needs aggressive criticism in the form of aggressive geometric buildings.

For another example, the “fold”, teased out of philosopher Gilles Deleuze’s *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque* and then appears as design in Peter Eisenman’s *Rebstock Park*, but as design that expresses *or acts philosophical*.<sup>9</sup> Eisenman describes his approach in *Rebstock Park* as a “reconsideration [of] two aspects of 20<sup>th</sup> century urbanism: space and time on the one hand and repetition and the individual on the other”.<sup>10</sup> Deleuze’s philosophical text deals with these same issues and in the same terms, a fact that Eisenman is keen to point out.

There is no doubt that Eisenman intends that *Rebstock Park* act as a philosophical statement, much like the Deleuzian text.

Architectural design, as a theoretical act, carries with it a secret meaning located in a design-text which is only accessible to those who can manage the language and through that, “read” the building.

Meanwhile, popular culture, or the meaning accessible to the people in general, is an aesthetic battleground. Reduced geometric versions of past forms, such as pediment, column and arch, have given way to thinly argued aggressive geometric caprice and the “public” has remained suspicious and yet possessive of new buildings, as can be seen in the recent controversy surround Melbourne’s *Federation Square*, designed by Lab Architecture.

The idea that design could be theoretical, philosophical or critical, was presented, by elevated authors such as Kenneth Frampton (the theoretical concept of critical regionalism) and Peter Eisenman (*Diagram Diaries*), as the natural work for architectural designers. To be critical was to express “theory”. To act theoretically is to “say” something effective within culture, which, for architects, is the *judgment of society* that had previously been submerged within the disciplines, such as anthropology.

Ironically, this influence has left design, especially architectural design, mostly unconsciousness of its own anthropological assumptions. The anthropological lens sits silently behind much of what is presented as architectural design theory and as design that is claimed to be theoretical. The many fields that come under the influence of the anthropological lens, such as the various branches of philosophy, sociology and feminist theory, also appear in architectural design theory in thin and unreflective ways.

The titles of theoretical texts, as revealed by a short glance at possibly the most detailed anthology of architectural theory of the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, shows the persistent influence of the anthropological lens and an architectural interest in related fields.<sup>11</sup>

Possibly the most deeply influenced of these is Frampton’s, *Towards a Critical Regionalism: Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance*.<sup>12</sup> The following quote illustrates the influence of the anthropological lens.

Architecture can only be sustained today as a critical practice if it assumes an *arrière-garde* position. That is to say, one which distances itself equally from the Enlightenment myth of progress and from a reactionary, unrealistic impulse to return to the architectonic forms of the preindustrial past...

The case can be made that Critical Regionalism as a cultural strategy is as much the bearer of *world culture* as it is a vehicle of *universal civilisation*...<sup>13</sup>

Frampton then argues, in a rather ambiguous way, that critical regionalism has to “deconstruct” world culture presumably to replace it with a universal mode, while at the same time and in a “synthetic contradiction”, offering a critique of its own universality.<sup>14</sup> Frampton argues that critical regionalism is a way for local conditions, cultural and physical and architectural to be included within building design. Nevertheless, critical regionalism retains a universal perspective, as if all cultures require architecture that has to

deal with the expressive needs of the individual creative genius played out against the interests of local cultures.<sup>15</sup>

The anthropological lens is really a kind of *logos of anthropomorphism* by which architecture is theorised as projection by “heroic” individuals. Like the paintings of Jackson Pollock, one is expected to stand silently before the philosophical forms that great architects give the world. The words of Pollock could easily be seen as referring to architecture:

I think that they [laymen] should not look for, but look passively – and try to receive what the painting has to offer and not bring a subject matter of preconceived idea of what they are looking for.<sup>16</sup>

Architectural design remains a struggle for self-expression that endlessly seeks new theoretical perspectives by which expressive form can be explained. The anthropological lens is behind the universal truth of architectural expression that defines and limits cultural diversity and creates the universal modern architectural world so familiar in western style cities. It is a form of cultural imperialism and denies the presence of other truths and other perspectives.

Students entering studios in which this is the case must relinquish, as they often do willingly, their own cultural perspective in favour of the universal truth of the west. The anthropological lens presents itself as a better truth than all others; as a truly international style. No wonder buildings designed by students from non-western countries within this enframing are indistinguishable from those of their local colleagues; they are learning *the* international style.

#### REM KOOLHAAS AND BIGNESS

Even scale has been used in a rather desperate way. Rem Koolhaas writes about building scale or “Bigness”,

Beyond a certain scale, architecture acquires the properties of Bigness... Bigness instigates the *regime of complexity* [reference to Venturi] that mobilizes the full intelligence of architecture and its related fields.<sup>17</sup>

Bigness is a condition “without thinkers” according to Koolhaas, so it is now revealed within architectural thinking and thereby claimed as architectural theory. His 5-point manifesto reflects conventional and rather familiar philosophical discourses of the 19th century, such as “part and whole”, the “uselessness of art” and the “Humanist expectation of ‘honesty’”.<sup>18</sup> “Bigness”, in summary reflects a naïve version of Kantian sublime, in which number or scale of phenomena cannot be, for a moment, reconciled with individual subjective self-expression.<sup>19</sup>

The sublime, as Kant emphasises, is a *feeling*, not knowledge as such.<sup>20</sup> That feeling is the feeling one gets from mentally reaching for a concept and falling back from the attempt. This occurs because the experience to which one brings a concept, is beyond the concept. Bigness is beyond the concept of scale for Koolhaas. One is in the presence of that which is beyond determinacy in concepts, sheer size. The Sublime then is the feeling of self-recognition of the limits of cognitive being and at the same time experiencing non-cognitive being.<sup>21</sup> Kant uses the example of the attempt to find a measure for “the Earth” using a “mountain’s height” and then by using the circumference of the Earth as a measure

of the Cosmos, both of which are beyond human ability to comprehend and therefore are Sublime in magnitude.<sup>22, 23</sup>

The Kantian sublime is not in relation to anything, just as “bigness” is not in relation to anything; it is just *big*. Koolhaas has offered an ecstatic subliminal “beyond” as an explanation for architecture, thereby thoroughly mystifying it, in a similar way to string theory, which can never be empirically tested because it is purely a representation. Bigness is one of the holy grails of theory: an indisputable representation of an ecstatic experience and as such the ultimately inaccessible *text*, promising a formal explanation and yet at the same time withholding it.

In short, Koolhaas is claiming “Bigness” as a way of grasping the world architecturally by grasping at philosophical mysteries. In effect he is re-inventing the Kantian Sublime as an architectural sublime. Bigness is one of latest theoretical claims for universality imbued with the anthropological lens. As the claims expand, the buildings continue to go up and the world is slowly covered with the expressive form before which we stand as silent, passive and receptive vessels before the heroic bigness of architecture.

Subsumed within a cult of individual self-expression, this form of universalism expands indefinitely, consuming ever more resources, until it reaches its natural limit; the full extent of the surface area of the Earth, and what is now recognised as an environmental catastrophe. If architecture, as we think of it now, is to survive it has to change its values, its perspective, not merely its theoretical explanation for form.

#### AVOIDING THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL LENS

The anthropological lens creates a pattern of consciousness, one that may be familiar to those from backgrounds other than the west that assumes a position of universality: *rationality*. Rationality always provides a superior position from which to “observe” culture, called “subjectivity”. A superior position is claimed in order to array the objective characteristics of a culture before the subjective “mind”. Rational knowledge is universal because it exists in a *meta*-state between the place from which it has been gained and the mind that observes it.

The problem with this is that if this is that if knowledge exists in this meta-state, how can it be communicated? All writing, art and any other form of communication are specifically and inextricably cultural (and are only ever *practices*) and therefore place all knowledge within a practiced cultural context. The universally rational mind can only ever know what it discovers *in itself*: It is a universe of one whose only effective state is, like Pollock’s viewers, silence. The illusion of communication, still largely assumed in western cultures, is that it *can* be objective.

The only way to achieve rational communication is to assume a specific cultural perspective as if it were universal. This works perfectly well while one is within one’s own cultural setting, more or less. Physicists can generally talk to each other and assume that what they say represents a context in which true universal knowledge is possible. They talk of various theories as if they were theories of what is actually there; the “real” and that the “real” is all there is. Indeed, it is the strangeness of the “real” that seems to fascinate

physicists. The language of physics is cleaned of all metaphor. For example, electrical “resistance” has a very specific meaning expressed in abstract symbols:  $R = V/I$ , in which an equation expresses a ratio, yet when each new discovery is made, metaphors burst out in the explanation; electricity is explained as if it were water in a hose, moving through a sponge, as a wave or particle and so on. Rationality then takes over to find the “truth”.

However, what alternative is there to rationality? Must we opt for a “poetic” approach to teaching design? Is this a resort to mysticism, magic and other “medieval” practices? How can I find effective and truthful knowledge in any other way than rationality?

The answer is to find a way for students express *error* and in error, find a greater value for a spatial *effect*. In other words, the answer is to replace truth-against-error with the value of spatial effect.

This will mean that beauty is not truth, nor truth beauty. Beauty becomes the overcoming power of effect. Rational truth is the assumption that one’s own beautiful effects are universally powerful and so can overcome anything.<sup>24</sup> This assumption is central to cultural imperialism and to rational notions of knowledge, revealed as universal truth in words, or as their name tells us, as *logos*. Almost all cultures that are subject to cultural imperialism are now sensitive, if not consciously reflective, about this assumption. Many cultural theorists have presented arguments to show how this assumption works.<sup>25</sup> In the studio, this assumption is a recipe for isolation and poor outcomes.

To accept cultural difference is to accept struggle between cultures, as a struggle between *equal* values, even *classes*. Strategies, such as the claim for universalism and the elimination of struggle itself, will always appear in this view of cultural competition. The task is not to eliminate competition but to divert the competitive energy into creative output, which is why the studio idea is so difficult to formulate.

#### THE IDEA FOR A STUDIO PROJECT

An idea for a studio project that does this is one that exists in similar forms in different places and under different measures of truth. Resemblance between instances is a key feature of such an idea, rather than precise truth or falsehood. Resemblance is not precise representation but brings about comparison of differences and similarities.

To find an idea for a studio, one must turn away from the conscious focus upon the task and focus look instead to instances of everyday using an outsider’s perspective or “stranger’s eye”.

#### THE CCCP

Communism is a strange effect, if one sees it just the right way. Communism is generally regarded as marginal in most English speaking, western style countries. However, in some countries, it remains an energetic, positive way of life. Communism is the “similar” cultural effect needed to create a studio project.

Between the various manifestations of communism there are differences and similarities, each of which is taken as a

“reality”. In Australia, the unkind “reality” about communism, for most Australians, is that it is a marginal intellectual position for the few remaining members of the alienated middleclass left submerged within working class nostalgia and poorly argued Marxism. This ironic view is represented very clearly in the film *Children of the Revolution*.<sup>26</sup> In China, the “reality” of communism is that it is *the* government and therefore is a nearly absolute and universal truth whose value is established by the power of its bureaucratic authority; *the party*. This “heroic” truth is expressed without a hint of irony in current posters in most Chinese cities.

Bringing these two “realities” into conjunction reveals their perspective differences and turns communism into an *effect*, which then opens up its aesthetic possibilities.

In a design studio, an idea like this must become a *design* idea through its aesthetic potential. How can a designer use this? There must be a *need* in order to make the idea effective as teaching device. For design the need is built into the project itself, as it is in design practice.

The introduction to the brief for the CCCP reads:

The project is based on the premise that the Communist Party of Australia, in order to remain financially viable, must adopt the same policy as the Chinese government towards capitalism. In short, this means that the Communist Party will have to become involved in a commercial venture. The decision has been discussed and part members agree that the only ethical venture is a nightclub for the workers. The task for interior architects is to design the new premises for the Party and the workers nightclub. The Party, in the spirit of new openness, has taken a lease on a building that suits their purpose and is ready to consult a designer. The Party has asked that a number of designer present proposals for the project and have decided that, in the interests of equity and support of the working classes in the struggle against the capitalist corporations that they will ask students to prepare the design proposals.<sup>27</sup>

#### THE STUDENT RESPONSE

Students responded to the CCCP with humour and good will. Especially gratifying was the realisation that the humour of such a project is accessible not only locals, but also non-local, overseas students. Chinese students re-examined their physical environment and saw, as if with a strange eye, the effects of communism with an aesthetic perspective. Australian students saw their own image of communism as an alienated minor and barely relevant political force, also with a renewed and strange perspective. Bringing the work to the studio revealed to all the students that rather than a “truth”, their view of communism was a cultural perspective. The expression of that perspective became a matter of pride and empowerment expressed as design.

Images of student work:



## CONCLUSION

There is something dangerous about this project. It produces nervousness in those that fear confrontation and struggle at the same time as freeing students, especially foreign students, from the fear of “academic rigour”, in this case, analysed under the term “anthropological lens”. Those of us that are prepared for the risks of losing our sense of cultural superiority seek out this type of project, enjoy the process and value the effect it has upon students.

Australia is a cultural melting pot and, despite a resurgence of Englishness flavoured with conservatism, remains one of the most culturally diverse countries in the world. For both Australian and non-Australian students, experiences in studios reflect this fact.

Australia is also largely monolingual English speaking and politically naïve. It relies upon older, larger and economically more powerful countries with a similar outlook to show it the way in most areas, including politics. Recently this focus has shifted to Asian countries as even our most conservative political leaders have begun to recognise this. However, when the Berlin wall was taken down and The USSR fragmented, Australia breathed a sigh of relief along with the European countries with which it identified. The “far left”, as communism is known in Australia, is unfamiliar to most Australians and in most cases represents something at least vaguely threatening. Culturally, communism represents something very different in China. The difference between these two contrasting cultural images of communism can be the foundation of a studio culture that results in new ideas in building design for both Australian and non-Australian students.

Avoiding the anthropological lens is fast becoming a necessity for the survival of many educational systems as indeed it has in most globalised cultures. This project is a very small step in the process of acceptance of recognizing and embracing difference, even when that difference confronts the various assumptions about culture within design education.

<sup>1</sup> Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*, Peregrine Books, 1963, p. 1-3. See introductory page for reference to Emile Durkheim.

<sup>2</sup> Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*, Peregrine Books, 1963, p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> The idea of “paper architecture” becomes a “process” of design in which identity, politics and society are “theorized”, but this is not the main argument of this paper.

<sup>4</sup> James L Peacock, *The Anthropological Lens: Harsh Light Soft Focus*, Cambridge University Press, 2001. It is not possible to present a more thorough explication of anthropology here, except to note that the transition from a structural orthodoxy to post-structural approaches in anthropology mirrors the general social change in the late 1960s, which is reflected in architectural theory.

<sup>5</sup> Of course, this approach is part of the general culture strategy of the expansive European Enlightenment, but the form in which it is described here is particularly strong for architecture.

<sup>6</sup> Robert Venturi, *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*, Published by The Museum of Modern Art, 2002 (first published 1966).

<sup>7</sup> Academics have struggled with this point in an attempt to show how design is research. This reflects the parallel in art where the insistence on the political meaning of art that has become essential to an art if it is to be used as research in some institutions.

<sup>8</sup> Daniel Libeskind’s website <http://www.daniel-libeskind.com/projects/pro.html?ID=2> 5/3/2007.

<sup>9</sup> Peter Eisenman, Plan for *Rebstock Park*, Frankfurt am Main, 1990.

<sup>10</sup> Peter Eisenman, *Folding In Time: The Singularity of Rebstock Park*, in the journal, *Architectural Design*, titled *Folding In Architecture*, Revised Edition, Wiley Press, 2004, p. 40.

<sup>11</sup> Charles Jencks and Konrad Kropf, *Theories and Manifestoes of Contemporary Architecture*, Wiley-Academy Press, 2003.

---

<sup>12</sup> Kenneth Frampton, *Towards a Critical Regionalism: Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance*, in Charles Jencks and Konrad Kropf, *Theories and Manifestoes of Contemporary Architecture*, Wiley-Academy Press, 2003, pp. 97-100.

<sup>13</sup> Kenneth Frampton, *Towards a Critical Regionalism: Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance*, in Charles Jencks and Konrad Kropf, *Theories and Manifestoes of Contemporary Architecture*, Wiley-Academy Press, 2003, pp. 97-8.

<sup>14</sup> Frampton uses “deconstruction” in an ambiguous way to mean both a critique, as it should be and, as is often the case, mistakenly, as demolition.

<sup>15</sup> There is a kind of chauvinism in this idea which says that only I, the architect, can fully appreciate the local cultural conditions as architecture. Perhaps an alternative is to abandon expansive development and to let the locals design their own architecture and build their own buildings.

<sup>16</sup> Harrison, Charles and Wood, Paul (Eds), 1992. *Art In Theory, 1900-1990, An Anthology of Changing Ideas*, Blackwell, USA, p. 575.

<sup>17</sup> Rem Koolhaas, *Bigness: or the Problem of the Large*, in Jencks, C and Kropf, K, *Theories and Manifestoes of Contemporary Architecture*, Wiley-Academy, USA, 2003, p. 307.

<sup>18</sup> Jencks, C and Kropf, K, *Theories and Manifestoes of Contemporary Architecture*, Wiley-Academy, USA, 2003, p. 307-8.

<sup>19</sup> Kant, Immanuel (trans, Werner S Pluhar), *Critique of Judgment*, Hackett Publishing Company, 1987 (first published 1790), pp. 97-208, *Book II Analytic of the Sublime*

<sup>20</sup> Kant, Immanuel, 1987 (first published 1790) (trans, Werner S Pluhar), *Critique of Judgment*, Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis Cambridge, p. 100. The Sublime, as it is described in Critique of Judgment under pins the 20<sup>th</sup> century versions, especially in French theory and so will be the starting point for this discussion.

<sup>21</sup> Kant, Immanuel, 1987 (first published 1790) (trans, Werner S Pluhar), *Critique of Judgment*, Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis Cambridge, p. 112.

<sup>22</sup> Kant, Immanuel, 1987 (first published 1790) (trans, Werner S Pluhar), *Critique of Judgment*, Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis Cambridge, p. 113.

<sup>23</sup> It should be noted here that while Kant uses magnitude as an *example* of the sublime, there is no need for it to be the only aspect of being in which the sublime can be found. Any sensory element could be found sublime. This is because all sense phenomena are necessarily incomplete and only indicative of a world-in-itself, in Kantian philosophy. The Kantian division between Phenomena and Noumena is between objects of experience and those of thought. Those of thought itself are the intuited things in themselves and Phenomena are those to which thought is brought. The Sublime breaks the distinction between Phenomena and Noumena. The sublime in smell, for example, would be that which cannot be identified and yet remains demanding of attention, as both a thought brought to experience and an intuited thought. As such, the sublime is destruction of subjectivity.

<sup>24</sup> The text from which this idea enters architectural aesthetics is Goerg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Introductory Lectures On Aesthetics*, Penguin, London, UK, 1993 (First Published in this translation 1886, but much older). It was a popular text in Australian universities even in the 1970s.

<sup>25</sup> See, Edward Soja, *Thirdspace*, Blackwell Press, USA, 1996 and Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, Routledge, 1994.

<sup>26</sup> *Children of the Revolution*, Peter Duncan Director, starring Richard Roxburgh, Australia, 1996.

<sup>27</sup> Tom Loveday, *CCCP Studio Brief*, 2006, “Introduction”