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ABSTRACT

This inquiry investigates the cultural meaning of architecture, and the notion that different cultures produce and experience space differently. This investigation focuses on cultural issues of space and place as related to ethnicity, gender and their combination. The site of inquiry is the University of British Columbia, a postsecondary educational institution founded on philosophies, ideologies, and values grounded in British scholastic traditions. The university, which is situated on traditional Musqueam land, and which has a large student population representative of diverse cultures, provides a unique site of study. Within the institutionalized spaces of the university, alternative educational spaces have emerged and coexist.

For the purpose of this inquiry the university is considered as the dominant norm with the three alternative sites representative of cultures of difference. The alternative sites included in the study are the Centre for Studies in Curriculum Instruction, the First Nations House of Learning, and the Centre for Research in Women's Studies and Gender Relations. The institutionalized spaces of the university are not experienced by all cultures in the same way. They are viewed as Western cultural constructs of space that differ from and are often incommensurable with cultures of difference. Given the cultural location of the user of the space, based on ethnicity and, or gender, the institutionalized spaces of the university are experienced differently.

The objectives of this investigation are: to view knowledge as a spatial construct; to view the differences of cultural constructs of space as to race, ethnicity and gender within educational sites; and to view the multiplicity of the cultural meanings of a space given the cultural location of the observer moving through that space. The methodological approach applied to this study is a discursive historical spatial analysis inclusive of architectural drawings, conceptual drawings and plans, maps, archival research, on-site spatial analysis, and participant meetings with users and “conceptualizers” of the respective sites.

Although each alternative site is representative of cultural differences, diverse philosophical processes and spatial practices, commonalities emerged such as notions of cultural inclusion, embracing difference, alternative ways of knowing, alternative ways of constructing knowledge, repositioning “other,” community, placemaking, and creating a spirit of place.
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Chapter One
Culturally Inclusive Methodologies for the Analysis of Space

I believe, that we would not have had empire itself, as well as many forms of historiography, anthropology, sociology, and modern legal structures, without important philosophical and imaginative processes at work in the production as well as the acquisition, subordination, and settlement of space.

Edward Said, 2000, 308

One of the basic elements of the relationship between oppressor and oppressed is prescription. Every prescription represents the imposition of one individual’s choice over another, transforming the consciousness of the person prescribed to into one that conforms with the prescriber’s consciousness. Thus, the behaviour of the oppressed is a prescribed behaviour, following as it does the guidelines of the oppressor.

Paulo Freire, 1997, 28-29

1.1 Introduction

Edward Said argues that philosophical and imaginative processes are at work in the production of space, inclusive of the acquisition, subordination, and settlement of space. The production of space and its corresponding modes of production are informed by philosophical processes. Paulo Freire argues that one of the relational elements between oppressor and oppressed is prescription, that is guidelines that are used as a tool to control behaviour. He maintains that it is through prescription that one individual’s choice is imposed on another, “transforming the consciousness of the person prescribed to, into one that conforms with the prescriber’s consciousness.” Within a hegemonic culture, such as Western culture, philosophical processes that inform the production of space become prescriptive processes, for controlling behaviour through the spatial ordering of society. Guidelines formed by the dominant culture become prescriptions for establishing control, conformity to a dominant spatial “norm.”

Thomas Markus, architect and professor, posits that text and design are a prescription for building. Texts that may inform building are inclusive of government acts, council minutes, competition briefs, building legislation, or design guides. He maintains that prescriptions are not always written texts but may be graphic “texts” as well, as that of architectural drawings.
Hence the combination of written text and graphic drawing becomes a prescription for building. He further maintains that prescriptive drawings often carry “covert symbolic statements where overt verbal ones might be unacceptable.” Architectural texts, such as “stylistic prescriptions were a major export to the colonies of European countries.”

This inquiry examines, more specifically in relation to educational institutions, the ways in which Western building culture has become prescriptive, whereby architecture and spatial constructs have become apparatuses for establishing hegemonic “norms” in the spatial ordering of society. Cultures of difference do not all construct, produce, and inhabit space in the same ways. One of the challenges for cultures of difference, within the spatial organization of Western culture, is to create spaces, places that are reflective of their own cultural philosophies, values, and practices.

The site for this spatial inquiry is the University of British Columbia located on a ridge of land overlooking the Pacific Ocean to the west, English Bay to the north, and the city of Vancouver to the east. The original and subsequent university plans situate the main axis of the site along an upper ridge that extends north-south, with western and eastern slopes. Buildings, public spaces, pedestrian walks, and landscaping are organized according to a hierarchy of spaces and places. Upon this topography, principle buildings representing the primary disciplines are located along the main north-south axis, Main Mall, and secondary disciplines and student service buildings are located along the sloping East and West Malls.

The university site, which is located on traditional Musqueam territory, is unceded land. However, it is more within the last three decades that stronger connections have developed between the university and First Nations peoples of Canada. Closer connections are progressing as related to the development of First Nations educational programs, and in facilitating the inclusion and active participation of First Nations students within the academic life of the university. The university student population is approximately forty thousand. The enrolment figures reported in the UBC Student Calendar for the academic year 2002 to 2003 indicate that close to sixty per cent of the student population are women. The number of women students does vary from discipline to discipline however. The student
population is becoming increasingly more representative of the cultural plurality of the city of Vancouver. As such cultural issues of space and place are meaningful and relevant within the academic life of the university.

The original design and planning for the university was firmly located within a traditional British scholastic system. Subsequent campus building and planning has been epistemic. Nevertheless, there has been a continuum and an adherence to the original design and the grid system. In the 1950s and 1960s compliance to an architectural Gothic collegiate style gave way to a universalist modernist style. Both approaches to university architecture can be critiqued, with the former representative of colonialism and imperialism, and the latter representative of a universalist approach.

This inquiry posits that Western constructs of space, which are produced as “universal norms” are not considered the “norm” for other cultures. The institutionalized spaces of the university are not experienced by all cultures in the same way. They are viewed as Western cultural constructs of space that differ from and are often incommensurable with cultures of difference. Given the cultural location of the user of the space, based on ethnicity and, or gender, the institutionalized spaces of the university are experienced differently.

This inquiry investigates the cultural meaning of architecture, and the notion that different cultures produce and experience space differently. This investigation is situated within the spaces and places of the University of British Columbia. The university as an educational site, situated on traditional Musqueam land, provides a unique site of study. Within the institutionalized spaces of the university, alternative educational spaces have emerged and coexist; alternative sites representative of cultural differences as to ideologies, education, and constructs of space. Three of these alternative educational sites are investigated in relation to the larger university site: the Centre for Studies in Curriculum Instruction; the First Nations House of Learning; and the Centre for Women’s Studies and Gender Relations. For the purposes of this inquiry the university is considered as the dominant “norm” with the three alternative sites representative of cultures of difference.
The term "site" as applied in this inquiry is invested with multiple meanings: geographic, architectural, phenomenological, and cultural. Site is used to denote the geographical location of the university, as well as an architectural term to indicate the physical site of a building. It is employed in a phenomenological sense as in Martin Heidegger's use of the word site to indicate a location or place. Site is also invested with a multiplicity of culturally informed meanings as in sites of cultures of difference, and sites of resistance. The different meanings of the word overlap and are interdependent in their complexity.

My argument is developed across eight chapters. In Chapter One, I present my research inquiry, a culturally inclusive methodological approach for the analysis of space, and I examine possible ways of decolonizing methodologies and historical inquiries through spatial analysis. Chapter Two, focuses on theoretical framings of concepts of space and culture, and current architectural discourses that intersect with cultural theory around issues of space and place. In Chapter Three, I examine historical moments in Western culture from the late sixteenth century on that contributed to the production of public educational spaces. Chapter Four, provides an overview of the history of the original design of the university and subsequent campus plans that continue to inform the spatial organization of the site. Chapters Five, Six, and Seven, present the oral histories of the "users" of the alternative spaces, according to the respective sites. In reference to these three chapters, the oral histories and theoretical perspectives presented are directly related to the cultural location(s) of the site. Recognizing that I have structured this argument, and thereby established limitations, I have nevertheless, in relation to the alternative site studies, shifted from the position of "I" to the voices of the users of the spaces, to allow for different ways of knowing, and different ways of producing space to emerge. An objective of this inquiry is to allow spaces for voices to come forth that provide counter positions to mainstream theories and discourses, thereby allowing for culturally located positions to come forward. In Chapter Eight, which is the summary of this inquiry, I examine commonalities that emerged from the culturally diverse sites, and further examine these alternative positions in relation to the theoretical framings around notions of space, place, and culture.
1.2 Research Inquiry

Do concepts of space inform the production of education? The premise of this inquiry is that philosophies, ideologies, and values are culturally constructed, and are disseminated through language, spoken and written, and through the ways that we “inhabit” space(s). Culturally constructed philosophies, ideologies, and values inform and produce the spaces we “inhabit,” and through extension and coexistence inform and produce educational systems. What is critical to this project is that one informs the other; ideologies, values, and spaces do not exist and act independently of one another, but are intrinsically and intricately interconnected.

Key to this project is that space is culturally constructed. The ideologies that shape a culture also shape the space and spaces that are “inhabited” by that culture. There are three main trajectories to this project. The first trajectory is the positioning of the dominant (Western) society as a culture that is constructed through and by its ideologies, philosophies, values systems and traditions. The second trajectory is that cultures produce spaces that extend and coexist with their ideologies, philosophies, and value systems. The third trajectory is that education is a system that is a cultural extension of a given society's ideologies and spatial organizations.

The purpose of this inquiry is (1) to identify multiple and diverse cultural constructs of space; and (2) to investigate the ways in which cultural constructs of space inform, produce, and coexist with educational systems. The methodological approach, applied to this interdisciplinary and intercultural project, is a historical spatial approach; a spatial analysis of “histories of spaces.” For the purpose of this analysis race, ethnicity, and gender are considered as cultural constructs.

This research inquiry is situated within the three knowledge bases of architecture, cultural theory, and educational studies, and draws from current discourses and theories in Women’s Studies and Gender Relations, and First Nations Studies. The objectives of this investigation are: (1) to view knowledge as a spatial construct; (2) to view the differences of cultural constructs of space as to race, ethnicity and gender within educational sites; and (3) to view
the multiplicity of the cultural meanings of a space given the cultural location of the observer moving through that space.

As part of this discursive historical inquiry, I conducted a spatial analysis of the site studies through architectural drawings, inclusive of conceptual drawings and plans, maps, archival research, on-site spatial analysis, and participant meetings with "users" and "conceptualizers" of the respective sites. Archival research was also inclusive of the First Nations Housing of Learning (FNHL) building archives located at the Xwi7Xwa library and the Department of Campus and Community Planning of UBC.

First, preliminary research was carried out to determine the scope of the archival holdings for each site. Second, meetings were held with the director of each site to discuss the scope of my research inquiry and to determine the responsiveness of each site as to inclusion in this study. The meetings all went well and the responses were favourable and supportive. In initial meetings and discussions with the FNHL Director, the discussions centred around the focus of the inquiry as a study of cultural constructs of space and their coexistence with educational philosophies and value systems. The methodology discussed was a spatial analysis of the First Nations House of Learning.

As this research project is an interdisciplinary inquiry situated within multiple fields of knowledge, encompassing architecture, cultural theory, education, gender studies, and First Nations Studies, it was necessary to mediate the methodological approach between the diverse and disparate knowledge bases. The methodological approach was further complicated in that this study is also intercultural. Given the interdisciplinary and intercultural nature of this inquiry, the application of traditional discipline-based academic methodological approaches was polemical. It was necessary to mediate the methodological approach amongst the diverse interest groups both on advisory and participatory levels.

Mediation of the methodology took about a year. A spatial analysis consistent with architectural research was acceptable to the FNHL. However, spatial analysis as a mode of inquiry was not familiar to the Faculty of Education. It was neither considered a meta-
analysis nor an acceptable mode of inquiry. More traditional methodological approaches of
the field of education, as quantitative, qualitative, and ethnographic approaches were
incommensurable with and contested by First Nations scholars. Through extensive
consultation with First Nations scholars within and outside the university, and in consultation
with research advisors, it was determined that the mode of inquiry would be a historical
inquiry, with a spatial analysis as a critical part of the inquiry.

Early in the study it was determined that there would be three site studies. One of the
arguments against including three sites as opposed to one or two was the amount of time that
would be involved. The problem of focusing on one site study was that it would not show the
multiplicity and diversity of cultural constructs of space. The problem of two sites was that
the study then risked becoming a binary study, a duality. It was then determined that the
research inquiry would be inclusive of three sites.

In the development of this research project, problematics of the study for the First Nations
House of Learning were discussed with the Director. Issues included a non-Aboriginal
person conducting the study, the number of sites involved, participants, terminology and
language sensitivity. One of the principle issues was that of non-native researching
experiences of native. FNHL agreed with the premise of my dissertation but would have
preferred a First Nations student to conduct this study. Another issue was the discussion of
one site study. The FNHL direction would not accept the House of Learning as the only site
study but would participate in context with other sites; in the context of the FNHL as a site
within UBC and as a separate site. The issue of terminology was problematic in relation to
terms such as critical pedagogy, race, and marginalized culture. There was not an objection
to the use of the terms but recognition that these terms were problematic for many First
Nations scholars. Language sensitivity was an issue, in particular with the term “case study”
which was considered to be an ethnographic term. The terminology used was that of “site
study,” a term more consistent with an architectural spatial analysis. A contentious issue was
the inclusion of First Nations students in the participant meetings. Even though the
methodology applied was a participatory approach in the gathering of oral histories, the
administration of the FNHL insisted on the non-involvement of First Nations students.
Objection to including First Nations students’ experiences on campus was based on the position that it could be potentially emotive and too sensitive a topic for students. The direction of the House of Learning did not want First Nations students to be perceived as objects of research, as Aboriginal students face challenges within the institutionalized spaces of the university, which are difficult enough. As the academy is becoming more inclusive of Aboriginal scholars and students, more written accounts of native histories, experiences, and ways of constructing knowledge are emerging. Looking at ways in which Aboriginal experiences have been spatialized by and within Western culture is a relatively nascent area of study.

The direction of the First Nations House of Learning approved the questions and content of discussion for the participant meetings, and content of consent forms. In relation to the FNHL’s participation in this project there were some requirements. One of the requirements was that the study would be inclusive of Aboriginal evidence. A second requirement was that there would be a separate consent form for FNHL participants. A third requirement was a statement as to the significance of the contribution of this study for the House of Learning. A fourth requirement was that the FNHL would have the option of viewing the chapter on the House of Learning site.

As this study included human participation, an ethical review application was made to the Ethical Review Board of the University of British Columbia. The ethical review application to conduct this study was written, submitted to, and accepted by the Board. The research was conducted within the ethical standards of the University of British Columbia Ethical Review Board. The ethical review application outlined the title, purpose and objectives of the project, summary of methodology and procedures, description of population, subjects excluded from participation, recruitment of participants, location of the project, location of the participant meetings, duration of the meetings, access to data, confidentiality, list of questions for participant meetings, and consent forms with covering letters. In relation to the First Nations House of Learning site, First Nations’ protocol was followed.
There were two to four participants from each of the respective sites: the Centre for Studies in Curriculum Instruction (CSCI); First Nations House of Learning (FNHL); and the Centre for Research in Women's Studies and Gender Relations (WMST). For the CSCI and the WMST, faculty and students participated. For the FNHL, faculty and the architect participated. The criteria for selection of participants were that they must have participated as (1) users of the space, or (2) participated in the spatial conceptualization. All participants were initially contacted by the director of each site. At each meeting, a consent form was presented to the participant and signed before the meeting began (see Appendix A). The questions were presented in a printed format to the participant followed by a brief review of the questions (see Appendix C). The duration of the meeting was an hour and a half. When necessary a second meeting was held to review transcripts. The meetings were recorded and notes were taken. A tape recorder was used to record the meetings with the permission of the participants. The tapes were then transcribed. The meetings took place at the respective educational sites in seminar rooms.

1.3 Methodological Approach for the Analysis of Space

My approach to this project is to investigate cultural differences; different ways of knowing, and different ways of constructing and producing spaces that inform pedagogy and place. The methodological approach applied to this inquiry, a historical spatial approach, is a spatial analysis of diverse cultural histories of educational spaces. This historical spatial approach is not a meta-history nor a meta-analysis but a spatial analysis based on multiple histories of spaces from the position of the respective culture. Key to this approach is that the methodology is culturally relevant and respectful to all communities who are participating, and where appropriate that the gathering of information is inclusive of Aboriginal evidence of Aboriginal histories of spaces.

It is critical to the interdisciplinary and intercultural nature of this project, and in respect to First Nations communities and all the communities that participated in this project that the mode of investigation, methodology, be culturally relevant. Emerging Aboriginal academic writing and discourse indicate that the traditional Eurocentric methodologies, as quantitative, qualitative, and ethnographic studies, are incommensurable with Aboriginal philosophies and
values. To implement a Eurocentric model would be to superimpose a universal model of the
dominant (Western) society on another culture. To superimpose one cultural model on
another would negate any knowledges of "difference." As such, this spatial inquiry and
analysis is inclusive of oral and written histories, archival research, maps and architectural
drawings, site observations, participant meetings, women's histories of spaces, and
Aboriginal evidence of Aboriginal histories of spaces.

One of the problematics in carrying out this project was that in spite of all attempts to subvert
perceived colonial and imperialist research methods, resistance to this project was still
encountered from indigenous scholars who take a position against non-Aboriginal academics
writing about indigenous ways of knowing. In view of the research abuses and the severe
consequences for indigenous communities, I respect and support many of these arguments.
One of the arguments is that of authority over the word, and authority over one's own culture
and history. Another well-founded argument is based on resistance to superimposing thought
processes, ideologies, and research methods of dominant societies on indigenous peoples
who have "experienced unrelenting research of a profoundly exploitative nature."\(^{13}\)

My counter-argument to this is one of overcoming boundaries, limitations, hierarchies, and
incommensurabilities of ideologies, value systems, and traditions to allow for a space or
spaces to dialogue; not to superimpose nor subsume nor to subjugate one model over another,
but to recognize and respect differences, and to encourage awareness of differences. In order
to accomplish this in some space at some moment resistance needs to give way to respectful
dialogue.\(^{14}\)

Although my research methodology is informed by Henri Lefebvre's concept of space as
physical, mental, and social, it is not the intent of this project to impose a Eurocentric,
patriarchal model onto the sites. One of the aims of this project is that it is a participatory
study inclusive of the voices of the "users" and "inhabitants" of all the sites, including First
Nations voices and Aboriginal evidence. In respect to the sites, meetings were intended to be
participatory with the "users" of the sites as participants, not as objects of a study. The
questions for the participants were organized in three parts and focused on histories of spaces
of the sites, educational practices, and the interrelationships between spatial constructs and educational practices. The questions for the participants were open and fluid, to give the participants the space to respond from experience. This study was also participatory in the sense of including the directors of the sites in the process. The direction of the FNHL participated in the design of the questions, content of discussion, and content of consent forms. This project is considered as a small step in learning about cultural differences in relation to space, and in relation to the notion of place within educational sites.

Critical to encouraging respectful dialogue is the space or spaces in which the dialogue takes place. Finding an appropriate space is one of the most difficult aspects in generating dialogue. Given that buildings and the spaces within buildings are culturally constructed, remnants of ideologies and value systems of the dominant (Western) culture are embedded in the architecture of the buildings of the university, and function as ever-present reminders of past and present oppression for marginalized cultures. To resist the spatial presence of the dominant culture, participant meetings for this project took place in the “home” site of the participants.

Certainly, one of the challenges of this project was the methodology that would be applied to carry out the inquiry. The methodological approach was complicated by the interdisciplinary and intercultural dimensions of the project. Investigating alternative educational philosophies and spaces, which subvert institutionalized practices also required subverting institutionalized methodologies.

1.4 Decolonizing Methodology

Traditional methodologies are viewed as extended disciplines of the institutionalized discourses of the academy, which Said refers to as “academically regulated discourse.” Methodological practices of research employed by the academy have been critiqued both within and outside the academy by marginalized, indigenous, ethnic, and gendered cultures. Within the academy, feminist and indigenous scholars have challenged the hegemony of Western epistemologies that shape history, research and writing. Linda Tuhiwai Smith and Stuart Hall argue that Western theories about history and research are based on a cultural
system of classification and representation, which reinforce Western ideologies about human nature, gender, race, space, and time.\textsuperscript{16} Said and Smith, both argue that from an indigenous perspective history, theory, and writing, which are all interconnected, are discourses of imperialism. They are emotive words, constant reminders of the "thousands of ways in which indigenous languages, knowledges and cultures have been silenced or misrepresented, ridiculed or condemned in academic and popular discourses."\textsuperscript{17}

In \textit{Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples}, Smith claims that the word "research" is "one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world's vocabulary."\textsuperscript{18} In the histories of the world's colonized peoples, research is implicated in the worst excesses of colonialism. Smith further argues that:

> It galls us that Western researchers and intellectuals can assume to know all that it is possible to know of us, on the basis of their brief encounters with some of us. It appalls [sic] us that the West can desire, extract and claim ownership of our ways of knowing, our imagery, the things we create and produce, and then simultaneously reject the people who created and developed those ideas and seek to deny them further opportunities to be creators of their own culture and own nations.\textsuperscript{19}

One of the principle concerns of indigenous peoples is the ideologies that inform research practices. Smith argues that research is written within a specific scientific or disciplinary approach, with the exception of feminist research, and as such it is not possible to discuss research methodology and indigenous peoples without understanding the ways in which knowledge is constructed by imperial and colonial practices.\textsuperscript{20} Ethnography, quantitative, and qualitative research are viewed as disciplines and methodological tools used to codify difference and to reinforce "various evolutionary schemes going from primitive to subject races, and finally to superior or civilized peoples."\textsuperscript{21} The science of ethnographic observation, an extension of European authority and superiority, is viewed as an effective system that applies tools of analysis, images, and notions to support Eurocentric views of barbarism, primitivism and civilization. Said argues that Darwinism, Christianity, Utilitarianism, idealism, racial theory, all affirm "the superlative values of white civilization."\textsuperscript{22}
A principle concern of the modernist project for colonized peoples is the Western ideology of who was human and who was not. Smith argues that the racialization by the West of the human subject and systems of social ordering enabled comparisons to be made between the West and the other. Smith further argues that history was inclusive only of those who were regarded as fully human, and others that were not regarded as human were classified as pre-historic and determined not capable of self-actualization.

One of the main works of the twentieth century to break with traditional historical theories and practices is Michel Foucault's *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. In this work, Foucault posits that whereas the history of thought, of knowledge, and of philosophy seeks more discontinuities, the practice of "history itself appears to be abandoning the irruption of events in favour of stable structures." He argues that historical practices have shifted from questioning the validity of "truth," "authenticity" of the document, to rigorous disciplinary techniques which "organize[s] the document, divides it up, distributes it, orders it, arranges it in levels, establishes series, distinguishes between what is relevant and what is not, discovers elements, defines unities, describes relations." History is now the work expended on material documentation as texts, registers, acts, buildings, institutions, laws, techniques, which according to Foucault "exists, in every time and place, in every society, either in a spontaneous or in a consciously organized form [...] history is one way in which a society recognizes and develops a mass of documentation with which it is inextricably linked." I would argue here that one of the problematics of Foucault’s analysis of history as one of material documentation is that it does not take into account the histories of indigenous cultures which are based on oral traditions.

Foucault describes historical analysis, as a discourse of the continuous with human consciousness as the subject of all historical development, as two sides of the same system of thought. This system, which has dominated since the early nineteenth century preserves against all decentrings to the extent in Foucault’s words: "we felt a particular repugnance to conceiving of difference." What Foucault is arguing here is that a historical system, which had as its ideological core the pursuit of origins blocks any discontinuities or differences. It is
this same system that reconstructed as in Orientalism, or removed as in gender, or erased as with indigenous peoples, the histories of others.

It is this historical analysis of human consciousness as the subject, and what constitutes human, that is the basis of Smith’s critique of Western historicism. Smith claims that ideas about defining people as human or not human were encoded in colonial discourses and embedded in systems of classification, hierarchies of race and typologies of different societies.\textsuperscript{29}

By the end of the nineteenth century, Foucault argues, the brief decentring of Western history through Marxist views was replaced by a “search for a total history, in which all the differences of a society might be reduced to a single form, to the organization of a worldview, to the establishment of a system of values, to a coherent type of civilization.” He critiques the closed, immobility of such a system which “opposes the living openness of history,”\textsuperscript{30} and states that “it is a long time now since historians uncovered, described, and analyzed structures, without ever having occasion to wonder whether they were not allowing the living, fragile, pulsating ‘history’ to slip through their fingers.”\textsuperscript{31} Robert Young suggests that it is in the work of Foucault that “we find the most unrelenting offensive against historicists’ theories of history.”\textsuperscript{32}

Foucault attempts to define a method of historical analysis freed from old philosophies, totalizing theories, and purged of all anthropological themes.\textsuperscript{33} He asks us to question the divisions and distinctions between established disciplines and discourses in respect to the categories, systems of classifications, normative rules, and institutionalized types on which they are based. His argument here is that these divisions of knowledge, which came about in the nineteenth century and which are still applied today to historical analysis “when first formulated, were distributed, divided, and characterized in a quite different way.” These categories, classifications, divisions of knowledge and discourse “are not intrinsic, autochthonous, and universally recognizable characteristics.”\textsuperscript{34} This is also one of Said’s main arguments, that it is the tendency of the West to universalize the world’s history.
Foucault argues that an analysis of a discursive field is orientated in a quite different way to traditional historical analysis. Discursive analysis establishes correlations with other statements and is inclusive of the discontinuities, the invisible discursive groups, the silent discourses, and what has previously been excluded. According to Foucault, this form of analysis seeks out the coexistence of discourses, “their mutual functioning, their reciprocal determinations, and their independent or correlative transformation.”

Said considers the genealogical work of Foucault to be formidable, but considers his inquiries still to be within the Western tradition. Said further disrupts Foucault’s rupture of Western discourses and disciplines and argues that one of the canons of modern intellectual history is the development of dominant discourses and disciplinary traditions in fields of scientific, social, and cultural inquiry of which the paradigms for these inquiries are exclusively Western sources. A critique of Foucault’s theory of discourse analysis is that he did not extend it far enough in examining discourses of marginalized peoples. That Foucault’s work on discourse analysis as a new form of historical inquiry remains exclusively within Western sources is one of the recurring critiques of his work. I would argue that Foucault disrupts/irrupts Western historical structures sufficiently to allow for alternative approaches, voices, and ways of knowing, to the hegemonic ideologies of Western historicism.

The vast number of critiques of Foucault’s work can be attributed to its extensive range and his own resistance to its categorization. Throughout his projects he is continuously revising his “discursive epistemology” which undergoes profound changes from the earlier works such as The Archaeology of Knowledge to later works such as Discipline and Punish. Foucault’s preoccupation with history has been consistent throughout his work. The Latin American scholar Roman de la Campa describes Foucault’s work as a divided corpus, the Foucault of Postcolonialism and the Foucault of Postmodernism. Within de la Campa’s critique, he also suggests that there is a critical terrain in Foucault’s work, which he calls a third space. Benigno Trigo describes this third space as “discourse’s ambivalence of or refusal to place subjects in symmetrical or dialectical relations of power.”
There have been further irruptions in philosophy of history and scientific historical inquiry through Postmodernism, Postcolonialism, Cultural Studies, Subaltern Studies, and Feminist theories. These irruptions have made it possible for marginalized cultures to begin to voice, to include, and to reconstitute their histories, according to their own philosophies, ideologies, and value systems. One of the most vigorous debates in cultural theory concerns the relation of theory to history. Young claims that history continues to be a deeply problematic concept. He argues that it is colonialism, which has implicated history and theory and "continues to determine both the institutional conditions of knowledge as well as the terms of contemporary institutional practices — practices which extend beyond the limits of the academic institution." Young proposes that not only is it necessary to present an alternative form of history but it is also necessary to have a different framework for thinking about it.

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, we are witnessing the emergence of new discourses of history in the discourses of postcolonialism, decolonization, and of a new humanism, which is inclusive of indigenous struggles to assert and claim humanity. Smith argues that it is necessary for colonized peoples "to decolonize our minds, to recover ourselves, to claim a space in which to develop a sense of authentic humanity." As Smith succinctly states, the cultural archive of humanity does not embody one unitary system of knowledge but multiple traditions of knowledge and ways of knowing.

Critical to the decolonization of history is to subvert an ethnocentric production of history. Said remarks on the asymmetry of the history of the West in that the "tendency in anthropology, history, and cultural studies in Europe and the United States is to treat the whole of world history as viewable by a kind of Western super-subject, whose historicizing and disciplinary rigour either takes away or, in the post-colonial period, restores history to peoples and cultures 'without' history." An underlying concern of Postcolonialism is based on the assumption of dominant Western cultures that marginalized peoples did not have a history, or histories before colonization. As stated by Said it is the view of the West that "the outlying regions of the world have no life, history, or culture to speak of, no independence or integrity worth representing without the West." One of the principle claims of Postcolonialism is the violent disruption by imperial powers of independent histories and
cultures of other societies. The violence of colonialism over marginalized peoples was also attested to in the writings of Frantz Fanon. Smith also argues that colonialism brought disorder to colonized peoples, often violently disrupting indigenous peoples from their histories, landscapes, social systems, and ways of knowing and interacting with the world, which Smith calls a "process of systematic fragmentation." Fanon speaks of this fragmentation, and of the reconstructing of these fragments "by the other, the white man, who had woven me out of a thousand details, anecdotes, stories."

For the purpose of this project the interpretation and application of the terms of imperialism and colonialism are that of Edward Said. Said analyzes imperialism as a geo-political and economic project. He uses the term "imperialism" to mean the practice, theory, attitudes of a dominating metropolitan centre ruling a distant territory; and the term "colonialism" as the implanting of settlements on that distant territory. Said argues that history, research, and writing are imperial colonial tools and are directly related to the imperialist project. The imperial society and that power take a discursive form in reshaping and reordering "raw" data into the local conventions and systematics of disciplinary order "premised on the silence of the native."

Theories and practices that inform historical inquiry are culturally constructed. Historical inquiry is informed and shaped by the ideologies and philosophies of the hegemonic culture. Prevailing discourses from outside and inside dominant cultures argue for the decentring of ethnocentric, anthropocentric research inquiries. Current discourses in Postcolonialism, Cultural Studies, and Feminist Studies support the claim that all forms of research inquiry whether scientific or that of the social sciences inclusive of ethnography, quantitative, and qualitative research are all part of the larger historical ideology of (Western) dominant societies, and have been instrumental in the subjugating and silencing of marginalized cultures be it cultures that are constructed by ethnicity, and or gender.

To move away from monolithic hierarchies of race, ethnicity, and gender requires a de-centering of methodology, and a shifting of centres to the peripheries and margins. Critical to the dynamic process of this intercultural spatial inquiry is decolonizing traditional
methodologies, which are culture specific; that is decolonizing the methodologies of the hegemonic culture.

1.5 Decolonizing History
Said posits that within academic Western thought, Postmodernism, Postcolonialism, and Cultural Studies are decentering the historical and socio-anthropological views and looking at culture as highly charged with ideologies of nation states. “The power to narrate, or to block other narratives from forming and emerging, is very important to culture and imperialism.”

One of the objectives of this inquiry is to introduce to the cultural landscape, alternative narratives, stories, philosophies, ideologies, and value systems that make up what Foucault refers to as the cultural archive of humanity. Critical to the methodological approach of this spatial inquiry, is the de-centering of methodology to be culturally relevant and respectful. This discursive historical spatial inquiry is inclusive of different philosophies, ideologies, and alternative ways of viewing the world that inform space and place within educational sites.

An underlying concern of indigenous peoples is Western ideologies that inform historical inquiry and research practices. Smith argues for the “decolonization” of methodologies, and the theories that inform them. Said suggests that one of the ways to decenter the centrality of Western history and historical practices is to include the stories of colonized peoples. Stories “become the method colonized people use to assert their own identity and the existence of their own history.” Smith argues that for indigenous peoples “reclaiming history is a critical and essential aspect of decolonization.”

According to Smith, in the discourses of decolonization there are two main strands. One draws upon the notion of authenticity that before colonization “we had absolute authority over our lives; we were born into and lived in a universe which was entirely of our own making.” The second strand demands an analysis by colonized peoples of “how we were colonized, of what that has meant in terms of our immediate past and what it means for our present and future.” For indigenous peoples the forms that decolonized methodologies take are multiple. Indigenous research and dialogue privileges the indigenous presence through
methodologies known as “researching back,” “writing back,” “talking back,” “writing from the margins” and “the Empire writes back.” The argument behind the discourse of the “Empire writes back” is that the centre does not have to be the imperial centre but can be shifted according to other ideologies.57

Cultural protocols, values, behaviour, and respect are integral to indigenous methodologies. “In First Nations and Native American58 communities there are protocols of being respectful, of showing or accepting respect and reciprocating respectful behaviours.”59 Knowledge-sharing processes, inclusive of the theories and analyses, which inform the ways in which knowledge is constructed, are also part of indigenous research methodologies.60 Theorizing by indigenous scholars is grounded in “sensitivity towards, what it means to be an indigenous person […].”61 A field of indigenous research is currently being formed which privileges indigenous concerns, practices, and indigenous participation as researchers and researched.62 Research strategies inclusive of ethnographic approaches are being developed and used by indigenous scholars in ways that are sensitive, respectful, and relevant to indigenous ways of knowing. I would add that the tension here is for non-native scholars to conduct research about native experiences using these models or strategies, which are then viewed as tools or extensions of a colonial model.

Western history, writing, and research have become contested sites for indigenous peoples. As “indigenous voices have been overwhelmingly silenced” Smith calls for the “rewriting and rerighting” of indigenous histories.63 Said takes this a step further and calls on us to look back at the cultural archive and to reread it contrapuntally “with a simultaneous awareness both of the metropolitan history that is narrated and of those other histories against which (and together with which) the dominating discourse acts.”64 Telling our stories from the past, reclaiming the past, giving testimony to the injustices of the past are all strategies which are commonly employed by indigenous peoples struggling for justice. On the international scene it is extremely rare and unusual when indigenous accounts are accepted and acknowledged as valid interpretations of what has taken place. And yet, the need to tell our stories remains the powerful imperative of a powerful form of resistance. 65
Said states that post-imperial writers “bear their past within them — as scars of humiliating wounds, as instigation for different practices as potentially revised visions of the past for a postcolonial future,” which become cultures of resistance.

1.6 History, Culture, and Space
One of the trajectories of this project is the positioning of the dominant society as a culture that is constructed through and by its ideologies, philosophies, and values systems. Another trajectory is that ideologies and value systems of a culture and society are extended and reinforced through the spatial organization of that society. Ideology is generally defined as (1) a set of beliefs characteristic of a social group (or an individual); and (2) as a system of ideas and ideals forming the basis of an economic or political theory. A prevailing concept of ideology is presented by Terry Eagleton as the material process of the production of ideas, beliefs, and values in society. He suggests a second meaning in which ideologies “symbolize the conditions and life experiences of a specific, socially significant group or class.” Of importance to this inquiry is his interpretation of ideology as confined “to the activities of a dominant social power. [...] dominant ideologies help to unify a social formation in ways convenient for its rulers; that it is not simply a matter of imposing ideas from above but of securing the complicity of subordinated classes and groups, and so on.” Eagleton’s concept of ideology is problematic as he still positions the meaning of ideology within social practice, without considering ideology as a cultural practice and that social practice is culturally informed. One of the claims that I make in this project is that ideologies as a set of beliefs of a social group are culturally constructed. As ideologies are culturally constructed then I argue that the spatialization of ideologies is culturally constructed and extended to the spatial organization and spatial systems of that group.

Lefebvre, Foucault, Said, Homi Bhabha, and Edward Soja, all claim in their writings that ideologies are spatialized. Critical to this discursive spatial inquiry is the historical spatialization of cultures of difference by the dominant culture.

A whole history remains to be written of spaces — which would at the same time be the history of powers — from the great strategies of geo-politics to the little tactics of the habitat, institutional architecture from the classroom to the
design of the hospitals, passing via economic and political installations. It is surprising how long the problem of space took to emerge as a historico-political problem.\textsuperscript{70}

History as a discipline has focused on the temporality of human existence and historiography has been the systematic writing of that temporality. In Western societies temporal existence has been privileged over spatial existence to the extent that space has been viewed as “fixed, lifeless, immobile, a mere background or stage for the human drama [...]”.\textsuperscript{71}

The question of space is central to Foucault's investigations of the ways in which Western societies construct knowledge. Foucault critiques the emphasis on temporality in historical inquiry. If one talks in terms of space it was assumed that one was hostile to time. He argues that such historicists are not aware of the implications of the spatial implantation and organization of domains, which throw into relief, historical processes that are related to power. Foucault argues that the spatializing description of discursive realities permits an analysis of related effects of power that otherwise might not be possible.\textsuperscript{72}

Lefebvre in his project, The Production of Space,\textsuperscript{73} emphasizes the interrelationships between ideologies and space. The prevailing ideologies of a culture are extended to the spatial organizations of that culture, corresponding spatial systems, spatial practices, and are embedded in the architecture. “What is an ideology without a space to which it refers, a space which it describes, whose vocabulary and links it makes use of, and whose code it embodies.”\textsuperscript{74} According to Lefebvre, “every society [...] produces a space, its own space.”\textsuperscript{75} The spatial practice of a society is revealed through the deciphering of its spaces.\textsuperscript{76} For Lefebvre, to study the history of space is to study the history of representation.

We should have to look at history itself in a new light. We should have to study not only the history of space, but also the history of representations, along with that of their relationships – with each other, with practice, and with ideology. History would have to take in not only the genesis of these spaces but also, and especially, their interconnections, distortions, displacements, mutual interactions, and their links with the spatial practice of the particular society or mode of production under consideration.\textsuperscript{77}
Critical to Lefebvre’s argument is that space is a product, space is produced, and as such social space is a social product. In his investigation of the ways in which Western society produces space, Lefebvre claims that space has taken on a reality of its own within society and that space produced “serves as a tool of thought and action; that in addition to being a means of production it is also a means of control, and hence of domination, of power.” I further complicate Lefebvre’s argument by introducing the notion that Western society is dominated by the ideologies and practices of the hegemonic culture, and thus society is a cultural product, which produces culturally constructed space and spatial practices. Lefebvre further argues that space has also been transformed by technology with technology used as a tool, as a mechanism to control, to dominate, and appropriate spaces. Dominant and dominated spaces are transformed and mediated by technology, by practice. In order to dominate space, technology is used as a tool to introduce a new form of control into a pre-existing space. For Lefebvre, space serves and hegemony makes use of it, with the help of knowledge and the technical expertise, of a system.

Said spatializes imperialist ideologies in relation to colonization. He claims that neither imperialism nor colonialism is a simple act of accumulation and acquisition but that both are supported by “ideological formations that include notions that certain territories and people require and beseech domination, as well as forms of knowledge affiliated with domination [...]”. Said makes the connection of imperialism and colonialism with territory, and with geography, and thereby spatializes the project of imperialism. I would argue that if imperialism and colonialism are territorial and supported by forms of knowledge linked to domination then the methods used to acquire that knowledge are also spatialized.

Said furthers this position by claiming that the appropriation of history and the historicization of the past include not only the domination of territory but also the accumulation and differentiation of social space. Underlying social space are the territories, land, geographical domains, which are the actual geographical underpinnings of the cultural contest of imperialism. He critiques not only historians but cultural historians as well in that they have failed to remark on the significance of the geographical notation, the theoretical mapping and
charting of territory that underlies historical writing and philosophical discourse. A number of cultural theorists, indigenous scholars, scholars writing from the margins and peripheries emphasize the difference in approaches to conceptualizations of space by Western cultures and Indigenous cultures.

Smith gives a powerful argument on the implications of Western historical inquiry for indigenous peoples, and her analysis of decolonizing methodologies is a critical contribution to current discourse for both indigenous and non-indigenous peoples. She discusses the importance of the land to indigenous ways of knowing but she does not extend her argument to be inclusive of investigating the implications of the spatialization of the colonial project, and the interrelationships of this spatial project with historical methodologies. Complex concepts of space and place of indigenous societies, and the implications of Western spatial constructs for indigenous peoples have not been critiqued by Smith. However, spatialized Western hierarchies of race, ethnicity, and gender have far reaching implications for indigenous and colonized peoples in relation to identity, roles within and between communities and societies, spirituality of place, land issues, and a multiplicity of issues for Aboriginal Title.

Edward Soja has contributed extensively to current discourses on space and to rethinking fundamental ontological and epistemological problems involved in combining the historical and spatial. He claims: “there is a growing awareness of the simultaneity and interwoven complexity of the social, the historical, and the spatial, of their inseparability and interdependence.” However, he argues that an unquestioned historicism still constrains the spatialization of historical discourse. According to Soja, the emergence in the nineteenth century of a specialized discipline of history was defined around “the detailed description and interpretation of particular events, backed by a distinctive historiographical research method designed above all for textual objectivity and empirical accuracy.” Soja emphasizes the importance of rethinking historical discourses spatially, and maintains that another level of spatialization must be reached; one that critically problematizes the interplay of spatiality and historicality, and that rethinks them together as “co-equal modes of representation, empirical inquiry, and (social) theorization.”
1.7 Feminist and Gendered Methodological Approaches

A general critique of "hegemonic historiography" and "Eurocentric historicism" has been central to the discourses of Postcolonialism and Cultural Studies. Bhabha argues that the wider significance of what he refers to as the postmodern condition "lies in the awareness that the epistemological 'limits' of those ethnocentric ideas are also the enunciative boundaries of a range of other dissonant, even dissident histories and voices – women, the colonized, minority groups ..." The epistemological limits of ethnocentric ideas are the enunciative boundaries for feminist and gender studies. Dominant patriarchal ethnocentric traditions of research and scholarship are challenged, deconstructed, and decentred by feminist and gendered theories and discourses. Feminist critiques have contributed much to the debate on hegemonic historiography. Feminists have "argued against the supposed neutrality and objectivity of the academy, asserting that claims put forward as universally applicable have invariably been valid only for men of a particular culture, class, and race." 

Historically, discourses and representations of women were and still are constructed by men; women did not participate, actively or passively, in the construction of discourses and representations about themselves. In the early modernist period, men in writing history in the masculine gender did not allow sexual differences to inform their narrative. History was written in a masculine language, a masculine narrative that became an institutionalized narrative. Current debates in Postmodernism, Postcolonialism, and Postfeminism all engage theories of difference, identity, and deconstruction in order to interrogate the ways in which "woman" is constructed. Feminist theories and methodological approaches challenge male institutions of privilege and superiority, and the inequitable treatment of women "within a society which is organized to prioritize male viewpoints and concerns."

Feminist and gendered methodological approaches to research, which cut across all disciplines, are inclusive of lived experience, autobiographies, women's narratives, histories, and women's ways of knowing and constructing knowledge. These approaches not only cut across disciplines but also cut across boundaries of culture and gender. Women's narratives
have become a powerful tool in countering institutionalized masculine language and masculine narratives.

In this inquiry I argue that women's histories, narratives, and lived experience are all spatialized. In feminist and gendered studies in architecture, spatial description and spatial analysis are methodological approaches used to define differentials and stratifications of gender and space. For example, spatial description is used as a mode of analysis by Daphne Spain in her work: Gendered Spaces.\textsuperscript{97} Dolores Hayden argues spatial description as a methodology has been ignored over social analysis\textsuperscript{98} but is instrumental as a form of analysis in rendering visible the ways in which women live, and the boundaries and limitations that have been enforced upon women across cultures. Diane Ghirardo's investigation of the control and containment of women in the Renaissance is a discursive historical spatial analysis of gendered spaces.\textsuperscript{99} To allow for the inclusion of women's experiences and histories, it is necessary to subvert Eurocentric patriarchal methodological approaches by applying forms of analysis that permit alternative experiences to come forth. Spatial description and spatial analysis as methodological approaches are instrumental in examining alternative gendered experiences.

In summary, this inquiry examines some of the problematics of the cultural construction of dominant spaces, and the spatialization of historical inquiry, and their implications for cultures of difference. I would argue that the study of spatiality on its own and in relation to historicism represents an enormous challenge to current scholarship. Although spatial constructs have implications for every discipline, to investigate issues related to space and place outside of the traditional academic spatial disciplines of architecture, urban studies, and geography meets with overwhelming resistance, which can be insurmountable. Regardless of the challenges and obstacles, this inquiry progressed and investigated cultural issues of space and place within the academy, more specifically in relation to the spatialization of educational sites. The cultural issues examined are not characteristic of, nor isolated to, one discipline but are characteristic of all disciplines that have been informed by Western ideological constructs of institutionalized spaces. For the purpose of investigating the implications of Western institutionalized educational spaces for diverse cultures, and the
corresponding emergence of alternative spaces, it was necessary to position this inquiry as an interdisciplinary inquiry that cut across disciplinary practices. One of the principle obstacles was breaking with traditional discipline-based methodologies. It was also necessary to consider methodological approaches that would be culturally relevant and respectful to Indigenous peoples.

As Bhabha reminds us, there is not a unitary, homogeneous political objective to marginalized peoples who find themselves caught up in struggles of class, race, and gender differences. Each position is a process of translation and transference of meaning. In order to allow for multiple meanings to emerge in this study multiple processes were included. Throughout this research project it became more apparent that there was a recurring commonality within marginalized cultures in having a voice, in being heard, not silenced; in being able to speak of one’s own history, in having that history heard; and the necessity for inclusiveness of multiple stories, histories. Diverse spatial histories have been gathered through multiple processes such as archives, architectural drawings, building documents, and oral histories. For the purpose of this inquiry the spatial is privileged over the temporal; spatial histories are privileged over a temporal history. Privileging the spatial allows us to view issues in relation to cultural differences that might otherwise not be visible.
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Chapter Two
Theoretical Framings: Space and Culture

The theoretical framings for this inquiry are situated within spatial theory and cultural theory. I examine the progression of concepts of culture, and the field of cultural studies as a location for a spatial analysis, which relate to space and cultures of difference. I then examine the cultural meaning of architecture, more specifically where current architectural discourses intersect with cultural theory around issues of space and place. This is followed by an analysis of spatial theories, which developed outside the realm of architecture but have influenced Western thinking about space, and have contributed to current architectural discourse.

2.1 What is Culture? Cultural Theory and Discourse

As part of my argument for this inquiry, I focus on the position that philosophies, ideologies, and value systems are culturally constructed and in turn produce and coexist with culturally constructed spaces. I examine cultural theories and current discourses as to the meaning of "culture," and the "spatialization of culture." There are two prevalent views concerning the meaning of culture in cultural theory and current discourses. One is that of aesthetics, architecture, high art, music, literature, performance, and that more recently has become inclusive of popular culture. The other prevalent meaning of culture, which is the focus of this inquiry, is "customs, institutions, and achievements of a particular nation, people, or group."¹ The Oxford Companion to Philosophy describes culture as all aspects characteristic of a particular form of human life and the system of values implicit in that form; a system of values of which participants in a form of life find meaning and purpose.²

What is culture? The word "culture" originally comes from the Latin "cultura" meaning growing, cultivation.³ The use and history of this word in the English language is complex. Raymond Williams describes culture as a noun of "process" as in the cultivating of crops, and "by extension the culture (active cultivation) of the human mind."⁴ Williams, one of the early contributors to cultural studies, claims that by the late eighteenth century in German and English the word culture was used as a noun of configuration or generalization "of the
spirit' which informed the 'whole way of life' of a distinct people."⁵ Culture as a whole and distinctive way of life became a tenet of the study of anthropology. Williams extends the anthropological use of the word to a sociological one, as in the sociology of culture, to "indicate the 'whole way of life' of a distinct people or other social group."⁶ We see here the emergence of the duality of the meaning of culture as that of "informing the spirit" and that of a "whole social order."⁷ Williams converges the duality of the meanings; a convergence in which he describes culture as a system, a signifying system through which "a social order is communicated, reproduced, experienced and explored."⁸

Simultaneously, Clifford Geertz makes the claim that culture is a system and that ideology is a cultural system.⁹ Concepts of ideology within social and political theory are polemic. In "Interpretation of Cultures," Geertz examines cultural idea-systems that are grounded in social structures and critiques the sociological interpretation of ideology as related to culture. He argues that sociology, which was still viewed as a fledgling discipline in the early 1970s, had not yet developed the methodological tools for interpreting culture. Although Geertz’s work is contested in contemporary cultural studies, his recognition of ideology as teleological is germane to this spatial analysis in that ideology can also serve as a mechanism in the spatial organization of a culture.¹⁰ In Geertz’s view of sociology as the study of patterns of human life he describes what he refers to as "culture patterns – religious, philosophical, aesthetic, scientific, ideological" as programs which provide a "template or blueprint" for the organization of social processes.¹¹ As such ideology would be a cultural program, which would provide a template for the organization of social processes. My argument here is that systems are made up of processes, and as such processes and systems are culturally informed.

Postmodernism, Postcolonialism, and Cultural Studies have contributed significantly to current discourses of culture. I would argue that contemporary Cultural theory is more a set of theories informed by postmodernist and postcolonial arguments, and that Cultural Studies although inclusive of the theoretical, focuses more on the study of cultural practices, its institutions, and the production of culture. Until recently, culture was subordinate to sociology within the academic hierarchical pyramid. Theorists have begun to argue that as social practices are meaningful practices they are fundamentally cultural.¹² I would extend
this to say that social meanings are culturally produced, and that social meaning is a cultural production.

Cultural Studies is the study of culture, more specifically the study of contemporary culture. I do not discuss here the historical development of the field of Cultural Studies but instead focus on issues within diverse Cultural Studies discourses that intersect with this inquiry. One of the claims of Cultural Studies is that it is not only interdisciplinary but anti-disciplinary. It is not restricted to one field of study but “draws from whatever fields are necessary to produce the knowledge required for a particular project.”

Cultural Studies is an interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary and sometimes counter-disciplinary field that operates in the tension between its tendencies to embrace both a broad, anthropological and a more narrowly humanistic conception of culture. Unlike traditional anthropology, however, it has grown out of analyses of modern industrial societies. It is typically interpretive and evaluative in its methodologies, but unlike traditional humanism it rejects the exclusive equation of culture with high culture and argues that all forms of cultural production need to be studied in relation to other cultural practices and to social and historical structures.

As Grossberg, Nelson, and Treichler claim there is no distinct methodology for Cultural Studies, “its methodology, ambiguous from the beginning, can best be seen as a bricolage.” They further claim that “it is problematic for cultural studies simply to adopt, uncritically, any of the formalized disciplinary practices of the academy, for those practices, as much as the distinctions they inscribe, carry with them a heritage of disciplinary investments and exclusions and a history of social effects that cultural studies would often be inclined to repudiate.”

The concept of “culture” within Cultural Studies is understood as “a way of life inclusive of ideas, attitudes, languages, institutions, structures of power, and a range of cultural practices such as texts, canons, artistic forms, and architecture. In this sense, Cultural Studies is concerned with “the every day terrain of people,” the interrelationships between separate cultural domains, and has had a strong commitment to disempowered populations. Its origins as a field of studies were forged, in the sense of the margins versus the centre, as to class,
race, ethnicity, and gender.

One of the arguments of this inquiry is that race and ethnicity are culturally constructed, and that gender is also a cultural construct. Some of the issues that will be examined in relation to constructs of race, ethnicity, and gender intersect with current discourses in Cultural theory and Cultural Studies. The cultural issues examined are inclusive of hegemony, as interrelations of domination and systems of domination; marginalization; cultural differences; and constructs of “other.” The spatialization of these issues is the focus of this inquiry.

Within Cultural theory and Cultural Studies, from the early 1970s, culture was analyzed through the concept of hegemony, relations of domination; at first more specifically around issues of class, and eventually extending to issues of race and gender. Culture then came to be seen as an apparatus within a system of domination that could be analyzed according to hegemonic practices and discourses. The hegemonic position is considered as the central, culturally dominant position, with cultures that are excluded from the centre as marginalized. This creates duality and tension between centre and periphery; a concept that is prevalent throughout cultural discourse. The centre–periphery duality constructs what Edward Said refers to as an authoritative position of the dominant culture over marginalized peoples. This cultural practice of centre and periphery, dominant and marginalized, is constructed, produced, and reproduced through processes, systems, and institutions, such as in educational institutions.

In cultural discourses marginality is viewed as a consequence of binaristic structures of patriarchy, imperialism and ethnocentrism, which centralize these discourses and experiences, with all other forms of experience and discourse considered as marginal or peripheral. Marginality can be viewed as a liberating site of resistance as in the writings of bell hooks and as a site of resistance in decolonizing academic scholarship as in “writing from the margins.” However, this is further complicated in postcolonial discourse in which the position is that resistance from the margins becomes a process of replacing the centre, or decentering the centre to the margins, rather than deconstructing the binary structure of
French theorists of the late 1970s and 1980s had a significant impact on the field of Cultural Studies. The work of Michel Foucault was influential in introducing systems of thought, the relation of space to social fields, and in examining the institutionalization of society. According to Simon During, culture also came to be seen as what Foucault referred to as a form of governmentality, as a means to produce conforming or docile citizens through institutions, such as education and work. The implications of Foucault’s work, more specifically his discursive historical writings of the spatialization and institutionalized of Western societies, will be discussed further in Chapter Three: Institutionalized Spaces.

An important discourse within Cultural Studies is that of “cultural difference.” The basis for the theorization around this discourse is to counter universal views, reductive thinking, and meta-analyses, which homogenize complexities of multiple ways of knowing, value systems, and cultural practices throughout the world. One theoretical direction of “cultural difference” is what Cornel West and bell hooks call the new cultural politics of difference in which the shift is from homogeneity of cultures to cultural diversity, multiplicity, and heterogeneity. West claims that the new cultural politics of difference is articulated by “talented (and usually privileged) contributors to culture who desire to align themselves with demoralized, demobilized, depoliticized, and disorganized people in order to empower and enable social action and, if possible, to enlist collective insurgency for the expansion of freedom, democracy, and individuality.” He argues that the new cultural politics of difference is not only applicable to the academy, but is inclusive of museums, galleries, and mass media. The challenge presented by the academy is seen more specifically as a methodological debate. The problematic, according to West, is how to think about and analyze representational practices in terms of history, culture, and society. An objective of my inquiry is to begin to rethink this problematic of cultural differences as related to issues of race, ethnicity, gender and education within the spatialization of the academy.

Homi Bhabha presents another theoretical direction for the discursive formation of “cultural difference.” His concept of cultural difference lies not only in the symbolic representations of
a culture but also in the processes that is the differences of cultural processes. His claim is
fundamental to the understanding of cultural difference in that differences exist not only in
the representations of a culture but also in the very processes of that culture; different
cultures process things differently. Not only are the ideologies, philosophies, and value
systems of cultures different but cultural practices are also different. As such Bhabha draws
our attention towards those “moments or processes that are produced in the articulation of
cultural differences.” He also argues that the “exchange of values, meanings and priorities
may not always be collaborative and dialogical, but may be profoundly antagonistic,
conflictual and even incommensurable.”

In theorizing about cultural difference, Bhabha draws a distinction between cultural diversity
and cultural difference. He argues that the idea that cultures are diverse has been realized for
some time.

It is a commonplace of plural, democratic societies to say that they can encourage and accommodate cultural diversity [...] the ability to appreciate cultures in a kind of ‘musée imaginaire’; as though one should be able to collect and appreciate them. Western connoisseurship is the capacity to understand and locate cultures in a universal time-frame that acknowledges their various historical and social contexts only eventually to transcend them and render them transparent [...] .

In this way cultural diversity becomes a bedrock of multicultural education policy. This is
problematic for Bhabha on two levels. First, “although there is always an entertainment and
encouragement of cultural diversity, there is always a corresponding containment of it.”
Second, “a transparent norm is constituted, a norm given by the host society or dominant
culture, which says that ‘these other cultures are fine, but we must be able to locate them
within our own grid.’ ” He claims that this is a creation of cultural diversity and
simultaneously a containment of cultural difference. He further argues that in societies where
multiculturalism is encouraged racism is still rampant because the universalism that permits
diversity masks ethnocentric norms, values, and interests. “Multiculturalism represented an
attempt both to respond to and to control the dynamic process of articulation of cultural
difference.”
Key to this inquiry is Bhabha’s argument countering the assumption that all forms of cultural diversity may be understood on the basis of a particular universal concept. He considers this to be dangerous and limiting in trying to understand the ways in which cultural practices construct their own systems of meaning and social organization. The difference of cultures (race, ethnicity, or gender) can not be accommodated within a universalist framework. He continually reminds us that differences can be so extensive that it is difficult “even impossible and counterproductive, to try and fit together different forms of culture and to pretend that they can easily coexist.”

“Different cultures, the difference between cultural practices, the difference in the construction of cultures within different groups, very often set up among and between themselves an incommensurability.”

Bhabha’s theoretical argument of cultural difference is also inclusive of notions of “hybridity,” “cultural translation,” and identity; issues that I do not focus on in this spatial analysis. My emphasis in this inquiry is, instead, on the spatialization of cultural difference. I would extend Bhabha’s argument further and say that cultural difference, cultural practice, and cultural production are all spatialized which further complicates the problematics set forth by Bhabha. Cultural differences are spatially contained and/or conflictual and contested. Bhabha uses a spatial language, which I call “spatial metaphorics,” as a psychoanalytic tool to examine more closely the issues, tensions, conflicts, and incommensurabilities of cultural differences. In this context, he describes the notion of “hybridity” as the “‘thirdspace’ which enables other positions to emerge.”

I would argue that for Bhabha the concept of “thirdspace” remains, for the most part, a psychoanalytic analogy and a structural analysis of a spatial language in reference to emergent narrative spaces. This argument on the differences between cultural constructs, cultural production, and cultural practices is central to the development of this inquiry – do concepts of space inform the production of education?

In Bhabha’s analyses of cultures he makes the connection between spatiality and temporality, as a temporal - spatial configuration privileging the temporal. My argument is that temporality as a Western construct has dominated Western thought and historicism. As
Soja,35 I argue that it is necessary to shift Western culture's view, to shift our perspective to privileging the spatial, not as a hegemonic replacement of temporality, but as a different way of viewing human existence that enables us to see issues and problematics of cultural differences in ways that have heretofore been invisible.

In Cultural Studies, the emphasis on the exclusivity of cultural differences within Western society is in part a response to the oppositional binary construct of the "other." A seminal work in the construct of "other" is Said's Orientalism in which he posits that the Western construct of the Orient has helped to define the West with the Orient as "its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience."36 This argument has implications for any colonized, or oppositional "other." In postcolonial discourse, the argument is that the construct of "other" has been a normalizing mechanism for Western society, and in defining Western society's relation to the world. This construct of "other" is viewed as a binary separation between colonizers and colonized that asserts the primacy of the colonizing culture and world-view.37 The "other" is then an ontological and epistemological distinction made between Western culture and cultures of difference.

Both Said and Bhabha consider the constructing of "other" by Western society as a process, a process of "othering." The term, "othering" was applied by Gayatri Spivak to the process by which imperial discourse creates "others."38 The "other" refers to the excluded or dominated subject. Spivak considers "othering" as a dialectical process – the colonizing "other" is established and the colonized "others" are produced.39 My argument is that if constructing "other" is a process, it is also systematized. Within this analysis, I examine the systematization of the processing of "other" and the spatialization of "other" in architecture and the built environment as related to education within the academy.

One of the major arguments in feminist cultural discourse is the traditional positioning of woman as the "other."40 The concern in feminist criticism is the engendering of culture as male, and the subsequent positioning of women outside of culture as in the binary of culture as male and nature as female. My argument is that the oppositional binary construct of woman as "other" to man is a cultural construct. In relation to Said's argument of "other,"
"woman" as a gender construct is the contrasting image, idea, personality, and experience to the male construct. “Woman” has not only been constructed in Western historicism as an oppositional “other” but has been historically and systematically subordinated and categorized as an inferior gender. I argue that this inferior subordination has been stratified and spatialized within Western philosophies, ideologies, and value systems and extended to educational systems and spaces.

A principal theme of Simone de Beauvoir’s project *The Second Sex* is the notion of woman as “other.” De Beauvoir’s statement, which has continued to resonate some fifty years later, “One is not born a woman, one becomes one” is explicit that females are not born as “woman,” but are culturally and socially constructed as “woman.” One of the objectives of her project, which is still relevant today, is to destroy the myth of woman’s inferiority to man. She argues that a lack of self-esteem and self-assurance are engendered in women and that independent women have the most difficult time of all. In reference to the intellectual and academic world, she maintains that the world of thought, of art, is a masculine world. “If they [women] undertake to write, they feel overwhelmed by the universe of culture, because it is a universe of men, and so they can only stammer.” Her response to these culturally engendered inequities is one of transcendence. “Culture must be apprehended through the free action of transcendence.”

When at last it will be possible for every human being thus to set his pride beyond the sexual differentiation, in the laborious glory of free existence, then only will woman be able to identify her personal history, her problems, her doubts, her hopes, with those of humanity; then only will she be able to seek in her life and her works to reveal the whole of reality and not merely her personal self. As long as she still has to struggle to become a human being, she cannot become a creator.

Simone de Beauvoir is making an argument here that women are not free agents of thought or action. According to Said, the constructed “other” is not a “free subject of thought or action.” Bhabha furthers this argument in claiming that the constructed “other”: “loses its power to signify, to negate, to initiate its historic desire, to establish its own institutional and
oppositional discourse.” The constructed “other” is the dominated “other,” and the process of domination is an act of cultural supremacy.

Robert Young maintains that “the appropriation of the other as a form of knowledge within a totalizing system can thus be set alongside the history (if not the project) of European imperialism, and the constitution of the other as “other” alongside racism and sexism.” I would argue that, in reference to sexism as in gender relations, the appropriation of woman, constituted as a constructed “other,” as a form of knowledge in Western culture, does not exist. In Western culture, as in many cultures, women have been an object of desire, an object of control, an object of subjugation, an object of ownership, but I would argue not as a subject of study, not as a source of knowledge. This is further evidenced by the near absence of women in history, the absence of women’s histories, the absence of women’s experiences as forms of knowledge, and by the absence of women’s ways of knowing in the cultural archive of humanity. In Western historicism the absence of knowledge by, of, or from women is so pervasive that little to no knowledge exists to appropriate. Any acknowledgements of cultural differences of the female gender have been sexualized. The existence of women, or knowledge of women, in the cultural archive of humanity is “in absentia.”

The Western ideology of woman as an inferior gender and abnormal, and the subsequent subordination of women in Western culture, was extended to colonized peoples. The implications for colonized women were extensive resulting in loss of social position and inheritance. Linda Tuhiwai Smith maintains that Western concepts of race intersect with concepts of gender. She argues that the process of engendering the “other” has had serious consequences for indigenous women in the ways in which indigenous women were described, represented, objectified, and marginalized by Western constructs. The projection of such constructs on to indigenous women resulted in the redefinition of their roles within indigenous societies that were under Western dominance. From an indigenous perspective, gender distinctions and hierarchies are deeply embedded in Western culture. The spatialization of gender differentials will be further examined in relation to architecture and
education within Chapter Seven, Changing Places: Centre for Research in Women’s Studies and Gender Relations.

Bhabha argues that theorizing the “other” as the object of knowledge, the docile body of difference, reproduces the relation of domination.\textsuperscript{53} He advocates a reorientation of theoretical work, which focuses on the concept of cultural difference not cultural diversity.\textsuperscript{54} He argues that cultural diversity is an epistemological object, an object of empirical knowledge whereas “cultural difference is the process of the \textit{enunciation} of culture as ‘knowledgeable’, authoritative, adequate to the construction of systems of cultural identification.”\textsuperscript{55} An objective of this dissertation is to look more closely at the production of cultural differences and cultural practices in relation to architecture and education. In so doing, I aim to subvert the dominant centre and reposition the “other” as knowledgeable, authoritative, and as active participants.\textsuperscript{56}

### 2.2 The Cultural Meaning of Architecture

Architecture produces and reproduces cultural meaning. It offers a visual, spatial, and material epistemology of a culture. The ideologies, philosophies, and value systems of a culture are embedded in the architecture, which reinforces and coexists with these ideologies. Culturally informed concepts of space are produced in the praxis and materiality of architecture and urban studies, and the interrelatedness of such praxis with philosophy, sociology, and cultural theory. As such I examine current architectural discourses that intersect with cultural theory around issues of space and place.

Recently, architectural theorizing is shifting from a discourse of styles, and orders, and building types to an emphasis on discourses of social issues and architecture, the built environment, and urban studies. Where this research departs from sociological inquiries of architecture is with the premise that societies are culturally constructed and hence architecture, buildings, and urban spaces are culturally constructed and produced. I claim that the ideologies, philosophies, and value systems of a culture inform, construct, and produce the spaces it inhabits. Architecture and the built environment are culturally constructed spaces and building culture differs from culture to culture.
There are a number of factors that are challenging what is viewed as the rigid, invariant, structures of modernism in architectural theory and praxis. In relation to this inquiry, I examine current cultural theories and discourses that intersect with current architectural theories and discourses that challenge modernism around issues of cultural difference. Modernism in architecture is characterized by claims to a universally applicable style: whether heroic, monumental and autonomous or banal, serially replicated and mass-produced. Postmodernism, which was first attributed to the domain of architecture, was seen as a move away from a modernist, universal view. Postmodernist critiques of modern architecture emphasize its isolated, detached view of community and society and its emphasis on a universal commonality of materials and technology. A prevailing critique is that regional and national variations in architectural design were replaced by a more universal, international style. Thomas Docherty argues that this resulted in a homogeneity of building and urban planning on a large scale which threatened the idea of “located tradition.” It is this homogeneity and universalization of building culture that is critiqued in Postmodernism and Postcolonialism. This universalist approach to building culture is countered by a return to locality and tradition and by a refocusing on notions of space and place.

One of the postmodern critiques of the modernist project is the autonomy of the site. The located tradition of the site disappeared in favor of a universalization of space and site. Robert Venturi claims that this universalization and neutralization was reinforced by a modernist emphasis on technology. He argues that this almost unitary focus on technology in architecture has contributed to the mechanization of space. I further Venturi’s argument by examining other influencing factors that have contributed to this mechanization of space along with the implications of a technologically-centered architecture that has become institutionalized.

An early movement to reject modernism's mechanized approach to building and society begins to build momentum in the 1950s. Out of the Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne (CIAM) meeting in 1953 in Aix-en-Provence a group of European architects known
as Team 10, came together “because of mutual realization of the inadequacies of the processes of architectural thought which they had inherited from the modern movement as a whole, but more important, each sensed that the other had already found some way towards a new beginning.”60 Their aim was both theoretical and practical with a social emphasis to build “towards society's realization-of-itself.”61

Team 10 is of the opinion that only in such a way may meaningful groupings of buildings come into being, where each building is a live thing and a natural extension of the others. Together they will make places where a man can realize what he wishes to be.62

The group of architects who made up Team 10 contributed to early critiques of modern architecture. Of importance to this inquiry is their emphasis on space and place, and on questions around human existence and architecture. Their ideas marked a shift from the concept of architecture as universal and autonomous to rethinking architecture in relation to societal patterns and notions of space and place. As a group they focused on social ideas, which included the role of the architect and society as the client.63 Ideas also centered around the building and site, not putting a building on a site, but with a building making a space.64 They encouraged an interaction between buildings and their environments. Other ideas included the notion that evolution in the structure of society is the growing awareness of man [sic] and his existence.65 Many of their ideas focused on building, space and existence and the notion that part of existence is consciousness of space.66 They advocated that architecture implies a constant rediscovery of human qualities translated in space.67 There was recognition on the part of the Team 10 architects of the interrelationships between man's [sic] need of identification with space through the built environment.68

Subsequently, architects such as Robert Venturi, Aldo Rossi, and Paul Rudolph have made significant contributions to current architectural discourse in decentring the canons of modernism, and the modernist high aesthetic, altering notions of what constitutes the social in the process. Venturi's writings on complexity and contradiction in architecture, which deconstruct modernist concepts of the built environment have become pedagogical tools for architects in rethinking architecture and society, and architecture's connectedness to society.
Venturi's conceptualizations of space are not a mechanized, Cartesian abstraction. According to Vincent Scully, Venturi opposes Cartesian rigour, he is “more fragmentary, moving step by step through more comprised relationships.” Venturi’s concern is with the complexities and contradictions of content and meaning in architecture. His concept of space is shaped by his notion of “simultaneous perception of a multiplicity of levels.” Venturi describes this as a “dimension of space, time and architecture” where space changes meaning as the observer moves through the space and changes direction. To further complicate Venturi’s spatial meanings, I introduce the notion of cultures of difference whereby space not only changes meaning as the observer moves through the space but that there is another level of complexity in that space changes meaning given the cultural location of the observer moving through that space. I revisit the problematic of cultural location in relation to architecture in the site studies.

Essential to Venturi's concept of space is that “conventional elements in architecture represent one stage in an evolutionary development, and they contain in their changed use and expression some of their past meaning as well as their new meaning.” Venturi proposes that change in the program of existing buildings is a valid phenomenon and a major source of contradiction in architecture, which he endorses. He “maintains that context contributes meaning to a part and change in context causes change in meaning.” This is further discussed in relation to the site studies.

Other early rejections of modernism in the 1960s included the work of Aldo Rossi. Rossi is considered to be one of the most influential architectural theoreticians since the Second World War. His theoretical work L'architettura della citta published in 1966 strongly counters the tenets of modernist architecture. Both his theoretical and practical work are indicative of a divergent direction for architecture. He advocates that the city and building are analogous and that the elements of the city have corresponding elements in buildings. Venturi argues: “Architecture occurs at the meeting of interior and exterior forces and use of space [...] Architecture as the wall between the inside and the outside becomes the spatial record of this resolution and its drama. And by recognizing the difference between the inside and the outside, architecture opens the door once again to an urbanistic point of view.”
Both Rossi and Venturi focused on the interrelationships between historical architectural elements past and present, and their changed meanings. Rossi proposed “not a style but a mode of analysis and an approach to urban housing, design and change that took into account particular histories, patterns of change and traditions.” Diane Ghirardo maintains that “for Rossi building types were understood as rooted in the specific customs and habits of particular cities or parts of cities rather than abstract constructs independent of historical conditions.” According to Anthony Vidler, Rossi challenges earlier typologies based on nature and subsequently mass production by the introduction of a third typology, which has as its inspiration the city. The city is the new typology, “it stands complete and ready to be de-composed into fragments.”

These fragments do not re-invent institutional type-forms nor repeat past typological forms: they are selected and reassembled according to criteria derived from three levels of meaning – the first, inherited from meanings ascribed by the past existence of the forms; the second, derived from choice of the specific fragment and its boundaries, which often cross between previous types; the third, proposed by a re-composition of these fragments in a new context.

Both Rossi and Venturi’s arguments recognize the multiplicities and heterogeneity of Western societies, and their interconnectedness with architecture, and as such their work has strong social and cultural implications.

Paul Rudolph’s position on modernism has also contributed to architectural discourse on issues of space, place, and culture. His critique of modernism is its emphasis of style over spatial concepts. “The two great limitations of modernism remain urbanism and a paucity of spatial concepts that satisfy man’s psychological needs […]. Thus we need to continue to develop spatial concepts.” He argues that free-standing buildings, objects in space, unrelated to one another, and unrelated to a particular site “cannot give a sense of place.” He further argues that modern vernacular superimposed on another culture is “not related to climate, site, or a way of life, and as such modern architecture has ‘not yet developed powerful enough ways of expressing diverse human aspirations.’” He advocates in architecture “the interrelation of the parts—and by parts I mean society and the place and the
whole notion of how you get things built [...]. Rudolph is concerned with the relationship between architecture and society and views architects as servants of society and whose work is relevant only insofar as recognizing society's demands. I would argue that considering Rudolph's position on architects as servants of society in relation to the growing cultural diversity of Western societies presents a challenge for architecture.

The theoretical work of Rudolph, Rossi, and Venturi have contributed to the disruption of modern architectural canons and have presented modes of analysis for re-examining architecture's relationships with society and space. Current architectural theory and discourse has proceeded slowly in embracing social and cultural issues. As Dolores Hayden maintains: "Architecture, as a discipline, has not seriously considered social and political issues, while social history has developed without much consideration of space or design." Social scientists frequently avoid "place" as a concept. She argues that the combination of social issues with spatial design is critical to the future development of cities, and I would add to architecture and the built environment. "Space is permeated with social relations; it is not only supported by social relations but it is also producing and produced by social relations." I would further complicate this argument and add that social relations and spaces produced are culturally informed, constructed, and produced. Social meaning is informed by culturally specific ideologies, philosophies and value systems.

Thomas Markus examines historically the social meaning of buildings and social relations between buildings and people. Within this context he investigates the production of space as a social process of building, and the centrality of power within this process. In his work, Building and Power: Freedom and Control in the Origin of Modern Building Types, it becomes evident that his investigation is more specifically about power and control imbued in buildings rather than a process of freedom. He discusses the historical influences of deep-rooted Western ideologies that had as their base intellectual and political ideals born in Britain and France, and that were reflected in the ideologies of the French and American revolutions, with the colonies as their testing grounds. He argues that there was an underlying unity in social ideologies between Britain and the Continent, which explains the uniformity
and remarkable similarity in exported building types despite the different contexts in which
the buildings were constructed.89

Critical to the debate on the implications of the social ordering of buildings in the control and
organization of Western society, is Markus’s investigation of buildings as part of a larger
schema. This schema is based on fundamental social ideologies and on an industrial ideology
of the machine that proposed that societies should be run with the same mechanized rigour.
Many have argued that by far one of the most powerful, influential, and pervasive of these
ideologies was the institutionalization of mechanized space. However, I argue that these
social ideologies were culturally informed, constructed, and produced and through cultural
processes were extended to cultures of difference. The exporting of building types which
were born out of Western cultural ideologies were systematically imposed upon peoples with
different cultural, spiritual, philosophical, and spatial ideologies; the extent and implications
of which are just beginning to be realized as colonized and marginalized cultures regain and
reconstitute their own histories. Different cultures produce different social meanings and as
such produce different spaces. The constructed spaces of architecture, the built environment,
and urban spaces are informed by and reproduce cultural meaning.

An interconnected study of cultural issues and space is further complicated today,
particularly in North America, with the separation of the study of architecture, the built
environment, and urbanism into separate disciplines. Given the current crisis in many North
American urban centres, urbanists are compelled to look for solutions to a myriad of social
and cultural problems. Much of the critical work on the built environment and cultural and
social issues is in the field of urban studies. Dolores Hayden’s project on The Power of Place
has been a major contributing factor to current debates on the built environment and issues of
race, ethnicity, and gender. In this project and subsequent publications she challenges class,
race, and gender distinctions in architecture. Through this project Hayden and those who
have worked with her challenge the elitist patriarchal canons of modern architecture by a
process of inclusion: inclusion of architecture of the everyday; restoration of ethnic history;
gender issues; gendered-ethnic issues; and by decentring the value systems for aesthetics in
architecture.
The Power of Place looks at some of the ways in which cultural meaning, social history, architecture, and urbanism are interconnected. It investigates the power of ordinary urban landscapes to nurture public memory, which encompass shared time and shared space. Its objective is to reclaim the entire cultural urban landscape, not just architectural monuments, but building types representative of working people’s everyday lives, and to restore to the urban landscape significant shared meanings which are cultural meanings. Buildings are an integral part of the urban landscape. They are a resource of lived experience and the result of the cultural production of space. Hayden proposes that the analysis of buildings and social spaces are critical to the study of the production of space. I would emphasize that an analysis of buildings and social spaces is critical to the understanding of the cultural production of space. As Hayden argues, this calls for changes in strategies and methodologies as quantitative analysis cannot adequately be applied to the human experience of place, and that spatial description as a methodology is ignored over social analysis.

In the field of architecture the whole problematic of cultural issues as related to race, ethnicity, and gender is an emergent discourse, a discourse, which is met with considerable resistance within the institutionalized practice and study of architecture. Regardless of overwhelming resistance, critical work in feminist issues and gender issues is moving forward. Within the discipline of architecture and architectural education issues of race, ethnicity, cultures of difference, and postcolonial issues as related to architectural theory and practice are emergent in mainstream architectural discourse.

2.3 Spatial Theory and Discourse
Spatial theories, which have developed outside the realm of architecture, have influenced Western thinking about space, and have contributed to the “spatial debate.” Within the spatial framings, I analyze Western theoretical constructs of space that have influenced current discourse, the application of these theories to architecture, and the implications of these spatial theories for the cultural meaning of architecture. In this analysis, I focus on Heidegger’s notion of dwelling – space as location, site, and place, Lefebvre’s model of space as physical, mental, and social, and Foucault’s discursive investigations of the
institutionalization of space. Sets of relationships are examined between these theoretical framings. As such, theoretical discussions are organized by relationships rather than chronologically. Although these models have contributed to current discourse on space and place, and the production of space, I argue that they fall short of providing the tools necessary for analyzing cultural constructs of space, and that these models need to be complicated by the inclusion of different cultural locations and theories.

2.4 Spatial Theories of Martin Heidegger
Heidegger’s writings on being, time, space, place, location, and site continue to be part of contemporary architectural discourse. Of importance to this argument is Heidegger’s conceptualization of space, place, and site. While his political affiliations with the National Socialist Party remain questionable and controversial, what Arthur Kroker\textsuperscript{94} refers to as the incommensurabilities of Heidegger, he nevertheless continues to have a significant influence on twentieth century Western thought.\textsuperscript{95} His work is important to any discussion of Western concepts of space in that his spatial conceptualizations are a clear break from Cartesian and Enlightenment thought. Heidegger’s preoccupation with “being and time” extended to conceptualizations of “being and space” as he pursued the problem of humankind’s situatedness in the world in his concept of “dasein”: existence, life, being, and the question of “being.” Heidegger spatialized the question of existence, of “being,” in relation to dwelling. For Heidegger, man’s existence that is his situatedness in the world is linked to the question of dwelling, thinking, and “being.” Through dwelling Heidegger links space to “being.”\textsuperscript{96}

Heidegger’s conceptualizations of space may be analyzed through his writings “The Origin of the Work Of Art,” “Building Dwelling Thinking,” “Poetically Man Dwells,” and “Art and Space.” His early conceptualizations of space can be traced to his essay “The Origin of the Work Of Art,” which was first presented as a lecture in Freiburg in 1935.\textsuperscript{97} In this essay he begins to spatialize his concepts of bringing forth, gathering, and dwelling and relates them to architecture. He claims: “a building, a Greek temple, portrays nothing. It simply stands there in the middle of the rock-cleft valley.”\textsuperscript{98} But as the building encloses the figure of the god, it becomes a temple, a holy precinct and the temple-work “fits together and at the same time gathers around itself the unity of those paths and relations in which birth and death,
disaster and blessing, victory and disgrace, endurance and decline acquire the shape of destiny for human being.\textsuperscript{99} Clearly, Heidegger is making a connection, a relationship between cultural meaning and building. A building on its own portrays nothing but when cultural meaning is gathered into that building and its surrounding environment, the building then represents the life of that culture. Heidegger's reference to the Greek temple is significant as it represents for Western culture an ordering of space, a spatial ordering in society that became an archetype for Western architecture.

Heidegger's themes of bringing forth, gathering, and dwelling are further developed in his essays "Building Dwelling Thinking" and "Poetically Man Dwells," which were first presented as lectures in 1951 and published subsequently in 1954. "Building Dwelling Thinking" was originally presented at a colloquium on "Man and Space." In this essay Heidegger asks: What is it to dwell? How does building belong to dwelling? He does not think about building as an art or as a technique of construction but "traces building back into that domain to which everything that is belongs."\textsuperscript{100} Key to Heidegger's position is that: "We attain to dwelling, so it seems, only by means of building [...] building, has the former, dwelling, as its goal."\textsuperscript{101} The spatialization of human existence as dwelling is one of the principle themes in these writings. Heidegger develops a relational continuity of being, dwelling, and building. It is clear that for Heidegger being and dwelling coexist.

To understand the ways in which people, that is Western society, dwell Heidegger goes back to the roots of early European languages – Latin, old German, and old English to determine the original meanings of the words, dwelling, space, place, location, and site. By tracing meaning through language Heidegger establishes the interrelationships between dwelling, being, and space. I would argue that Heidegger's search for the linguistic origin of the meanings was in fact a search for the original cultural meanings of the words in Western societies. Heidegger traces the meaning of the word building. In old English and high German the noun for building, "buan" means to dwell. He traces the meaning of the verb to build "bauen" as to remain, to stay in a place. This verb also carries the meaning, to cherish, to protect, to preserve, to care for, specifically, to till the soil, and to cultivate the vine. He thereby, establishes a cultural relationship between building and dwelling.
Heidegger establishes a connection between the German verb “bauen,” to build, to dwell and the verb to be as in “ich bin,” I am. He states: “the way in which you are and I am, the manner in which we humans are on the earth, is Bauen, dwelling.” For Heidegger, “I am” and “I dwell” are interconnected. Based on this argument Heidegger claims both modes of building: (1) building as cultivating as in the Latin “cultura”; and (2) building as the raising up of edifices as in the Latin “aedificare” are comprised within genuine building, that is dwelling. Building as dwelling is man's everyday experience on the earth, it is “‘habitual’— we inhabit it.” It is significant to note that Heidegger does not look at building as an art form, an object, or an independent monumental work but as an everyday experience, something of everyday life, habitual.

Heidegger also traces the origins of the meaning of the word space and examines links between being and dwelling and space. He maintains that the German word for space, “raum” originally carried the meaning of a place cleared or freed for settlement and lodging. He interprets this meaning as:

A space is something that has been made room for, something that is cleared and free, namely within a boundary, Greek peras. A boundary is not that at which something stops but as the Greeks recognized, the boundary is that from which something begins its presencing.

He further establishes a relation here between the German word for space “raum” and the Greek word for boundary “peras.” “Peras” is not something that stops but something that “begins its presencing” and as such he claims: “space is in essence that for which room has been made, that which is let into its bounds.” Heidegger’s conceptualization of space is inclusive of place, location, and site, which are critical to his thinking of space and to his development of the interrelationships of space and existence. He has established that a direct connection between the meaning of “space” and “place” already existed in Western culture. He returns to this notion of place again and further develops it in a later work, “Art and Space” in which he discusses space and place in relationship to technology.
For Heidegger, place, location, and site are intricately connected. Spaces are provided for by locations and “man's relation to locations, and through locations to spaces, inheres in his dwelling.”

He poses the question: What is the relation between man and space? According to Heidegger, buildings are locations that allow spaces. A location allows one to enter into a site by arranging the site into spaces and admits one the sense of installing. “Building by virtue of constructing locations, is a founding and joining of spaces [...].”

He argues that space does not exist as a single entity but exists in relation to other spaces and in relation to nature. “Nevertheless, because it produces things as locations, building is closer to the nature of spaces and to the origin of the nature of space than any geometry and mathematics.”

Building accomplishes its nature in the raising of locations by the joining of their spaces. His argument here is that spaces receive their “being” from locations and not from the homogeneous vast expanse of the space of Galileo and Newton nor the Cartesian notion of absolute space. His claim is that the relationship between people and space is none other than dwelling.

Heidegger's approach to the spatialization of human existence through place, location, and site can be realized through his story of the bridge. He examines the bridge and its connectedness. The bridge brings stream and bank and land into each other's neighbourhood. The bridge “gathers” the earth as landscape around the stream. It gathers the fourfold: the earth, the sky, mortals and divinities “in such a way as to allow a site for it.” The spot along the stream becomes a location because of the bridge. The bridge gathers and connects and in so doing, “it allows a site [...] something that is itself a location can make space for a site [...]. By this site are determined the localities and ways by which a space is provided for.”

Heidegger revisits the question of the meaning of “space” and “place” in relation to human existence and technology in his later work “Art and Space,” published in 1973. In this essay he continues to reinforce his counter argument to Galileo and Newton's concept of space as a homogeneous expanse, and challenges the modernist assumption of a “physically-technologically projected space” as the sole genuine space. In countering, both of these dominant spatial concepts, he argues that all articulated spaces, artistic spaces, spaces of
every day practice, spaces of commerce, are not one objective cosmic space. And he maintains that the objectivity of a theory of a world space remains the subjectivity of a consciousness that was foreign to epochs that preceded modern European times.\textsuperscript{115}

To further challenge these pervasive dominant spatial concepts, Heidegger in this later work, returns once again to language, to the German word “raumen” meaning to clear out, to free from wilderness. From the original meaning of “raumen,” he develops and extends his notion of “place”:

Clearing away brings forth the free, the openness for man's settling and dwelling [...] clearing away is the release of the places toward which the fate of dwelling man turns in the preserve of the home or in the brokenness of homelessness or in complete indifference to the two. Clearing-away is release of places [...] clearing-away brings forth locality preparing for dwelling.\textsuperscript{116}

This character of clearing away as the release of places, Heidegger argues, is difficult to determine, “so long as physical-technological space is held to be the space in which each spatial character should be oriented from the beginning.”\textsuperscript{117} Place is not located in a pre-given space, after the manner of physical-technological space. He claims that space unfolds itself through the reigning of places of a region. “Place always opens a region in which it gathers the things in their belonging together.”\textsuperscript{118} Here, Heidegger is making an argument for locality and to look on locality as the interplay of places. Also, integral to Heidegger’s sense of place is the notion of gathering, “sheltering of things in their region,” as in the older form of the word “die Gegnet” meaning “that–which-regions.”\textsuperscript{119} He maintains that this sense of the word is one of openness. “Through it the openness is urged to let each thing merge in it’s resting in itself. This means at the same time: preserving, i.e. the gathering of things in their belonging together.”\textsuperscript{120}

By returning to the origin of the meanings of building, space, and place, Heidegger is re-establishing cultural connections, not only between the words but also in the relational values of the words. He calls on us to return to language, which is culturally representative. In both his early and late work, Heidegger maintains that the original meanings of the words have been lost to us; the words have been disconnected from their source. He claims that the real
sense of “bauen,” namely dwelling, has fallen into oblivion. To Heidegger this loss of meaning is a decisive event when dwelling ceases to be experienced as man’s “being.” A theme in his spatial writings is that the alienation of contemporary existence is based on the separation of thought from dwelling, and thus from “being.” He argues that this disconnectedness of “being” and dwelling did not exist before modern technology. He further argues against the privileging of technology in the modern world, and attempts to return humankind to some form of authentic existence.¹²¹ “This time of technology is a destitute time, the time of the world’s night, in which man has even forgotten that he has forgotten the true nature of being.”¹²²

For Henri Lefebvre, Heidegger’s concept of space is ontological and as such is problematic. I would agree that it is an ontological conceptualization of space in that he “spiritualizes” the interrelationships of space, dwelling, and being. But I would also argue that Heidegger’s conceptualization of space is more than ontological, it is also a grounded space. A concept of space that is grounded in building, places, locations, and sites; grounded in a connectedness with earth. I would take Lefebvre’s argument further and say that Heidegger’s conceptualization of space is based on the coexistence of the ontological and grounded.

Heidegger’s spatial conceptualizations still make a significant contribution to discourses on space. His development of concepts of space grounded in place, location, and site mark a clear break from dominant theories of a mathematical infinite space, and from the Cartesian absolute space. A critique of his conceptualizations of space is that they are strongly situated within a Eurocentric philosophical position. His search for the linguistic origins of the meaning of building, space, and place are situated within the Classic languages of Latin and Greek, and the German and English languages. Regardless of Hannah Arendt’s influence, he does not extend his theoretical arguments to be inclusive of ethnicity and gender.¹²³ His work does not consider cultural differences of space, and is firmly situated within a Eurocentric cultural position. Nevertheless, when Heidegger writes about space, in his spatial essays, he privileges spatiality over temporality, and as such, he has created openings for other cultural discourses. In these essays he spatializes the language of existence, being, presencing, and boundaries. It is this spatial language that is recognized by cultures that privilege spatiality.
over temporality, thereby providing openings for cultural discourse. Of importance, is that he also brings the discussion of space into the everyday spaces of human existence. As such his spatial writings have contributed to current discourses and debates in architecture, cultural geography, urban studies, and cultural theory. His writings on everyday spaces, boundaries, presencing, and horizon have been influential in cultural theory.

Cultural theorist, Homi Bhabha begins his work *The Location of Culture* with a citation from Heidegger’s “Building Dwelling Thinking”: “the boundary is that from which something begins its presencing.” He posits “it is the trope of our times to locate the question of culture in the realm of the beyond.” He maintains that the “beyond” signifies spatial distance and that the imaginary of spatial distance that is to live somehow beyond the borders of our times “throws into relief the temporal, social differences that interrupt our collusive sense of cultural contemporaneity.” He is arguing here that it is the spatial that throws our temporal existence and social differences into relief. As presented earlier, Bhabha argues that it is the epistemological limits of ethnocentric ideologies that enunciate the boundaries of dissonant and dissident histories and voices of women and the colonized. In reference to Heidegger, Bhabha claims that it is in “postcolonial migration, the narratives of cultural and political diaspora, the major social displacements of peasant and aboriginal communities,” that “it is in this sense that the boundary becomes the place from which something begins its presencing in a movement not dissimilar to the ambulant, ambivalent articulation of the beyond.” To further illustrate his argument Bhabha equates the cultural movements to go beyond boundaries, to Heidegger’s bridge: “Always and ever differently the bridge escorts the lingering and hastening ways of men to and fro, so that they may get to the other banks [...] The bridge gathers as a passage that crosses.” Bhabha brings Heidegger’s spatial conceptualizations into current cultural discourse. He further examines being in the “beyond” as “to inhabit an intervening space” but in reference to Heidegger “to dwell in the beyond is [...] to be part of a revisionary time, a return to the present to redescribe our cultural contemporaneity; to reinscribe our human, historic commonality; to touch the future on its hitherside.”
In architecture the question of space and human existence was actively debated as related to theory and practice by CIAM and Team 10. Later developments in architecture and phenomenology focused on Heidegger’s work in relation to space and existence. In Architecture: Meaning and Place, the architectural theorist Norberg-Schulz further develops Heidegger’s concept of space as connections between habitat and place. Building on Heidegger’s theories, he puts forward the notion of “space as a system of places,” and maintains that a system of places are a necessary condition for adaptation to a given environment. Norberg-Schulz distinguishes between notions of space and place whereby “‘space’ denotes the three-dimensional organization of the elements which make up a place, ‘character’ denotes the general ‘atmosphere’ which is the most comprehensive property of any place.”

Postmodern architectural theories and discourses are marked by a return to a consciousness of place and location. In architecture polemic postmodern discussions centre around issues of the heterogeneity of lived space and are in favour of a cultural heterogeneity in the form of pluralism, the spirit of the place, the spirit of the time as opposed to a universalization of place and location. Within this postmodern debate there is a strong advocacy for regionalism in architecture. There is also recognition of the need for cultural pluralism in built architecture.

The phenomenon of universalization, while being an advancement of mankind, at the same time constitutes a sort of subtle destruction, not only of traditional cultures, which might not be an irreparable wrong, but also of what I shall call for the time being the creative nucleus of the great cultures, that nucleus on the basis of which we interpret life, what I shall call in advance the ethical and mythical nucleus of mankind [...].

Kenneth Frampton advocates a regionalism in architecture and draws upon the work of Heidegger, via Hannah Arendt, to support his position. He argues for an architecture that is grounded in “the specific culture of the region - that is to say, its history in both a geological and agricultural sense - becomes inscribed into the form and realization of the work.” He maintains that this inscription of the site “arises out of ‘in-laying’ the building into the site,” and by doing this embodies “in built form, the prehistory of the place, its archaeological past.
and its subsequent cultivation and transformation across time. This cultural and historical connectedness to the site, which Frampton is advocating is closely related to Heidegger’s spatial conceptualizations of place, location, and site. Frampton’s notion of layering and “in-laying” the site also has connections to Heidegger’s concept of gathering into the site to create a place, a location, and ultimately a space.

Frampton calls this notion of regionalism, critical regionalism, which he maintains “seeks to complement our normative visual experience by readdressing [sic] the tactile range of human perceptions.” He argues: “the capacity of the body to read the environment in terms other than those of sight alone suggest a potential strategy for resisting the domination of universal technology.” Frampton proposes that the tactile is also an important perception of the built form. He suggests that a range of sensory perceptions are registered in the built form as intensity of light, darkness, heat and cold, feeling of humidity, the aroma of the material, and the sound we make as we walk through the space. This view, which is grounded in phenomenology, opposes the Cartesian view of a mind-body duality. He discusses the skepticism around grounding architectural practice in a metaphysical concept such as “being,” however, he argues that “we are, when confronted with the ubiquitous placelessness of our modern environment, nonetheless brought to posit, after Heidegger, the absolute precondition of a bounded domain in order to create an architecture of resistance.” Heidegger’s argument based on the state of homelessness of humankind resulting from a disconnectedness of being and dwelling, which was brought about by technology, is further interpreted here by Frampton as placelessness.

The bulldozing of an irregular topography into a flat site is clearly a technocratic gesture, which aspires to a condition of absolute placelessness, whereas the terracing of the same site to receive the stepped form of a building is an engagement in the act of ‘cultivating’ the site.

This erasure of the cultural and historical life of the site, and resulting sense of placelessness, has strong implications for future directions in relation to architecture and cultural issues.
I question Frampton’s interpretation of Heidegger’s concept of boundary, as a “clearly defined” and “bounded domain,” which I find problematic. I would argue that Heidegger’s concept of boundary is not a clearly defined, bounded domain, which is indicative of a demarcation, something fixed, but instead as Heidegger states, boundary in the Greek meaning of the word “is not that at which something stops” but is that from which “something begins its presencing.” Heidegger also relates this concept of boundary to his concept of gathering, which indicates that the meaning of boundary in this sense is not fixed and bounded but instead something that gathers into the site and by doing so creates a site, a place, and ultimately a space. This is closer to Bhabha’s interpretation of Heidegger’s concept of boundary as “the place from which something begins its presencing in a movement not dissimilar to the ambulant, ambivalent articulation of the beyond” and links these movements to Heidegger’s bridge: “Always and ever differently the bridge escorts the lingering and hastening ways of men to and fro [...]. The bridge gathers as a passage that crosses.” I would also argue that this indicates a fluid interrelationship of the act of being, of presencing with the process of gathering; there is a fluidity in their coexistence.

Current phenomenological approaches to architectural design and planning influenced by the theories of Heidegger focus on space, location, site and place. Such design arguments emphasize a need of a specific locus on earth “with a relationship to the elements, to earth and water, to plant and animal life.” Key to phenomenological arguments and subsequent emergent notions of space is “genius loci,” the nexus of identity and sense of place, a gathering of self. Currently active phenomenological approaches to architectural and environmental design focus on inclusion of diverse cultures and recognize that a heterogeneous society poses crucial questions for design. According to Robert Mugerauer, a critical question for design is cultural life, “how would we attempt to nurture both concretely enriching differences and also a generally intelligible social identity”? He also advocates the importance of designing for the needs of different phases of human life, and emphasizes connections between living spaces, places, and sets of relationships. In his work, Mugerauer investigates environmentally and culturally sensitive design projects such as the Green architecture movement, which focuses on designs that will be adaptive to bioregions and that will also “be responsive to historical, cultural environments [...] and provide for a sense of
personal and regional identity." He remarks that in Canada, there is advocacy for "responsive planning" in housing in which design is for example sensitive to the values of First Nations peoples. Mugerauer further argues that environmentally and culturally sensitive design projects that are "grounded in sophisticated views of our private and social bodies, memories, and architecture, do not result from any sort of mechanical application of fixed ideas, forms, and materials. Each project and program, each desired cultural outcome, had to be thought and designed afresh." He also maintains that, in the ensuing debates over these culturally and environmentally sensitive design approaches, they are considered in the field of architecture to be the "other" architecture. He counters this prevailing attitude in architecture of the "other" with an argument of openness to the theoretical and practical.

Another level of contribution to current spatial discourses comes from Heidegger’s later writings on space. In his later thinking and theorizing about space, he discusses the connections between space and technology and that the implications for our technological existence is one of homelessness; a homelessness of our technological era, in the sense of our disconnectedness. Through his writings on technology and space we gain a sense that the privileging of the technological in Western societies is so extensive that it is ontological. Nevertheless, it is not an objective of this research inquiry to engage in a debate of the advantages and disadvantages of regional architecture vs. a universal technologically-centred architecture but instead to examine some of the problematics that have emerged from the dominance of the latter in relation to a privileging of a homogeneity of space over cultural differences in constructed space.

2.5 Spatial Theories of Henri Lefebvre
Another major force in current discourses on space is the spatial theorizing and writings of Henri Lefebvre. The spatial problematic was critical to Lefebvre’s thinking and writings. I examine some of the complexities and contradictions of Lefebvre’s spatial conceptualizations in relation to my inquiry – do concepts of space inform the production of education? First and foremost, Lefebvre’s contribution to spatial theories is his investigation of the sociology of space, the ways in which Western societies construct and produce space. Second, I will examine his spatial concepts in relation to the ways in which he posits that knowledge is
constructed as perceived, conceived, and lived. Third, I will examine Lefebvre’s modalities of spatial production and their interrelationships. And fourth, I will examine Lefebvre’s concept that space is a process, and the process of producing space.

In his project on spatial practice published as The Production of Space\(^{154}\) Lefebvre took on the enormous task of investigating the ways in which Western societies construct and produce space and spatial relations. More specifically, Lefebvre’s project is an investigation of the spaces of social practice and the social production of spaces within Europe, inclusive of Marxist philosophy and neo-capitalist practice. He emphasizes that the spaces produced by society are “social spaces,” and the production of these spaces are “spatial practices.” His work is critical to the understanding of Western epistemology of space and spatiality.\(^{155}\) Lefebvre claims of his project that he “does not aim to produce a (or the) discourse on space, but rather to expose the actual production of space by bringing the various kinds of space and modalities of their genesis together […].”\(^{156}\)

Key to Lefebvre’s work and to this research inquiry is Lefebvre’s claim: “Every society […] produces a space, its own space”\(^{157}\) and that the spatial practice of a society is revealed through the deciphering of its spaces.\(^{158}\) In this analysis, I extend Lefebvre’s assertion to make the claim that spatial constructs and spatial practices are culturally informed, and as such I investigate the cultural practices of a society as revealed through a deciphering of its spaces and spatial practices.

Integrated in Lefebvre’s design of the production of social space is his construction of spatiality as a form of knowledge. In his theorizing about space, Lefebvre argues against the concept of a Euclidean, infinite space. As did Heidegger, he opposes the Cartesian logic of a homogeneous space, space as the realm of the absolute. He argues that in Western society mathematicians appropriated space, thereby detaching it from philosophy. Within modernist thought “a philosophy of space has been revised and corrected by mathematics – the modern field of inquiry known as epistemology has inherited and adopted the notion that the status of space is that of a ‘mental thing’ or ‘mental place.’ ”\(^{159}\) Lefebvre claims that since the
Enlightenment, a duality has existed between physical space and mental space, with the privileging of mental space. His aim is:

to discover or construct a theoretical unity between ‘fields’ which are apprehended separately [...]. The fields we are concerned with are, first, the physical - nature, the Cosmos; secondly, the mental, including logical and formal abstractions; and, thirdly, the social. In other words we are concerned with logico-epistemological space, the space of social practice, the space occupied by sensory phenomena, including products of the imagination such as projects and projections, symbols and utopias.\textsuperscript{160}

One of Lefebvre’s major contributions to the theoretical debate on space is the introduction of his concept of a social space into the realms of mental and physical space. He does not privilege one over the other but continually searches for a theoretical unity between the fields of physical, mental, and social space.\textsuperscript{161} Important to current spatial discourse is Lefebvre’s idea of a diversity or multiplicity of spaces. Lefèbvre situates his concept of space as social, physical, and mental within what Edward Soja calls a spatial triad of perceived, conceived, and lived experience.\textsuperscript{162}

In Lefebvre’s construction of space as a form of knowledge, he investigates as Heidegger did the relationship of language to space. He searches to uncover concealed relations between space and language within the spatial practices of societies. As such he poses the question: “To what extent may a space be read or decoded”?\textsuperscript{163} He argues that the notions of message, code, information cannot help us trace the genesis of a space but, however, “an already produced space can be decoded; can be read.”\textsuperscript{164}

If indeed spatial codes have existed, each characterizing a particular spatial/social practice, and if these codifications have been produced along with the space corresponding to them, then the job of theory is to elucidate their rise, their role, and their demise [...] instead of emphasizing the rigorously formal aspects of codes, I shall instead be putting the stress on their dialectical character. Codes will be seen as part of a practical relationship, as part of an interaction between ‘subjects’ and their space and surroundings. I shall attempt to trace the coming-into-being and disappearance of codings/decodings.\textsuperscript{165}
In Lefebvre's reading of existing codes, his emphasis is on the dialectical character of codes— the relationships and interactions between subjects and their space and surroundings—what he refers to as the social-spatial practices. Lefebvre recognizes that codes inherent to the knowledge of space and social practice have been in dissolution and all that remains of them are relics: words, images, and metaphors. Nevertheless, Lefebvre investigates throughout his project the meanings of the remaining relics, words, images, and metaphors of past societies in an attempt to understand spatial practice and the production of space in Western culture. For Lefebvre, "a spatial code is not simply a means of reading or interpreting space: rather it is a means of living in that space, of understanding it, and producing it."

The notion of space as lived experience is important to Lefebvre's theoretical arguments about space. He focuses on the spatialization of modern society and what he refers to as the spatialization of lived experience. He argues that philosophers have abandoned the theory of knowledge in favour of a reductionist approach focusing on the knowledge of the history of philosophy and the history of science. He maintains that knowledge can only be conceived of as separate from both ideology and non-knowledge (pre-existing systems of knowledge) that is from lived experience. He claims that lived experience of space is not divorced from theory. He maintains that theory should be based on lived experience; knowledge should be constructed from lived experience.

Within his theoretical design of space, Lefebvre introduces the concept of fields of space as, mental, physical, and social, which he interrelates with knowledge constructed as perceived, conceived, and lived. His methodology is a mode of analysis based on the dialectical relationships within this concept of spatiality. He refers to perceived, conceived, and lived spaces as a triad of spatiality. He argues in favour of a theoretical triad against binary theories, which he maintains give way to oppositions, contrasts, echoes, and mirror effects. Going beyond modernist dualities and binaries is critical to Lefebvre's investigations of knowledge constructed from lived experience. Key to his spatial triad is the dialectical relationships that exist and inter-relate on multiple levels between the perceived, the conceived, and the lived. Lefebvre argues that it is only through a dialectical analysis of these relationships that human spatiality can be understood. Lefebvre refers to his spatial triad of
perceived space (perçu), conceived space (conçu), and lived space (l'espace vécu) as three moments in social space.

Lefebvre further complicates his spatial design by introducing modalities of spatial practice. Perceived space is connected to materialized spatial practice. Conceived space is connected to representations of space, which he also refers to as "abstract space." And lived space is connected to representational spaces, which he also refers to as "absolute space." He describes spatial practice as that which embraces the social production and reproduction, and the locations and spatial sets characteristic of social formations. Lefebvre suggests that spatial practice ensures continuity and cohesion of each member of a given society's relationship to that space. The spatial practice of a society constructs that society's space in a dialectical interaction; it produces it and appropriates it.

Human beings do not stand before, or amidst social space [...]. They know that they have a space and that they are in this space [...] they act and they situate themselves in space as active participants. They are accordingly situated in a series of enveloping levels each of which implies the others, and the sequence of which accounts for social practice.

In Lefebvre's spatial schematic conceived space is the space that is connected to and controls knowledge, signs, and codes. As conceptual space, it tends towards a system of verbal signs. As part of his larger theoretical design of the social production of space, Lefebvre connects the construct of conceived space with the modality of produced space, which he refers to as representations of space. Representations of space, both real and imagined, are the conceptualized space of scientists, planners, urbanists, technocratic subdividers and social engineers. Representations of space are laden with knowledge (savoir) that is a mixture of understanding (connaissance) and ideology. They occur by intervention, "by way of construction – in other words, by way of architecture, conceived of not as the building of a particular structure, palace or monument, but rather as a project embedded in a spatial context [...]." Lefebvre claims that conceived spaces and representations of space are the dominating spaces and mode of production in any society. They are the spaces of power and ideology, of control and surveillance. Projects of ideology and political power, which have representations in conceived space control and dominate by constructing an order in space,
and by regulating spatial practices. I would argue that an intervention of representations of space also occurs by way of discourse, as the discourse of an ideology that informs the construct of space, the production of that space, and the spatial practices that take place within that space. As Lefebvre states: “What is an ideology without a space to which it refers, a space which it describes, whose vocabulary and links it makes use of, and whose code it [space] embodies?”

Part of Lefebvre’s schematic of the production of space is his concept of lived space: “space as directly lived through its associated images and symbols, and hence the space of ‘inhabitants and users.’” He refers to lived space as representational space. He claims that representational spaces tend towards non-verbal symbols and signs. These spaces embody complex symbolisms, which may or may not be coded. “They have their source in history – in the history of a people as well as in the history of each individual belonging to that people.” Lefebvre proposes that:

We should have to study not only the history of space, but also the history of representations, along with that of their relationships – with each other, with practice, and with ideology. History would have to take in not only the genesis of these spaces but also, and especially, their interconnections, distortions, displacements, mutual interactions, and their links with the spatial practice of the particular society or mode of production under consideration.

In his theoretical design of the production of space Lefebvre does not privilege one spatiality, or one mode of spatial production, over another. He does, however, make the argument that in modern society perceived space and lived space have been subsumed by conceived space and representations of space as a modality of production. He argues in favour of knowledge constructed on the basis of lived experience. He seeks a unity within and between his conceptualization of human spatiality in the perceived, conceived, and lived and within and in connection to the modalities of spatial practice. He states that “it is reasonable to assume that spatial practice, representations of space and representational spaces contribute in different ways to the production of space according to their qualities and attributes, according to the society or mode of production in question, and according to the historical period.”
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Important to this analysis is Lefebvre's concept of space as a process. Societies produce space, space is the outcome of a sequence of operations. "It [social space] subsumes things produced, and encompasses their interrelationships in their coexistence and simultaneity." He argues that the social relations of production have a spatial existence; social relations project themselves into a space, becoming inscribed there, and in the process produce that space. Lefebvre further argues that if space is produced, if it is a productive process, then there is a history of space. He proposes that the passage of one mode of production to another is of the utmost theoretical importance.

Each mode of production has its own particular space, the shift from one mode to another must entail the production of a new space [...] examination of the transitions between modes of production will reveal that a fresh [new] space is indeed generated during these changes, a space which is planned and organized subsequently.

Lefebvre applies his theoretical design of the production of space to an analysis of modern society. He describes a complex system of interrelationships within the spaces of modern society that are informed by an ideology of accumulation and the extent of the power of this ideology. Within this complex system he maintains that spatial practice is predominant through the reproduction of its social relations. The dominant form of space, he argues, is conceived space (representation of space), which is controlled by knowledge and power, leaving only a narrow leeway for representational spaces (lived space). In his search for the genesis of the mode of modern space, which he calls the "space of accumulation," he determines that in contrast to Medieval space and Renaissance space, modern society has produced a representation of space, an abstract space, in which political practice takes precedence over social and cultural forms of practice. He maintains that in modern society ideological, political, abstract spaces supercede representational spaces, lived spaces. This dominant form of space, which represents centres of wealth and power, moulds the spaces it dominates and seeks to reduce obstacles and resistance to it, forcing differences into symbolic forms. The abstract space of modern society operates negatively in relation to perceived and lived space. It only functions positively within its own implications of technology, applied sciences, and knowledge, which is bound to power. Dominant power "tends toward homogeneity, towards the elimination of existing differences or
peculiarities. He maintains that the conceived space (abstract space) of ideologies and politics is centralized, organized, hierarchized, symbolized and programmed. The principal force of the abstract spaces of modern social space is “concealed by its illusory transparency” that of political power embedded in a bureaucracy that perpetuates itself. I elaborate on this argument in relation to Foucault’s theories of power embedded in space.

Critical to Lefebvre’s analysis of modern society is that the abstract spaces (conceived spaces) of modern political power (dominant power) are perpetuated by bureaucracy and technology through a reproduction, a repetition of spaces and social relations; “repetitious spaces are the outcome of repetitive gestures” associated with instruments that are designed to duplicate as do machines. Within modern society, space has taken on a reality of its own - space produced “serves as a tool of thought and action; that in addition to being a means of production it is also a means of control, and hence of domination, of power.” Lefebvre claims that dominated space – is a space transformed and mediated by technology, by practice. In order to dominate space, hegemonic powers use technology to introduce a new form into a pre-existing space. Within this analysis he maintains that the abstract spaces of modern society harbour specific contradictions. One of these contradictions lies in the ideology of homogeneity of modern Western societies. Lefebvre argues that in fact: “Abstract space is not homogeneous; it simply has homogeneity as its goal, its orientation, its lens.” The abstract spaces (conceived spaces) of modern society are fragmented not homogeneous. The dialectical homogenizing and fractured spaces of modern societies he claims are broken down into models of sectors, determined on an empirical basis as systems, as systemic.

The oeuvre of Henri Lefebvre is an important contribution to our understanding of Western spatiality, the ways in which Western societies construct and produce space, and the multiple ways that spatial relations play out in our everyday lives. His major spatial project, The Production of Space, is part of a larger oeuvre to come out of the social unrest in France in the late 1960s and 1970s, which analyzes and challenges Western ideologies, social structures, and distributions of wealth and power. Important to this inquiry is that Lefebvre,
in addition to examining space as a means of production, also examines space as a means of control and domination in Western societies.

Lefebvre's contributions to our understanding of spatiality are numerous. As a social theorist he introduces space as a knowledge construct and as comprised sets of relationships into the domain of sociology. In his investigations of the sociology of space he counters binary structures of space and introduces a theory of multiple spatial relationships that exist, interact and interplay on multiple levels. Into the realms of mental and physical space he interjects the concept of social space. Critical to his overall contribution is that space is not only conceptualized but it is produced. He presents a complex design of conceptual forms of space, modes of production of space, and spatial practices that illustrate for us the complexities and intricacies of our human spatiality. His argument demonstrates that space is not only conceptualized and produced but that it is a process, and that the process of producing space exists and interrelates on multiple levels.

For Lefebvre, space is relational. In examining social relations in terms of space, he determines that they have a spatial existence; social relations project themselves into a space, becoming inscribed there, and in the process produce that space. Within this hypothesis, he claims that space in all its conceptual and material forms, as well as spatial practices, is relational and exists as sets of relations.

Lefebvre's contribution to current discourses on space is significant in his application of his theoretical design to an analysis of modern Western societies. Through a spatial analysis and a deciphering of societies' spaces he reveals the interconnectedness of ideologies and spatial constructs and that ideologies are embedded and inscribed in our social spaces. His analysis further illustrates the ways in which hegemony is extended through space and that space also becomes a tool for hegemonic thought and action; a tool to control, dominate and regulate spatial practices.

Given the extensiveness and complexities of Lefebvre's project there are undoubtedly contradictions, which are further complicated by the complexities, nuances, and subtleties of
the French language. Relevant to this inquiry are his contradictions around the notion that ideologies are inscribed and embedded in space. Lefebvre argues that ideologies are "in space," they intervene in space but that they do not produce space. This is an interesting contradiction because in his analysis of modern Western societies he maintains that ideologies are embedded in modes of production and spatial practices. He further establishes connections between ideology and the built form in his argument that the intervention of ideology, of conceived space "occurs by way of construction [...] by way of architecture, conceived of not as the building of a particular structure, palace or monument, but rather as a project embedded in a spatial context." My argument on the interconnectedness of ideologies and spatial constructs departs from that of Lefebvre. Ideologies are not only "in the space," as embedded in the space, but they are present in the systematic processes that produce the space to the extent that they become prescriptive. I argue that ideologies and value systems inform concepts of space, inform modes of production, and inform spatial practices. I argue that there is a direct correlation between ideologies and the space produced, and ideologies and value systems are the motivating forces that push forward and control the production of spaces. As we examine more closely multiple ideologies representative of multiple ways of knowing across diverse cultures then the direct coexistence between ideologies and the production of space becomes more apparent. This is argued in more detail in relation to the site studies.

A further critique of Lefebvre's project is that his spatial theories are located primarily within a Eurocentric position. He does recognize that Western society is a culture. However, he does not consider that social relations and their corresponding spatial practices are culturally informed and that space is culturally produced. He does not consider the implications of a hegemonic production of space for cultures of difference with the exception of the engendering of space, and even then his analysis is limited. Nor does he take into consideration the implications when one cultural production of space overlaps another, or when one cultural production of space completely subsumes another. His aim to bring all the spatial constructs, modes of spatial production, and spatial practices together within one single theory is also problematic, as it does not take into consideration that cultures of
difference have spatial concepts and practices that might not only be different but incommensurable with a single theory.

The implications of Lefebvre's theoretical analysis of space and the application of that analysis are far reaching for current discourses of space across multiple knowledge bases. His concept of the construction of knowledge as lived experience, and taking space from the realm of the infinite or sacred to the spaces of the everyday, are significant contributions for current discourses in Cultural Studies. His analysis of Western constructs of space and spatial practices have further implications for discourses on cultural differences as related to issues of knowledge constructs, hierarchy, centralized power, dominance, and marginalized peoples, which are investigated further in relation to the three site studies. His work serves as a mode of analysis, and has been instrumental in spatial analysis in relation to urban studies, cultural geography, and gender studies. In the domain of architecture, the application of his theories as a mode of analysis or a mode of critique is an emergent discourse.

From the mid to the later part of the twentieth century a number of theorists began to examine the interrelationships between space and human existence, ontologically, philosophically, theoretically, and in its material form. Few pushed the investigation of our spatial existence as far as Heidegger, Lefebvre, and Foucault (with the later exception of Said's work on the spatialization of imperialism and colonialism). Each of these theorists is located in Western culture but approach human spatiality from very different positions. Within their investigations there are overlaps and commonalities where one theory reinforces the other. All three have in common that space is relational and that sets of relationships coexist. There are links between Lefebvre and Heidegger's conceptualizations of human spatiality as to: location, place, site; boundaries; the significance of the spaces in between; and the ontological meanings of space. In relation to the work of Lefebvre and Foucault, Lefebvre is very critical of Foucault's writings on space, to the point of being dismissive.194 This is interesting given the emphasis placed by both writers on the interrelationships between society and space, and given that Foucault's influence is evident in Lefebvre's work on dominant spaces. In relation to the work of Foucault and Heidegger, there is a growing
emergent discourse on connections between their thinking. In reference to intellectual influences on his work, Foucault claimed in an interview in 1984 that:

Heidegger has always been the essential philosopher [...] I set out to read Heidegger in 1951 or 1952 [...] I still have here the notes I took when I was reading Heidegger. I’ve got tons of them! [...]. My entire philosophical development was determined by my reading of Heidegger [...]. My knowledge of Nietzsche certainly is better than my knowledge of Heidegger [...]. It is possible that if I had not read Heidegger, I would not have read Nietzsche. I tried to read Nietzsche in the fifties but Nietzsche alone did not appeal to me—whereas Nietzsche and Heidegger: that was a philosophical shock!

The claim here is not that Foucault is Heideggerian but that Heidegger was an intellectual stimulus for Foucault, a stimulus that “functioned as an invitation to think with Heidegger, but beyond Heidegger.” This emergent discourse on the connections between their work has been described as critical encounters. Within Heidegger, Lefebvre, and Foucault’s theoretical positions on space there are differences. It is the differences that I bring to the forefront, I draw out and examine within the context of their contribution to this inquiry, not as polemics but as encounters that, as Foucault says, opens up problems.

2.6 Foucault’s Spatial Discourses

The present epoch will perhaps be above all the epoch of space.
Foucault, 1984, in Soja, 1996, 155

Contributing to our thinking of spatiality from a cultural location of Western society and particularly relevant to this inquiry are Heidegger’s philosophy on the interrelations between dwelling and human existence, Lefebvre’s theories on spatial constructs, the production of space, and spatial practices, and Foucault’s discursive historical investigations of institutionalized spaces in Western societies. Critical to this analysis of their spatial projects in relation to my hypothesis are the differences in the ways in which they problematize human spatiality within Western culture.

Foucault examines by way of a discursive historical analysis the interrelations between institutionalized spaces and institutionalized practices in Western society, more specifically
France, England, and to some extent Germany. Throughout his work he investigates the ways in which Western society constructs knowledge and the relationships between knowledge, space, and power.

One of the first problematics that Foucault addresses in his work is the construction of knowledge. For Foucault understanding the past is a way of understanding the present. He investigates the past through a genealogical analysis of "epistemes" and discourses. His argument is that frameworks of knowledge are forever changing, and refers to these changes, shifts, in knowledge as "epistemes," periodizations of knowledge. Foucault views the spatialization of Western society from Medieval to Modern as epistemic, from the space of localization, to the space of extension, to the space of arrangement.200

Critical to Foucault's analysis of the past is the spatialization of knowledge and power and their interrelationships. The question of space is central to his historical investigations.201 In an analysis of Foucault's oeuvre, from early to later writings, Soja maintains that "a comprehensive and critical understanding of spatiality was at the centre of all his writings":202 Madness and Civilization (1961); The Birth of the Clinic (1961); Discipline and Punish (1975); and The History of Sexuality (1976). During the 1960s he also produced a series of essays including the "The Language of Space" (1964). It was at this time that he became increasingly engaged with architecture and the spatial order of things.203 He was invited by a group of architects to do a study of space, which he presented in 1967 as a lecture entitled: "Des espaces autres," (Of Other Spaces).204

Foucault's commitment to a spatial problematic and a spatial praxis can be further traced through his interviews with geographers, architects, and anthropologists.205 In an interview in 1976 with French geographers published as "Questions à Michel Foucault sur la géographie" in the journal "Hérodote,"206 Foucault says that he is often reproached for his "spatial obsessions" but he maintains that it is through these "spatial obsessions" that he had come to what he had basically been looking for: "the relations that are possible between power and knowledge."207 This statement by Foucault is key to recognizing the importance of space in his work, and the connections he investigates between knowledge, space and power.208
Heidegger, Lefebvre, and Foucault each establish a relationship between space and place in their work. For Heidegger a place exists because of the locations of things. For Lefebvre spatial practice defines places. Whereas Foucault maintains that space is a hierarchical system of places. In his lecture “Of Other Spaces” Foucault gives a brief history of space in Western society, and the relations between space and place from Medieval to Modern. He traces this concept of space as a hierarchical system of places back to the Middle Ages. As do Heidegger and Lefebvre, he argues against Galileo’s conceptualization of space. He claims that before Galileo’s concept of an infinite, open space there existed in the Middle Ages “a space of localization.”

It could be said that there was a hierarchical system of places in the Middle Ages: places that were sacred and profane, protected and, on the contrary, open and undefended, urban places and rural places [...]. In cosmological theory, supercelestial places existed, in contrast to the celestial place, opposed in its turn to the terrestrial place [...]. This hierarchy, contrast and mingling of places made up that which might, very approximately, be called medieval space. That is to say, the space of localization.209

Foucault argues that “the real scandal caused by Galileo’s work” was the extent to which it dissolved the space of localization, the space of the Middle Ages.210 From the seventeenth century onwards, Foucault maintains that the space of localization gave way to Galileo’s space of extension, in which the location of a thing was no more than a point in its movement.211 He further argues that Galileo’s work gave a theoretical desanctification of space, but he questions whether the complete desanctification of space has been achieved in practice. He points out that our lives may be in fact “still ruled by a certain number of unrelenting opposites, which institution and practice have not dared to erode [...] such as the contrast between public and private space, family and social space, cultural and utilitarian space, the space of pleasure and the space of work - all opposites that are still actuated by a veiled sacredness.” 212

In today’s society, Foucault claims that the space of extension has been taken over by the space of arrangement which he defines as the arrangement of individuals and society in
space; the spatial ordering of society. "In our era, space presents itself to us in the form of patterns of ordering."²¹³ It is Foucault’s historical investigations of the spatial ordering of society that is of importance to this inquiry. He observes that the ordering of space in society takes the form of institutionalized spaces, practices, systems, and techniques; techniques which he refers to as mechanisms. His claim is that the spaces of society are “outlined in the very institution of society”²¹⁴ and in society’s institutions. In his project, Discipline and Punishment,²¹⁵ he elaborates on this theme and investigates three forms of institutionalized space: the space of exclusion; the space of containment; and the space of internment. Foucault’s analysis of institutionalized models of space and institutionalized practices and their coexistence are examined in more detail.

A major contribution of Foucault’s work to current discourses on our spatial existence is that he opens up the discussion by problematizing institutional spaces and institutional practices. He describes this more succinctly when he states: “I have always been concerned with linking together as tightly as possible the historical and theoretical analysis of power relations, institutions, and knowledge, to the movements, critiques, and experiences that call them into question in reality.”²¹⁶ Established Western historical, theoretical, institutional, and knowledge relations are called into question in this inquiry through an analysis of critiques and lived experiences as related in the following site studies.
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Chapter Three
Institutionalized Spaces

My hypothesis is that space is culturally constructed. The philosophies, ideologies, and values that shape a culture, also shape the space and spaces that are “inhabited” by that culture. Based on this hypothesis, I investigate Western constructs of space that are informed by culturally based philosophies, ideologies, and values centred around discipline and the institutionalization of discipline through spatial arrangements and spatial practices that are extended to and embedded in our educational systems. I further investigate the implications of institutionalized spaces and spatial practices in education for cultures of difference.

Within Western culture a predominant conceptual construct for educational buildings is premised on an institutionalized construct. Regardless of the building type, the conceptual core of many educational buildings is based on culturally informed Western ideologies of discipline and institutionalized disciplining spaces. This argument follows a trajectory in Western culture from the early seventeenth century to the present of a spatial ordering of society through discipline, institutionalized spaces, and spatial practices that is extended to and informs building, including educational institutions. 1

3.1 Foucault and Disciplining Spatial Models

This inquiry draws on Foucault’s discursive historical investigations of discipline and institutions to further analyze institutionalized spaces and spatial practices in Western culture. As part of his investigation Foucault traces the history of discipline in Western societies, from the disciplining of society through the public spectacle of punishment to the disciplining of society through the institution. In his analysis of the later, he establishes connections between ideologies of discipline and the spatialization of discipline. He observes that the spatial ordering of society through discipline takes the form of institutionalized spaces, spatial practices, and systems and techniques that are also spatialized. Foucault is occupied with three forms of institutionalized space: the space of exclusion; the space of containment; and the space of internment. His argument is that ideologies of discipline and the spatial ordering of society through discipline inform these institutionalized spaces. In
Discipline and Punish

Foucault's thesis is that discipline proceeds from the distribution of individuals in space; the assignment of individuals to a fixed space; and the mechanistic techniques that are used for surveillance and control of an individual in an assigned space.

Foucault traces connections between ideologies of discipline and the spatialization of discipline, which are joined in the formation of the "institution" during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, he maintains that in France "strict discipline" was considered as an art of correct training.

The chief function of the disciplinary power is to 'train' [...] It does not link forces together in order to reduce them; it seeks to bind them together in such a way as to multiply and use them. Instead of bending all its subjects into a single uniform mass, it separates, analyses, differentiates, carries its procedures of decomposition to the point of necessary and sufficient single units. It 'trains' the moving, confused useless multitudes of bodies and forces into a multiplicity of individual elements — small, separate cells, organic autonomies, genetic identities and continuities, combinatory segments. Discipline 'makes' individuals; it is the specific technique of a power that regards individuals both as objects and as instruments of its exercise.

This ideology of strict discipline through the art of correct training is examined by Foucault in relation to early models of disciplining institutes, such as the military camp and the military school and their corresponding spatial arrangements. Foucault posits that the function of the disciplinary power is to train by linking and binding its forces together and that this is not accomplished by bending its subjects into a single uniform mass but by breaking down that mass into smaller disciplined units "small, separate cells." These cellular units are then organized according to a hierarchical system of distribution; both social and spatial. The distribution and organization of these cellular units is then controlled by the disciplinary power through observation: "the exercise of discipline presupposes a mechanism that coerces by means of observation; an apparatus in which the techniques that make it possible to see induce effects of power, and in which, conversely, the means of coercion make those on whom they are applied clearly visible." Through spatial distribution and arrangement Foucault claims that disciplinary power is not a power of omnipotence, but a "modest, suspicious power, which functions as a calculated but permanent economy."
In his historical investigations, Foucault determines that the spatialization of discipline is further reinforced through techniques, which he refers to as mechanisms, specifically observation, surveillance, and normalization, which are in turn spatialized. The spatial arrangement of the military camp was an effective model of controlling and disciplining by observation; a model, which Foucault refers to as an "observatory." In effect military camps of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were of a size and population that was so extensive they formed a temporary city whereby control and discipline through observation became a necessary operational function. According to Foucault, the plan of the distribution of tents, and the disposition of files and ranks were determined by a network of gazes that supervised one over the other. He refers to the model of the military camp, or its underlying principle, as the "spatial nesting" of hierarchized surveillance where "all power would be exercised solely through exact observation; each gaze would form a part of the overall functioning of power [...] the disposition of files and ranks were exactly defined," controlled by a network of gazes. Foucault claims that this "spatial nesting" of hierarchized surveillance became embedded in the construction of working-class housing, hospitals, asylums, prisons, and schools.

The military camp is an early model of a disciplinary spatial construct. As a configuration of disciplining spaces, Foucault argues that it became a model for the "disciplining institution" by controlling a mass of people through "arrangement," which was further reinforced through disciplinary mechanisms. He viewed the military apparatus as a large machine of organization, control, arrangement, discipline and surveillance. The idea of a hierarchical distribution of the small disciplined units of the military camp was also embedded in the architecture of the military school. According to Foucault, the military school building was a mechanism for training; a pedagogical machine that had its source in the École-Militaire conceived by Paris-Duverney, which Foucault describes as an apparatus for observation. In the spatial configuration of the military school, rooms were distributed along a corridor like a series of small cells. A window was placed on each of the cell doors at chest level as an apparatus of surveillance. Foucault claims that this infinite concern for surveillance and
control is expressed by innumerable petty mechanisms in the architecture of the school.\textsuperscript{10} The military school, as a pedagogical machine, became a prototype for schools.\textsuperscript{11}

A whole problematic then develops: that of an architecture that is no longer built simply to be seen [...] but to permit an internal, articulated and detailed control – to render visible those who are inside it; [...] an architecture that would operate to transform individuals; to act on those it shelters, to provide a hold on their conduct, to carry the effects of power right to them, to make it possible to know them, to alter them.\textsuperscript{12}

Disciplinary institutions of the seventeenth century functioned as a machinery of control, the divisions they created further served as apparatuses of control and observation, which were spatialized by the eighteenth century. Foucault maintains that through hierarchized surveillance and the insidious extension of disciplining mechanisms, disciplinary power became an integrated system; it grew into a multiple, automatic, anonymous power. Its functioning is that of a network of relations, of systems, that traverses the whole in its entirety, power that derives from one another, “supervisors perpetually supervised.”\textsuperscript{13} He further argues that the success of disciplinary power is derived from the use of simple instruments as disciplinary techniques, mechanisms of separation, division, distribution, hierarchical observation (gaze), surveillance, normalizing judgment, and their combination. The role of disciplinary mechanisms is one of instrumentation “in the progressive objectification and the ever more subtle partitioning of individual behaviour” for the purpose of control.\textsuperscript{14} Foucault’s argument, which is of importance to this inquiry, is that disciplinary power functions by breaking down a mass of people into smaller cellular units, by hierarchized arrangement, by a distribution of individuals in space, and by continual surveillance.

By the eighteenth century with the burgeoning of the metropolis, increase in urban populations, and an increase in material production, control by spatial ordering became more complex. As Foucault observes, supervision became more necessary and difficult, and the instrumentation of surveillance became more critical to the ordering and control of society. “Surveillance becomes a decisive economic operator both as an internal part of the production machinery and as a specific mechanism in the disciplinary power.”\textsuperscript{15} He further
argues that during the eighteenth century the disciplinary mechanism of surveillance was extended throughout society.

The power in the hierarchized surveillance of the disciplines is not possessed as a thing, or transferred as a property; it functions like a piece of machinery. And, although it is true that its pyramidal organization gives it a ‘head’, it is the apparatus as a whole that produces ‘power’ and distributes individuals in this permanent and continuous field. This enables the disciplinary power to be absolutely indiscreet, since it is every where and always alert, since by its very principle it leaves no zone of shade and constantly supervises the very individuals who are entrusted with the task of supervising; and absolutely ‘discreet’, for it functions permanently and largely in silence.16

3.2 Spatial Configurations of Early Schools

The ideology of discipline as linked to the education of the greater populous can be traced back as early as 1560 in Scotland with the publication of the Book of Discipline, which envisaged a nationwide network of Parish schools. In the seventeenth century, the schooling of children principally from poorer classes came under the direction of Christian and charitable organizations.17 With the development of Parish and Charity schools, the increase in the number of students at the elementary level, and the need for methods in regulating the activity of a whole class, surveillance became a key component in the reorganization of elementary schooling.

In England, Locke, as Commissioner of the Board of Trade, had proposed in 1697 an industrial school model for children as part of his Parish School Proposal. Discipline, control, and surveillance were integral parts of this model. Industrial schools could be very large with as many as a hundred to two hundred children. The design of these schools was governed by ideologies of discipline and surveillance. The workroom was laid out to allow for full supervision by the school master/mistress, with adjacent rooms for educational purposes or punishment. The emphasis was on work and instruction was given for usually one hour a day. The school master/mistress was situated centrally with a full view of all rooms and levels; discipline was production.18
By the late seventeenth century material production and education coexisted in early models of schools in the form of a workhouse. Education was linked not only to work in a pre-industrial factory; it was also linked to agriculture. Markus argues that the rural settlement was seen as an ideological setting for education; gardens, agriculture, and nature provided educational literature. He claims: “Remote wilderness, awaiting military subjugation and cultivation, is seen as a colony;” a colony of industry. School buildings were clustered together as a colony, each school varying in production. In contrast to this ideological setting, these rural settlements were developed for the poor as pre-industrial sites and workhouses. Markus describes one of the rural settlements, New Harlem, Yarranton (1677), which was designed for this purpose. The settlement contained numerous schools, each with a designated activity for production. The spatial arrangement of the Yarranton schools was that of a large workroom. At the centre of the workroom was a central box, like a pulpit, around the periphery were tiered benches seating about two hundred children, engaged in activities such as spinning. The pupils were overseen by a “Grand Mistress” who sat on a box in the middle of the room. A hierarchical relationship was established between the school-mistress, as the person responsible for surveillance and production, and the children. The emphasis in this scheme was on discipline and productivity. The spatial configuration was that of the inverted theatre which provided visibility for surveillance; the stage now being the domain of the observer and the auditorium that of the observed. (fig.1.) The incline of the successive rows of seating arrangement is such as to give full surveillance of the body. The first building, (Science building), constructed at the University of British Columbia, incorporated this model. The spatial arrangement of the inverted theatre is still a model that is widely used in lecture halls in universities today. The Yarranton scheme is a model of an ideological construct of discipline coexisting with a spatial construct; one is used to reinforce the other. According to Markus, the Yarranton scheme foreshadowed the key elements of the industrial revolution school.

Discipline, control of the poor, and material production were ideologies that shaped early schools. These ideologies were further reinforced through spatial arrangements and control of knowledge. In the industrial schools, labour was distributed according to gender. Schools varied according to production and gender. Boys were trained in blacksmith work,
woodwork, shoemaking and agriculture. In spinning schools, girls were trained to knit, sew, and spin. Instruction in the form of disciplines appeared in the industrial schools as early as the seventeenth century and included reading, writing, and religious instruction. In spinning schools for girls, the curriculum of reading and writing was often replaced by manual instruction of knitting and sewing. Ideologies of morality and values were linked with discipline and reflected in the curriculum. Instruction was most often limited to an hour a day with the curriculum emphasis on disciplined labor and production.

It was not uncommon for industrial schools to be located adjacent to prisons. Markus claims: “In Britain the industrial school had its origins as much in education as in carceral and Poor Law institutions.” Poor law institutions, carceral institutions, and industrial schools were all part of the spatial ordering of society and control of the masses. By the beginning of the nineteenth century industrial schools gradually began to disappear in Britain due to lack of profitability, and were eventually replaced by huge workhouse schools legislated by the New Poor Law of 1834. Industrial, agricultural, and workhouse schools were all punitive institutions. Penal reform, education and schooling were closely linked. Workhouses were often physically part of penal institutions. Work, education, and discipline were integral parts of the penal system as they were in the workhouse schools. The workhouses were characterized by coercion and harsh discipline. Markus claims that it was in these workhouses that the seeds of many educational practices are found.

3.3 Discipline, Normalization, and Space

Like surveillance and with it, normalization becomes one of the great instruments of [disciplining] power. Foucault, 1977, 184

In these early models of schooling, discipline was achieved through training, surveillance, and compliant behaviour. Normalcy was advocated. John Locke’s writings on Some Thoughts Concerning Education, in 1693, emphasize the importance of conforming to the norm within society. He outlines his recommendations for working with children so that they may acquire the virtue and wisdom necessary for living in the world. More important to Locke than the knowledge of the world in the education of children was the attaining of
virtue, which he claimed could only be attained through training. According to Locke, training was to be reinforced through reward and punishment, by esteem and disgrace, which he advocated are “the most powerful incentives to the Mind.”

Locke views conformity and duty as measures of virtue. He emphasizes the necessity of conforming to the norm of humanity.

Foucault argues that within disciplinary systems a penal mechanism functions and that specific to disciplinary penalty is non-observance, that which departs from the norm. The domain of non-conforming is punishable within a disciplinary system and takes a corrective form. “Disciplinary systems favour punishments that are exercises – intensified, multiplied forms of training, several times repeated.”

Corrective behaviour is achieved through repetitious training. Training and behaviour are further controlled by the spatial distribution and arrangement of students according to ranks or grade. This hierarchizing penalty “distributed pupils according to their aptitudes and their conduct, that is, according to the use that could be made of them when they left school; it exercised over them a constant pressure to conform to the same model, so that they might all be subjected to ‘subordination, docility, attention in studies and exercises, and to the correct practice of duties and all the parts of discipline’. So that they might all be like one another.”

Foucault observes that the combinatory disciplining mechanisms of surveillance and normalization became powerful disciplinary tools for schools. “The perpetual [penality] that traverses all points and supervises every instant in the disciplinary institutions compares, differentiates, hierarchizes, homogenizes, excludes. In short, it normalizes.” Critical to Foucault’s argument is that within disciplinary school systems “normalization” is achieved through spatial distribution and spatial arrangement.

The power of normalization imposes homogeneity by pressure to conform, thereby, simultaneously emphasizing difference. The norm is rewarded; difference is punished through corrective training. Foucault claims that the power of normalization “individualizes by making it possible to measure gaps, to determine levels, to fix specialties and to render the differences useful by fitting them one to another […] the norm introduces, as a useful imperative and as a result of measurement, all the shading of individual differences.”
Schools as disciplining institutions became an apparatus for normalization. The school as an apparatus to reinforce an ideology of normalization underlines the coexistence of disciplining ideologies with disciplining spaces.

3.4 Discipline, Society, and Space

Another form of spatial arrangement emerged in the seventeenth century that had implications for educational institutions, which Foucault calls the spatial arrangement of containment. Spatial containment on a large scale came about in Europe with the Great Plague. Foucault describes an order published at the end of the seventeenth century found in the Archive Militaires de Vincennes concerning measures to be taken in French towns upon the outbreak of a plague. He describes the “strict spatial partitioning” of the town into distinct quarters, each governed by an intendant. Only the intendants, syndics, and guards are allowed to move through the streets. “Each individual is fixed in his place.” If he moves it is at the risk of life, contagion or punishment. Each day the intendant inspects the street for which he is responsible. The inhabitants of each house must appear at their “assigned” window. In this way all are accounted for, so the sick and the dead may not be concealed. A hierarchy of spatial surveillance is established. Markus, as does Foucault, argues that control of society during the great plague by orderly segregation, surveillance, and control prefigured the vast penitentiary.

Foucault observes that in response to the disorder, the chaos that was caused by the plague, society was controlled by “strict divisions [...] the penetration of regulation into even the smallest details of everyday life through the mediation of the complete hierarchy that assured the capillary functioning of power [...].” Critical to this control was the “assignment” of each individual to “his ‘true’ place [...].” Foucault’s argument is that this ordering of division, partitioning, and segmenting of society continually under a hierarchy of surveillance and control provided a model for the formation of a disciplinary society.

3.5 Panopticon-Inspection-House

The architectural figure of a disciplinary society was manifested in the late eighteenth century in Jeremy Bentham’s “Panopticon.” The Panopticon was conceived as an
architectural model of discipline and surveillance. Bentham conceptualized the Panopticon as an inspection-house applicable to any establishment in which persons were to be kept under inspection. He outlines its purpose in a letter to a friend dated 1786.

Panopticon; or The Inspection–House: Containing the idea of a new principle of construction applicable to any sort of establishment, in which persons of any description are to be kept under inspection; and in particular to Penitentiary-Houses, Prisons, Poor-Houses, Lazarettos, Houses of Industry, Manufactories, Hospitals, Work-Houses, Mad-Houses, and Schools

Bentham’s design for the Panopticon consists of a peripheric building with a central tower. (Fig. 2a.) The central tower, called the inspector’s lodge, is pierced with wide windows that open onto the inner side of the peripheric building. The peripheric building is divided into cells, each cell extends the depth of the building, each cell has a large window on the exterior circumference and a large grated opening on the interior circumference, both on the same radial axis that corresponds to the windows of the central tower. (Fig. 2b.) The window on the outside allows light to cross the full length of the cell, illuminating the cell and its occupant. Each cell is separated from the other so that the inmates have no communication with one another. According to Foucault, “all that is needed, then, is to place a supervisor in the central tower and to shut up in each cell, a madman, a patient, a condemned man, a workman, or a schoolboy.” Foucault describes the spatial relations of the Panopticon as:

Each individual, in his place, is securely confined to a cell from which he is seen from the front by the supervisor; but the side walls prevent him from coming into contact with his companions. He is seen, but he does not see; he is the object of information, never a subject in communication.

In the spatial construct of the Panopticon-Inspection-House, Bentham brings together his Utilitarian philosophy on punishment and contemporary ideologies of discipline and correct behaviour. He reinforces this spatial model of discipline and surveillance with a proposed management plan. The intent of the inspection-house is to be polyvalent, a model for "any institution it may be thought proper to apply it to." Bentham’s objective was not only to discipline the body through surveillance but also to discipline and control the mind through surveillance. He saw his inspection-house as: "A new mode of obtaining power of mind over
mind, in a quantity hitherto without example.” Locke had advocated the same philosophy a century earlier when he emphasized the value of reward and punishment as “the most powerful incentives to the Mind.” Such was the extent of the Panopticon’s use that Bentham envisioned a series of panopticon buildings constructed in proximity to one another to form a compound that would serve the multiple needs of society.

In Janet Semple’s analysis of Bentham’s Prison: A Study of the Panopticon Penitentiary, she maintains that Bentham’s Panopticon originated in the theories and principles of eighteenth century prison reform. Penitentiary reform included the idea that punishment must deter but also be proportionate to the crime. Bentham’s Panopticon reflected these Enlightenment ideals and his Utilitarian philosophy of labour, expressed in his statement: “Oblige men to work, and you certainly make them honest.” Bentham believed prisons should be simultaneously a place of custody and a place of labour. I argue that there is a trajectory in the history of Western culture of an interconnectedness between prison reform, workhouses, and educational institutions.

Bentham’s ideas on prison reform and punishment can be found in his earlier writings: Rationale of Punishment. His interest in prison reform was both philanthropic and humanitarian. He deplored prison life of hunger, cold, damp, smells, disease, noise, and the absence to what he referred to as the consolations of religion. I argue that of importance here is that the wretched conditions of the buildings that housed prisons were the same spaces of poor workhouses and schools. The Rationale of Punishment was written at a time when John Howard was beginning to expose the deplorable conditions of prisons. In his extensive travels to investigate prison systems, Howard determined that more died in prisons in England due to the abhorrent conditions than by the death penalty. As carceral institutions, poorhouses, and workhouses were often housed in the same buildings, they were all part of the same spatial organization and spatial practices. Changes made to one institutional body impacted the other. I argue that there was a direct correlation between penal reform and educational spatial practices.
In the construction of the Panopticon, Bentham proposed that the most advanced materials of his time, iron and glass were to be used extensively. Pillars, arches, staircases, and galleries were to be made of cast iron as it was lighter and more flexible and it would not harbor "putrid infection." Glass was to be used extensively in skylights and in windows for each cell. Large windows would allow light to penetrate the cell, rendering the occupant visible to the authority in the central tower. At night, lamps outside each window backed by reflectors would cast light into the cells, "[they] would extend to the night the security of the day." Bentham’s vision of the Panopticon was that of a beautiful building, a stately dome which will "add singularity to beauty […] it will give life and ornament to the country […] it will be a lantern; it will be a bee-hive [...]." In contrast, some two hundred years later, Foucault in reference to its psychological effects, describes the Panopticon as a "cruel ingenious cage."

The purpose of Bentham’s inspection-house was continual discipline and surveillance. Its function was the centrality of surveillance over a distribution of individuals in assigned spaces. The essence of his plan was based on the idea, which he referred to as an "effectual contrivance […] seeing without being seen" and the constant pressure that one was or could be at any moment under surveillance.

It is the most important point, that the persons to be inspected should always feel themselves as if under inspection, at least of standing a great chance of being so […] for the greatest proportion of time possible, each man should actually be under inspection. This is material in all cases, that the inspector may have the satisfaction of knowing, that the discipline actually has the effect which it is designed to have.

Continual surveillance was achieved by Bentham through the centrality of the surveillance. The central inspection lodge was the focal point of the building both architecturally and administratively. From the central lodge the authority would exercise constant surveillance while remaining invisible. Foucault claims that Bentham laid down the principle that power should be invisible and unverifiable. Bentham’s design of the Panopticon was a departure from that of his contemporaries, as William Blackburn, in that surveillance extended beyond the communal areas of courtyards and passageways into the very interior of the cells, providing continual surveillance. Bentham’s extension of panoptic techniques in his use of
natural and artificial light to continually illuminate the cells produced a space of surveillance where the occupant was always the object of that surveillance. Bentham suggested that his panoptic system of centre and periphery was so effective in itself that it did not require a circular plan but that the circular plan was the most economic in terms of construction, and required the least number of inspectors. In Bentham's Panopticon, the circle, as a spatial concept, functioned as an instrument of surveillance. It was later implemented by Bentham in his design for a monitorial school.

Bentham's architectural concept of an inspection-house was part of a greater project in which he formulated the theoretical foundations of a perfect system of law, legislation, and government. He viewed the Panopticon as "a great and new invented instrument of government." What set his project for the Panopticon apart from his contemporaries was the coexistence of a disciplinary ideology with a disciplinary spatial construct, which were intended to be applied throughout society as an instrument of government.

It will be found applicable, I think, without exception, to all establishments whatsoever, in which, within a space not too large to be covered or commanded by buildings, a number of persons are meant to be kept under inspection. No matter how different, or even opposite the purpose: whether it be that of punishing the incorrigible, guarding the insane, reforming the vicious, confining the suspected, employing the idle, maintaining the helpless, curing the sick, instructing the willing in any branch of industry, or training the rising race in the path of education: in a word whether it be applied to the purposes of perpetual prisons in the room of death, or prisons for confinement before trial, or penitentiary houses, or houses of correction, or work-houses, or manufactories, or mad-houses, or hospitals, or schools.

Bentham envisioned his Panopticon as a humanitarian act, as "a simple idea of Architecture" that would transform society. I would argue that the greater significance of Bentham's Panopticon project lies in the intent of the extension of this architectural ideal to every institution within society. He viewed the Panopticon and the disciplinary methods that it incorporated as an instrument, an agent of government that would not only control society but also transform society. He believed that the Panopticon simplified the tasks of discipline and surveillance. Bentham proposed that by the gradual adoption and diversified application
of this single principle a new scene of things would spread itself over the face of civilized society. It was his belief that every aspect of society would be improved by its application.

Bentham not only conceptualized a spatial schematic and corresponding management system for the discipline and control of society, but he also devised this spatial schematic in such a way that it would exercise a disciplinary power over the mind. He maintained that within his panoptic system activities of individuals housed in these spaces would be managed by multiple disciplinary mechanisms. Foucault refers to these mechanisms as "panoptic techniques" and the philosophy of the implementation of these techniques as "panopticism." The "panoptic techniques" implemented by Bentham were separation, distribution, hierarchical observation (gaze), continual surveillance, normalizing judgment, and their combination. All of these mechanisms are spatialized. The combination of this spatial schematic and coexisting management system created, according to Foucault, a new "political anatomy" that would work through multiple institutions, inclusive of schools, and throughout the whole social body.

Critical to the far reaching significance of Bentham's Panopticon is that it is part of a project in which he advocated sweeping changes in laws, legislation, and changes in the current government. He called for a change in the system of government itself. Bentham conceptualized systems: systems of laws, punishment, legislation, and government. He saw the Panopticon-Inspection-House as a spatial system of discipline and control through surveillance; surveillance of the body and the mind. His new principle of construction in the form of the architectural figure of the Panopticon was submitted to Parliament on several occasions, each time with modifications. It was never built due to material costs. However variations of his spatial schematic and implementation of his panoptic management system have been applied to public institutions in Western societies throughout the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries; not only carceral institutions, but also hospitals and schools alike.
3.6 Panopticon-School

Bentham's intent for the Panopticon-Inspection-House was that its application was to be extended "without exception." He intended the spatial schematic of the Panopticon to be applied to schools for the purpose of "training the rising race in the path of education." In adapting this model to schools, he recommended that gratings, bars, and bolts be replaced by partitions and screens between each student, thereby, maintaining separation and division of the students by assigning them to cellular units. Each partition would have a bed, a bureau, and a chair. These small disciplinary units are then organized by a hierarchical system of distribution. As Bentham outlines in his proposal, the Panopticon will permit by this method "different measures and casts of talent, by this means rendered, perhaps for the first time, distinctly discernible." He argued that one of the main advantages of the Panopticon-School was the constant surveillance by the school-master which would banish all distractions, of every kind. It would do away with the vice of "cribbing," and idleness would be unknown. As Foucault observed, within Western societies, the chief function of the disciplinary power is to train and control, by breaking down the masses, in this case the masses of students, into smaller disciplinary units; small, separate cells. The distribution and organization of these cellular units is than controlled by the disciplinary power through an apparatus of observation and surveillance.

Spatialized disciplinary strategies have their roots in military camps and military schools. Bentham compares his model of the Panopticon-School with the model of the Royal Military School at Paris. The principles of separation and surveillance are reinforced in the spatial arrangement of the Royal Military School: "the inhabitants being separated from one another by partitions, but exposed alike to the view of the master at his walks, by a kind of grated window in each door." Bentham maintains that the Panopticon-School would be more functional than the model of the military school, as the school-master could remain in one place, the inspector's lodge; inspecting all the students with a gaze.

Bentham's proposal for the Panopticon-Inspection-Houses was based on control by coercion through discipline, continual surveillance, reward and punishment, and labour. He extended the same principles to his model for the Panopticon-School to which he proposed two
possible extensions. The first was that surveillance be applied only to the hours of study. The second option was that it be applied to the whole circle of time inclusive of study, repose, refreshment, and recreation. The second option reinforces his underlying principle of the Panopticon as a new mode of obtaining power of mind over mind. He claimed that the advantages of the later, a Panopticon-School with continual surveillance were numerous. By extending the range of inspection over every moment of a boy’s time, the application of “constant and unremitting pressure to the tender mind” would give “herculean and ineludible strength to the gripe of power” and cautioned that one “need to be very sure of the master […] then his [student’s] mind will be of the master’s mind.” Bentham extended this principle further by suggesting the removal of children from the parents as much as possible, allowing that the parents would always be able to view their child’s progress through “a peep behind the curtain in the master’s lodge […] they might see their children thriving and learning […] without […] counteracting discipline.”

The Inspection-House-Schools were also viewed by Bentham as settings for pedagogical experiments. They would provide opportunities for educational experiments in genealogy and the control of knowledge. Not only does Bentham suggest separating children from their parents as much as possible, he outlines principles for pedagogical experiments in which children would be completely separated from their parents from infancy to the age of twenty or twenty-five years. Such a separation would permit experiments in genealogy. “An inspection-house, to which a set of children had been consigned from their birth, might afford experiments.” He proposes that this would provide a field for discovery, that the genealogy of each observable idea might be traced as the parents’ stocks would be known and numbered. Bentham also proposed experiments in controlling knowledge to be carried out between Panopticon schools. Different knowledge would be given to students in different schools and after twenty to twenty five years, the results would be examined.

Gender also played a role in Bentham’s panopticon model for schools. Males and females were to be kept separate. In order to preside over virginity, he recommended “transferring damsels at as early an age as may be thought sufficient, into a strict inspection-school.” He further proposed setting up an inspection-house boarding school for “young ladies” and
suggested that eager “gentlemen who are curious in such matters would crowd to such a school to choose themselves wives.” Foucault claims that Bentham’s Panopticon was an architectural apparatus that “could be used as a machine to carry out experiments, to alter behaviour, to train or correct individuals [...] to try out pedagogical experiments” which functioned as a laboratory of power.

In Bentham’s project, the disciplinary power, in this case the government, controls the school system through a hierarchized distribution of individuals in space and surveillance. Foucault maintains that control of knowledge is implemented through a highly fine-tuned hierarchy of disciplinary mechanisms such as distribution of students according to rank and grades, normalization procedures, inclusion and exclusion. He further argues that the Panopticon is a machine that whatever use one may wish to put it to, produces homogeneous effects of power. He observes that the fortress-like architecture of public institutions was replaced by panoptic institutions of arranged separations that could be clearly and easily observed; the occupants were subjected to a field of visibility and thereby the constraint of power. Foucault claims “panopticism was a technological invention in the order of power, comparable with the steam engine in the order of production.” Semple, who also concurs with Foucault, claims that Bentham’s work has recently become a source of academic scrutiny and that his work has been viewed as more than architectural ingenuity, more than a philosophical concept but as a historical event that rivals in importance the invention of the steam engine.

For Foucault this historical event, the invention of the Panopticon and panopticism, marks the transformation of public institutions through new models. As Lefebvre argues, it is the changes in modes of production of space within a society that are indicators of changes in that society. The Panopticon design marks a change in a mode of production of an architecture that is an apparatus of control.

Bentham’s spatial schematic for the Panopticon-School was designed to inform the production of education; to produce a normalized education with a controlled outcome. His panoptic spatial schematic and management system developed from pre-existing Western ideologies of discipline and spatial control of society continue to impact upon educational
spaces and educational systems in the early twenty first century. Markus argues that Bentham’s spatial concepts covered the whole range of educational schemes from buildings to curricula, for the poor and middle classes, from nurseries to primary, and secondary schools to universities.83

With the Panopticon, Bentham created a technology of systems – spatial systems, disciplinary systems, systems of control and surveillance, systems to control knowledge, all of which he applied to education. A technology of systems combined with material technology creates a powerful machine. In the nineteenth century the emphasis on technology of the machine and production was at the forefront of Western culture and extended to education.

3.7 Monitory Educational System
The influence of the “machine” appeared in the new schools of the nineteenth century.84 The monitory school system was one of the new models to emerge during this time. This new system of education was praised by Coleridge as: “An incomparable machine – a vast moral steam engine.”85 The monitory educational system as conceptualized by Bell and Lancaster was based on the concept of the coexistence of discipline and economics and continued to perpetuate the ideology of work and education. In 1808 Bell describes the efficiency of the system:

A master who was able and diligent, could, without difficulty, conduct ten contiguous schools, each consisting of a thousand scholars [...]. Like the steam engine, or spinning machinery, it diminishes labour and multiplies work [...]. For unlike the mechanical powers, this intellectual and moral engine, the more work it has to perform, the greater is the degree of perfection to which it is carried.86

Both Bell and Lancaster’s monitory school systems were based on ideologies of discipline reinforced by spatial arrangements. Discipline and surveillance were key to the spatial ordering of monitory schools. Bell published an account of his system in 1797 in which he describes a pyramidal hierarchy of monitoring, beginning at the base with students to assistant teachers, to teachers, to the schoolmasters who came under the surveillance of the
superintendent. Bell wrote: "After this manner the school teaches itself." The whole function of surveillance was achieved by spatial arrangement.

Lancaster’s system was first introduced in 1798 in a Sunday school in his father’s home. He eventually expanded his school into a workshop using monitors with one hundred and thirty pupils. The early spatial configuration of the monitorial schools was a single large open schoolroom. The students were spatially ordered row by row with each row under the surveillance of a monitor. Markus provides us with an idea of the scope of these single schoolrooms with an account of their dimensions. In 1801 Lancaster had a schoolroom built which was 35 by 33 feet, which he later enlarged to a length of 75 feet to accommodate seven hundred children. By 1804 he built a new schoolroom for one thousand children. This system was based on a hierarchy of surveillance that functioned through the spatial ordering of students.

The spatial configuration of the monitorial schools eventually shifted from distribution of the students by row, to distribution in the form of a U-shape. The large single schoolrooms were subdivided into classes; each class was in the configuration of a U-shape, with the placement of each class back to back, preventing students from having eye contact with another class. In this way the spatial partitioning, that is the breaking down of the large single schoolroom into smaller units was designed to achieve maximum control and surveillance, resulting in a spatial network of surveillance from class to class, room to room. Discipline and competition were reinforced through “spatial placement,” by a method of marking rank in space. Both Bell and Lancaster ranked children by performance, which was reinforced by a spatial placement. The monitorial educational system represents a widely used model where disciplining ideologies coexist with spatial constructs to control and produce education.

Bell and Lancaster’s monitorial educational systems remained influential throughout the nineteenth century, impacting spatial configurations of schools and educational systems throughout Europe, extending to Sweden, Russia, and America. Lancaster’s system was extended by the Society of Friends in America and was applied to the education of Native
The Society produced a manual, which served as a guide to schoolrooms and class arrangements emphasizing the importance of the school as a disciplinary machine.

3.8 Summary

I argue that there is a trajectory of spatial organization in Western culture from the late sixteenth century on, from the long ranks and files of military camps, which were subdivided into cellular units to the long corridors of military schools, flanked by similar units, to the repetition of the same configuration in public institutional buildings of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This spatial organization allows for an effective disciplinary mode of surveillance and control. In Bentham’s model of the Panopticon, he seized upon the possibilities of the power of surveillance and control through spatial division and partition, and by an overriding surveillance system. Although circular in form, the spatial schematic for the Panopticon incorporates the same principles of discipline, surveillance, and control as earlier military models. The importance of Bentham’s work is that he also incorporates into his spatial design the principle of the power of a centre-periphery duality integrated with the principle of an anonymous surveillance of seeing without being seen. Said refers to Bentham’s spatial schematic, the principles of which are still in effect today, as “the Benthamite organization of space.”

Models of Western spatial systems, which are based on ideologies of discipline and disciplinary spaces, as evidenced in England and France in the parish and charity schools, industrial schools, workhouses, the panopticon schematic, and monitorial schools became institutionalized in the eighteenth century. Since the eighteenth century, disciplining ideologies have been inscribed in the spatial constructs of institutionalized buildings, and in turn have informed the production of education. Markus observes that as the buildings remained similar from country to country (in Western societies) indicates a common ideological unity in an approach to education. This common ideological unity was marked by a disciplinary, mechanistic approach to education with a network of surveillance reinforced through spatial arrangement. Before the professor, teacher, or instructor begin to instruct, before they begin to transmit knowledge, facts, ideas, values to the students, the students are already preconditioned to receive the information by the spatial ordering, arrangement,
distribution and spatial constructs in which they find themselves. An institutionalized spatial construct is broken down into small, cellular units, in a hierarchized arrangement, with fixed points of observation and surveillance which predetermines and prescribes the ways in which knowledge will be transmitted. Within this institutionalized spatial construct the student is assigned a space; a space that will inform the way in which knowledge is to be delivered and received.

Through the combination of technology and production these spatial systems of dominance, discipline, and control were extended from the Empire to the colonies, superimposing Western spatial constructs on cultures of difference. The combinatory impetus of technology and mass production in the twentieth century witnessed the repetition and spread of technological systems, including spatial systems, with a force previously unknown. At the dawn of a new millennium, the prevailing institutional building culture and interior spatial organization for (Western) schools and university buildings, including the University of British Columbia remains the same. The institutionalized spaces of the university are experienced differently by cultures of difference. I argue that for cultures of difference, based on ethnicity, gender, or their combination, the university spaces represent authority, domination, control, and conformity to a Western norm.
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4.1 Early Spatial History

In 1890 an act entitled “Respecting the University of British Columbia” was passed by the Government of British Columbia for the purpose of establishing a university in order to raise the standard of higher education in the province and “to serve the academic needs of the young and the growing province.” However, the conceptualization of the university did not take place until 1908 with the “University Act.” A regional commission was established to offer suggestions for an “ideal site.” Regional tensions developed over the location of the site, and as a result a Site Commission Committee was established consisting of educationalists from outside the province. The committee published a report in June 1910 outlining the reasons why the university site should be located in the lower mainland, and proposing a number of possible sites. The report also emphasized considerations for the future site. It was proposed that the site should be nine hundred and fifty acres, allowing two hundred and fifty acres for the campus and seven hundred acres for “experimental purposes in agriculture and forestry.” They strongly recommended: “the university should not be placed on a site which may in time be completely surrounded by a city.” The committee determined that Point Grey was the most suitable site. In December 1910 the Provincial Government allocated one hundred seventy five acres for the university in the Point Grey area. In 1924 the university legally acquired the one hundred seventy five acres it was situated on with an additional three hundred seventy three acres of crown land. (fig.6.) Acreage was added in subsequent years including the wireless site making the total acreage of the university presently at over nine hundred and ninety acres. The site of the University of British Columbia is one of the largest in North America with Stanford University in California comparable in size. It is a spectacular site on a point of land overlooking the Pacific Ocean to the West, the Rocky Mountains to the North, bounded by the city of Vancouver to the East, forests to the South, and the Musqueam First Nations Reserve to the Southwest.
With approval of the one hundred seventy-five acres in 1910, an architectural design competition was begun. The accompanying texts and resulting designs are prescriptive. The six-page design brief produced by the Provincial Government in February 1912 outlined the instructions and regulations of “The Competition for University Buildings for the Provincial Government of British Columbia.” Architects practicing in Canada were invited to submit plans for the new university. The design brief, which outlined a budget of a million and a half, identified the buildings to be included, with an emphasis on a block plan whereby various groups of buildings would be “so arranged that they shall lead up to one beautiful and harmonious scheme.” In the design brief there was considerable emphasis on the site, “this university scheme contemplates erecting on a magnificent site, visible to every ship entering Vancouver, a small city which is capable of being made one of the most interesting and beautiful in the world.” It was the intent of the design brief not to limit the style, nevertheless late Tudor, Elizabethan, and Scottish Baronial were strongly suggested. The prescriptive text further listed each building, its purpose, and area in square feet. The list of buildings was extensive, with a strong emphasis on the sciences. Provisions were also made for buildings for the Liberal Arts and Fine Arts inclusive of a museum. One or two buildings were to be provided for Pedagogy, which would include model schools for kindergarten, elementary, and secondary instruction with rooms for manual training. The initial design proposed a separate division on the campus site for a Women’s College which was to be inclusive of buildings for instruction and residence, specifying dormitories, commons, club rooms, and a gymnasium. Given the magnificence of the university site the intent was “to create beautiful grounds, as creepers and trees of all kinds growing profusely” with provisions for a principle garden for outdoor festivities.

On November 13, 1912 the jury of the architectural competition submitted a report with an accompanying letter to the Provincial Government of British Columbia about their findings concerning the competition entries. The jury included Henry Esson Young, Minister of Education, Francis Carter-Cotton, Chancellor, W. Douglas Caroe, and A. Arthur Cox, Samuel Maclure, architects. The prescription for the design of the site and university buildings was further delineated in this lengthy report. The philosophies and ideals that were
to emanate from the educational institutes and their corresponding architectural styles, which are representative of Great Britain, are strongly laid out in the letter and report.

If we look back to Great Britain as an example it is quite impossible to gauge the influence for good upon busy centres, which the recent establishment of Universities has had. So much the more is it of importance that the buildings, to be erected upon such a site as is available, and likely to form such a precedent, should be in all respects of the highest order of design, planned and fitted in every detail to meet the needs and to be worthy of their destiny.\textsuperscript{10}

The jury members were of the opinion that the buildings would remain a standard in British Columbia for all time, to be commented on and criticized the world over.\textsuperscript{11} In their opinion the acclaim of the university would be contributed to by the natural surroundings. Their enthusiasm for the site was narrated in both the report and the accompanying letter.

The site may justly be described as ideal. It is so in its commanding situation upon the bay, in its natural beauty and contours, which permit the most to be made architecturally of its great possibilities. It is so in its comparative seclusion, so suitable to a home of learning, and at the same time in its accessibility to the City.\textsuperscript{12}

Nineteen designs were submitted in all. The position of the jury was that the instructions permitted too wide a latitude and were not explicit enough. One of their major criticisms was that many of the entries did not “make the most of the beautiful views which it [site] commands.”\textsuperscript{13} They expressed concern that many of the designs submitted were dependent on the leveling of the site, which was not acceptable to the jury. As such these entries were rejected.

We think therefore that those competitors who have failed to give attention to this point, but who have designed buildings suitable to be set down upon any comparatively common-place level site, possessing none of the distinctive attributes of this one, have failed to make the best of the opportunity.\textsuperscript{14}

A further criticism of the jury was that many of the entries did not follow the block structure for the site as laid out in the design brief, and were consequently rejected. Considerable concern was placed on the architectural style of the buildings. The jury strongly rejected any
design submissions of an Italianate, Classical, or American modern style. They did however recommend the model of British universities:

While freedom is given to the competitors as to style, a definite suggestion is made as to the appropriateness of three distinctive styles, viz., a free rendering of late Tudor or Elizabethan or Scotch Baronial [...]. It is quite clear that the instructions had in view the dignified but simpler and often domestic types of the older English Universities, rather than the more grandiose modern American examples.\textsuperscript{15}

In accord with these sentiments the submission by the Vancouver architectural firm Sharp and Thompson, was judged successful because, in their opinion, it “has best succeeded in laying down a well-devised and workable plan suitable to the site. There is much to be said in the commendation of the straightforward and direct scheme [...]. The buildings fit themselves naturally and in a simple and well-balanced manner upon the site, and culminate in the dominating block of the Administrative Group.”\textsuperscript{16} (fig.3.) The block structure was clearly a deciding factor in the winning design, as was the architectural style, which was described as a free rendering of the late Gothic.\textsuperscript{17} However, the adjudicating committee strongly recommended to the Provincial Government that modifications had to be made to the winning entry and that stronger instructions had to be provided.

A design committee, which was formed by the Government, consisted of three advisors and the architects Sharp and Thompson. On November 10th, 1913, a report on the general design for the university as prepared by Sharp and Thompson was submitted by the committee to the Board of Governors of the University of British Columbia. The report states “The University of British Columbia is here conceived as an institution of the first order whose scope shall be co-extensive with the educational needs of the Province [...] comparable in the range and magnitude of its activities to the seats of learning of any country of the world.”\textsuperscript{18} The aim of the design is defined as creating a comprehensive plan to accommodate such an organism, and which “will inevitably develop with the advance of knowledge and changes in social conditions.”\textsuperscript{19} As in the initial design brief the magnificence of the site is to be fully utilized, providing not only a panoramic view from the site, but reciprocally to the site, as was so often emphasized, “a full view of the University will be afforded to all vessels bound to or
from the City of Vancouver [...] the first impression gained by those who come to
Vancouver by sea will be that of a seat of learning and culture."\textsuperscript{20} The more comprehensive
1913 design brief states that the underlying principle of the architectural design was to
recognize the natural and unchangeable conditions of the topography, which "must be fully
recognized and conformed to in any determination of the character and disposition of the
buildings to be placed upon it."\textsuperscript{21} Another determination of the brief was that "the design
must have unity; must constitute in all its parts a single conception by bringing into a
coherent relation both buildings, grounds and communications, which thus are made to
constitute a single organism."\textsuperscript{22} The revised plan "is based on two axes crossing at right
angles on the higher levels of the site."\textsuperscript{23} The north-south axis follows a high ridge of the
natural topography. A further analysis of the design brief shows that areas on either side of
the axes were further divided into quadrangles, which allowed for a right angle positioning of
buildings, roads, and paths.

The architectural style of the university buildings as prescribed in the initial February 1912
design brief was furthered reinforced in the November 10, 1913 brief. The designated style to
be used was that of "Modern Tudor [...] [because] as a phase of English Gothic Architecture,
and better than any period of the Renaissance, does it express and perpetuate the traditions of
British scholastic life."\textsuperscript{24} Tudor Revival architecture was often used in England for schools
and workhouses in the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{25} Tudor architecture was most commonly
executed in brick but in this case the design committee recommended that the materials to be
utilized were to be indigenous. Stone was prescribed as the main material for building
exteriors. Granite was chosen over native stones of a bluish-grey tone and the prestigious
white Haddington Island stone. Once again strong emphasis was placed on unity, conformity,
and adherence to the design scheme in all phases of development.

The unity of effect toward which each step of development should be directed
will be possible only by adherence to a controlling scheme of architectural
style, materials and color. This is as necessary as conformity to the essential
lines of the plan. Within these broad bounds there may and must be allowed
freedom in treatment of individual units but this freedom should never be such
as to disturb the general harmony of the whole design.\textsuperscript{26}
By 1914, the architects had revised their 1912 submission design to embody the modifications of the second design brief. (fig.4.) The 1914 Plan retained the block structure and many of the landscape features of the earlier proposal, but refined them. The blocks were further partitioned to define six main areas and the planting scheme was more strongly delineated. The six areas allowed for: the main campus and academic core; medicine; sport and recreation; theological colleges; women's college; and agricultural land. (fig.5.)

In 1914 work began on clearing the site and construction of the Science building. The outbreak of World War I interrupted the construction, which was indefinitely postponed. Temporary wood huts, which became known as the Fairview Shacks were installed until construction could resume. The construction quality of the buildings was poor; according to the Planning Facilities report of 1982, at the time they "lacked even the basic facilities not to mention adequate space for university activities." As the building conditions were considered deplorable, and as construction still had not resumed by 1922, students and supporters launched a campaign called the "Great Trek." Demonstrators paraded from downtown Vancouver to the Point Grey site where they occupied the structural skeleton of the Science building (now the Chemistry building). This action on the part of the students resulted in government funding to complete the Science building and the library. Semi-permanent buildings were constructed to accommodate Arts, Engineering, and Agriculture, administrative offices, auditorium, cafeteria, and a power-house. No funds were allocated for the proposed Women's college. Many of these buildings that were intended to be semi-permanent or temporary are still in use.

A photographic image of the skeletal structure of the Science building affords a cross section of the building and of its compartmentalized design in which the interior spaces are broken down into small cellular block units. The spatial organization of the university site in the form of block structures is repeated in the interior spatial organization of the Science building. The demonstrators are further divided into smaller units, according to their academic discipline, within the block units of the building. (fig.7.) The spatial construct of small cellular units is instrumental in the organization and ordering of the students even during a demonstration.
During World War II, there was a government initiative to encourage students to stay at university, and as a result enrolment doubled. However, no permanent buildings were constructed to meet the needs of increased enrolment and academic activities, "overcrowding reached intolerable proportions." At the end of the war temporary army barracks that had been constructed by the Department of National Defense for use during the war were given to the university at the request of the Administration. Once again the army huts were intended as a temporary solution. Over the years, as permanent construction could not keep up with the spatial needs of the university, the army huts were kept in use. When the huts were replaced they were often not demolished but relocated, renovated, and reassigned. Their structural, environmental, and aesthetic deficiencies have long been noted. The building situation of the university remained the same for some time until the late 1950s and 1960s, which witnessed numerous building projects with further development of the north part of the academic core of the campus and an expansion south with a number of new science buildings.

4.2 Campus Plans

In 1968 a Master Plan was completed; it was the first comprehensive study of the university buildings and campus site since the original plan of 1912. As in the original, the later plan retained the emphasis on landscaping. The 1968 Plan attempted to give a sense of order and definition to the sprawling campus through landscape planning and by providing building guidelines for the anticipated growth of the university population, due to increased enrolment and the augmentation of programs.

Another planning initiative inaugurated in 1989 and concluding with a revised plan in 1992 established principles and strategies for the growth, development, and management of the university buildings and campus site. It is this plan, which continues to be operative today. The aim of the 1992 Campus Plan is to ensure that there is cohesive growth of future building projects for the following ten to twenty years. The Plan is founded on the university's history, physical relationships with neighbours, and genius loci — "spirit of the place." The central theme of this Plan is that "the campus whole is greater than its parts." This Plan is devised around a set of strategies for the design of the campus that are intended
to last over time. Building projects are viewed as falling into two categories, communal and constituent. Communal projects are viewed as "public works" that provide a linkage between the parts, such as the integrating landscape, and the connecting framework of roads and paths. Constituent projects are viewed as those undertaken by faculties and support units. Although these projects are considered as meeting the "private needs" of the respective faculties, they are required to meet the greater needs of the campus as well: "first, by being sited and distributed as defined in the Campus Plan, and second, by meeting the Planning Strategies" as set out in the plan.

In Sharp and Thompson's original and modified plans for the university, the spatial structure of the campus was founded on a block structure within a grid system with the Main Mall and University Boulevard intersecting as the principle axis. The 1992 Campus Plan further reinforces this block structure and grid system, in language and praxis. (fig.8.) It describes the spatial structure of the campus with the Mall "as the primary unifying structure or spine of the campus" and the secondary structure as "the rib system of pedestrian paths between academic blocks." (fig.9.) It stipulates that priority is given to groups of projects, which combine to reinforce this campus structure. In this way "the genius loci of the site is clarified, and each project contributes to the particular character area in which it is located."

One of the strategies of the 1992 Plan is that "the university is committed to quality, permanence and life-cycle economy in building construction, ending the era of temporary and semi-permanent development." Reliance on temporary and semi-permanent construction has been problematic for the university. Despite the lack of permanent building, the spatial structure of the campus, a block and grid system, which was laid out in 1912 has been adhered to since. Other strategies included that the design of a project is to reinforce the "genius loci" of the site by responding to landscape typologies. The "genius loci" that is continually referred to in the 1992 Plan is not based on "the spirit of the place" in the sense of the natural landscape setting and natural topography of the site but instead is based on a prescribed "spirit of the place" that is in effect a contrived, controlled, orderly typology of spatially constructed areas that have been superimposed on the natural landscape. As such the 1992 Plan did not reinforce the topography of this magnificent site but instead reinforced
what they referred to as “landscape typologies” of “Ordered Malls, Western Slopes, Academic Garden, and Town Centre.” In this sense site suitability is determined as projects that “ensure the best functional, social, technical and environmental relationships among related users and between users and neighbours.” Site suitability, as defined by the Campus Plan refers to those projects that comply with the strategies set out in the Plan. The new buildings are to be designed to express their role “to support the larger structural patterns of the campus.” All building projects are to be monitored at each stage in order to ensure that they comply with the campus block structure and grid system. Routes, plazas and other landscapes are defined by the block structure and “are ordered to reveal the primary spatial organization of the campus.” In order to reinforce this compliance a project design checklist must be responded to, by all project designers.

The 1992 Campus Plan is constructed as a “comprehensive Institutional Plan for UBC” based on a central theme that “the whole is greater than the parts.” It reinforces the original spatial ideal for the university, of a harmonious scheme with the design of the campus site based on a block structure. However, another ideology emerges in the 1992 Campus Plan. A campus is a family of buildings and landscapes. Each building or landscape has individual needs and a separate identity. However, as in a family, each can and should make a contribution and work together so that the whole is greater than the parts. The alternative is that each is designed to meet only the needs of its own special constituency without reference to the others or, worse, works at cross purposes to the needs of others and to the common good.

This Plan views the university as a “community of facilities inhabited by a community of people.” It advocates spatial homogeneity in that the whole is greater than its parts, and compliance to a block structure within a grid system. Of importance here is that in this position the “spatial community” of buildings and landscapes is privileged over the “community of people.” The emphasis is first on the community of facilities, which is then inhabited by a community of people, instead of the reverse position, with the emphasis on the university as a community of people who inhabit the facilities. The institutional spatial ordering of the buildings takes precedence, and in turn the people are placed into that spatial ordering. This becomes problematic in that it privileges homogeneity over difference. This
position also advocates for "the common good" which encourages the question, for whose common good?

In addition to reinforcing the spatial structure of the university site and compliance to that structure, the 1992 Campus Plan is also a tool for the implementation of the University Mission Statement, physically, and spatially.

The physical aspirations of the Mission Statement can be implemented [...] when the buildings and landscape on campus not only meet the needs of their particular users, but also contribute to the composite environment to make the whole campus an efficient place to learn, work and live – a place which uplifts the spirit and is a joy to inhabit.46

The spatial constructs and the spatial organization of the university coexist with the University’s Mission Statement. One is seen as reinforcing the other. On many levels the spatial structure of the university predetermines what the Mission Statement can or cannot accomplish, and thereby informs the production of education.

The UBC Mission Statement is closely tied to its physical environment, that is to its prescriptive physical environment: “the university is and must be ‘an environment to support the adventure of the mind and spirit.’ That environment is intellectual, social and physical.”47 One should support the other. The 1992 Campus Plan reinforces the University Mission Statement: “if an area of activity is not based on a conceptual framework and may be carried on with a minimum of thought, it has no place in the university.”48 In the case of competing interests in the design of projects the overall campus structure must take precedence over individual projects. Projects that do not fit into the established norm are considered as “competing interests,” which are not desirable as “the unbalanced results do not further the UBC mission.”49 The Mission Statement also advocates that the university “serve the province as well as it should as a mainspring for economic, social and cultural development.”50 Thereby, creating a tension between projects that are viewed as competing interests with the promise to serve the cultural development of the province, or closer to home, the cultural development of the university. How does one incorporate into the one hundred year old spatial grid of the university, a culturally informed spatial design that is not
based on a block structure and a grid system? I would argue that the Mission Statement and the Campus Plan are premised on one spatial norm, one cultural norm. How can the UBC Mission embrace cultural development based on one spatial and cultural norm?

The spatial structure of the campus is an institutional objective of the 1992 Plan. This institutional objective is based on a block structure, which further facilitates the division of the university site into discipline-based precincts. Within this objective, a challenge emerges which is to spatially meet the inter-disciplinary mandate of the Mission stated as: “the inter-relationship between disciplines, the need to re-establish links between the humanities and the sciences, and the need to build bridges within the humanities and within the sciences.”

The planning group, of the 1992 Campus Plan, argue that campus sprawl has made it difficult to implement the Mission objective of encouraging interdisciplinary linkage and cross-disciplinary contact. Their “Mixed Use” strategy is an attempt to overcome this challenge: “greater emphasis will be placed on mixing uses throughout the campus, to counter the historical separation of land uses and to establish a closer proximity among people, disciplines, work and living places, and services.”

4.3 Summary

The original design briefs and subsequent campus plans have established the spatial norms for the university, which are in turn reflected in the university mission statements. The initial February 1912 design brief for the university buildings and the campus site issued by the Provincial Government reflected the prevailing Western cultural ideologies of the governing and intellectual social body of that time, and became prescriptive for the spatial constructs of the university. When the Provincial Government, design committees, and the University Board of Governors determined that the architectural style of English Modern Tudor should be the prevalent style of the buildings of the university, spatially organized as a block structure and a grid system, the cultural ideologies and philosophies of one culture, a culture of difference, were being superimposed on to the indigenous landscape and on to the indigenous culture. Modern Tudor as the prevalent architectural style was determined as representing and perpetuating the institutional “traditions of British scholastic life.” As such the philosophies, ideologies, values, and institutional traditions of British scholastic life were
transported to the Pacific Northwest Coast, and were represented and embedded in the architectural figure of the buildings, and the spatial organization of the buildings and the site. An architectural structure was viewed not only as representing, but more critically, as perpetuating a British institutional system; an educational system and architecture that was also comparable to European educational systems and buildings. A Western culturally informed spatial ordering was projected on to the topography of the Pacific Northwest Coast.

This highly ordered spatial construct has continued to be reinforced through all campus plans. The 1959 Campus Plan, which focused on the development of the southern part of the campus, is strongly criticized in the 1992 Campus Plan as "lacking the discipline of the regular block structure, and as "losing the cohesive order of the Grand Plan."55 The 1968 Master Plan strongly reinforced the spatial organization of the Grand Plan. A campus proposal of 1982 further adhered to this spatial organization. The 1992 Campus Plan has not only reinforced the institutional block structure and grid system as the norm but has structured strategies for compliance to this norm for all current and future building projects based on a central theme that "the whole is greater than the parts."56 The 1992 Campus Plan was ratified by the Board of Governor's, on the recommendations of the President and Vice-Presidents. As such it reflects the philosophies and ideologies of the administrative and governing bodies of the university.

Within the Western institutionalized spaces of the university, alternative spaces, which are representative of cultures of difference, have emerged. Three of the alternatives spaces that are studied here are: the Centre for Studies in Curriculum Instruction located in the Faculty of Education; the First Nations House of Learning; and the Centre for Research in Women's Studies and Gender Relations. (fig.10.) At the time of the 1992 Campus Plan, all three of the alternative sites were experiencing some form of spatial change, a spatial process of change that grew out of differences in educational philosophies and values. Participant meetings, with users and those of whom contributed to the spatial constructs of each site, took place ten to eleven years after the 1992 Campus Plan was ratified. Oral histories of these alternative spaces were narrated in participant meetings by users of the spaces. All three sites are a departure from the institutionalized spaces of the campus and are determined, informed, and
transformed to reflect different educational philosophies and ideals. In turn these newly determined spaces have become an apparatus, an instrument in the production of new and alternative forms of education.
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Chapter Five
Transforming Spaces:
The Centre for Studies in Curriculum Instruction Site

5.1 Site Description
The Centre for Studies in Curriculum Instruction (CSCI) is one of the alternative spaces within the university. The Centre is located on the third floor, central block, of the Faculty of Education building, which is now known as the Scarfe building. (fig.11b.) The Education building, which was built in 1962 and designed by the Provincial Department of Public Works, is situated at the intersection of the principle axes of the university, as established in the Grand Plans of 1912 and 1914, where Main Mall intersects University Boulevard. It is placed at right angles to the intersection, within the university grid system. (fig.10.) The building comprises four rectangular blocks: office block; classroom block; central block also known as the lecture block of classrooms, seminar rooms, and auditorium; and the library block. (fig.12.) The central block is perpendicular to and joining the two flanking north and south block structures. It was part of an expansion and renovation project for the building, which was carried out in two phases, from 1990 to 1996 by the architects Hotson and Bakker. In the Scarfe building the spatial arrangement of each floor of the classroom, office, and lecture blocks is organized according to a division of small cellular units, which flank either side of long corridors. The third floor of the central block, which houses the CSCI was completely gutted. A longitudinal section for the renovations to the central block shows an adherence to the spatial arrangement of small cellular units flanking long corridors. (fig.13.) This newly renovated and expanded central block also houses a large lecture hall on the first floor. The spatial arrangement of the lecture hall is the inverted theatre model made popular in eighteenth and nineteenth century industrial schools and workhouses in England and Europe. The model of the inverted theatre was used by the original university architects Sharp and Thompson in the design of the lecture rooms in what is now the oldest building on campus, the Science (Chemistry) building. This model continues to be used as in the large lecture hall of the newly renovated Scarfe building. (fig.15.) In the inverted theatre model the incline of the stepped seating arrangement gives maximum surveillance of the student body, individually and as a whole. The disciplining spaces of the Scarfe building are representative
of the dominant institutionalized spaces of the campus. Similar adherence to disciplining institutionalized spaces can be found in educational buildings throughout Western cultures.²

5.2 Histories of Spaces

As the University of British Columbia is situated on a geographic fault line, one of the driving forces of the 1990 - 1996 renovation and expansion project of the Education building was a seismic upgrade of the building complex. The central block had been originally constructed with clay brick, hence it was particularly vulnerable and had to be gutted, and the structure seismically reinforced. (fig.11a.) Although the renovation and expansion project of the building took place in the 1990s, and although the third floor was completely gutted, the renovation plans retained an institutionalized spatial configuration of cellular clusters of offices, classrooms, and meeting rooms flanking two long corridors. (fig.14.) In the expansion scheme the spatial arrangement of the third floor was designed to provide for a departmental library, small administrative offices along the east side, and small departmental rooms for research and interviews along the west side. Following the university-prescribed norm, each administrative, research, and interview office is 125 square feet.³ The design of the rebuilt central block makes more use of natural lighting, via large exterior windows and the use of glass as wall dividers, than either the office or classroom blocks. Nevertheless, there are interior spaces, students’ offices, a graduate student common room, and computer labs with no natural lighting. Part of the seismic upgrading involved the placement of large steel beams diagonally across the exterior skin of the building, cutting across windows. When experienced from the interior, looking out, the visibility of the beams and their size contributes to a feeling of confinement.

In addition to the expansion and renovation project there have been a number of organizational and administrative changes within the Faculty that have impacted on the spaces of the Centre for Studies in Curriculum Instruction. One of the most notable changes was that numerous Education departments, divisions, and units were amalgamated into four departments. “And so there has been a lot of changing configurations of faculty and departments and that certainly has had a lot of impact on the space.”⁴ As many of the units were disparately located across the campus, nineteen different locations, in army huts and
The Centre for Studies in Curriculum Instruction has been in existence for more than twenty-six years as a graduate unit. For over fifteen years it was housed in a number of temporary buildings on campus, including those clustered in an area of the campus called “Ponderosa.” The CSCI moved from its provisional location to the third floor of the central block of the Scarfe building during the 1990s expansion and upgrade. Although the Centre is part of the Faculty of Education and physically located in the Education building, administratively it is directly responsible to the President’s Office. When the Centre moved into the newly renovated spaces of the third floor central block it inherited the spaces planned according to a departmental structure. Alternative views of these spaces were narrated by users of the spaces in participant meetings. The narratives document the oral histories of faculty and graduate students, who are “users,” who “inhabit” the spaces that make up the Centre for Studies in Curriculum Instruction.

The users reactions to the Education building are consistent in their dissatisfaction for the building. The discontent is based on the design, spatial organization, ventilation, lighting, and institutional aspect of the building.

This building looks a lot like a [...] ship to me. It’s not a very beautiful building, and I have recalled that in the renovation of the building things like a common room for faculty to eat, and things like that were just not considered. It’s not a real strong social space [...]. I remember that some of those beams [seismic supports] actually came across people’s windows that were in their offices. They weren’t able to open the windows. You know that there wasn’t a real consulting process with the faculty. (Faculty, participant one)

Sterile space. I think of white brick and I think of grey, the colour of cement. I think the building, overall, can be constraining in some pretty major ways [...]. The university is made up of a lot of buildings, I typically, perceive as quite scattered or disjointed, sometimes as if the spaces don’t have an awareness of each other existing. (Student, participant two)
I don’t find the physical environment very conducive, especially to the work that I do because it’s more embodied. (Student, participant three)

Looking from the outside, there seems to be a lot of concrete [...]. I come from a country where the architecture is different. One of the things I noticed when I was in my office, I had to say, how does this ventilation work? (Student, participant four)

The spatial constructs of the Centre were predetermined in the original institutionalized design of the Education building and subsequently reinforced by the renovation project. Faculty and students of the Centre, the actual users of the spaces were not part of the consultative process in the expansion and renovation project. The Centre was assigned a space, a space within the larger institutionalized Education building. Reactions to the assigned spaces differ from the perspective of faculty and students:

We have a very nice space here on the third floor, a very coveted space. It was very nice for our community to have such a nice space, here, in this glass [part of the] building. This is the newer [space]. This is one of the nicer spots. (Faculty, participant one)

The physical space here does feel somewhat constricting [...]. I don’t typically produce things here, sometimes because there is no natural light whatsoever. That’s pretty basic. (Student, participant two)

The chairs are problematic, the rooms, the circulation [...]. I would prefer that it was a more natural environment – natural - with natural materials. The building and the lighting, hurts my eyes. And actually, it limits the way that I can think. (Student, participant three)

It is a room [computer lab] in the middle of nowhere and it concerns me being in that room sharing with five people and wondering all the time whether we are getting enough fresh air or not [...]. There are some rooms where they don’t even have any source of natural lighting, just artificial lighting, and therefore, if they are going to have any movement of air it will be second-hand air from other rooms [...]. I find I don’t like doing my work in that office [...] when I have to work in a room like this where I can’t even see where the ventilation is coming from, and so on, I feel uncomfortable. So my tendency is to not use any room here, which I am not comfortable with [...]. They had to make do with what was already there [...]. And they had to look
at what they had, and say okay this will be the offices, this maybe will be the lounge, and this will be the computer room. I am saying this because in my office I don’t really feel comfortable, in the sense that I am happy to have that office, but I have the feeling that everything they provide is because that’s the space they were given - and they had to make do with what they have. Otherwise, the original design of the Centre, the rooms and the structure would have been different. When I first came here, I didn’t think this was the way one would use the spaces but if that’s all you had to deal with, you had to make do, make the best of what you have […]. It’s my feeling that the [space] was not originally for the purposes that it is today. (Student, participant four)

The users of the Centre for Curriculum Instruction are graduate students and faculty. With the exception of the Director and graduate advisor, faculty members are based in different departments of the Faculty of Education, and teach in the Centre. Faculty and graduate student offices are separated and located in different buildings with faculty offices located in the office block and graduate student offices located in the central block. The majority of the graduate students are in the doctoral program. The graduate student body is predominantly mature students with extensive professional backgrounds. The Centre also has the largest number of First Nations and international Ph.D. students in the Faculty of Education. Many of the students come to the Centre with combined professional, academic, and lived experience and are seeking alternative forms of teaching, learning, analysis, and problem-solving approaches, to counter standardized forms of education. Over fifty percent of the students began their doctoral program in other departments, either in Education or other departments within the university, and transferred to the Centre to pursue alternative ways of knowing, teaching, and learning.

We have, I think, one of the strongest communities of graduate students on campus. We had received the Peter Larkin award last year [for] support of students […]. We have a group of full-time students, almost all doctoral students […] that come from very different backgrounds and disciplines centred around education, somebody that might be looking at nutrition, somebody that might be looking at choreography, dance, somebody looking at culture, so we have a very broad sweep of different interests […]. Fifty percent of our Ph.D. students have been in another department at one time or another. They may have done their Master’s degree in another department or may have transferred in the middle of, during, their Ph.D. to this Centre, and I would say most likely because of the community. We tend to have students that are in-between space people who study interdisciplinarity with the focus
on inter-in-between spaces where they might be looking across. This is very much a co-created community and student-centred. We don’t have faculty housed here, except for the graduate advisor and myself. And students have found that to be a good thing, that they don’t feel second-class, or that they’re not moved way over here, away from faculty. And their space is right here, and they are the number one people that create this community. So structurally by having people - professors - that are housed in departments, as opposed to the centre - so, that I draw upon them to teach or supervise, but physically they are not here and it works. It works very well for the students to feel that they are empowered by this community that they create [...] We do have several First Nations students who are in the Ts’kel program who have made a choice to be in this community. We have a pretty good percentage of international students in the Ph.D., several from African countries and Asian countries. We have had a couple of students transfer here to our Ph.D. program that came from other departments in other faculties. So we tend to attract a particular kind of student who looks at broad kinds of issues and students that I think are looking for a community. (Faculty, participant one)

[The students are] indigenous scholars, people who are perpetual students, teachers, doctors, principals and so forth, administrators. So that’s self-identified and usually that means how I see myself, as people who are interested in local communities, the land, social justice, and action. How do we get action? That are non-violent? To have an inclusive environment [...] I like that people are a little bit older than undergrads because they have more lived experience so that’s a richness, a presence. (Student, participant three)

There are several people who have transferred into this Centre from different faculties [...] my experience is that it’s one of self-protection in the Centre and a feeling of guardedness, of nurturing something or preserving something, whether it’s social or physical or academic or artistic or intellectual. (Student, participant two)

One of the richness of the Centre is it has a lot of foreign students as far away as North America, Europe, Asia, Africa, South America. (Student, participant four)

5.3 Cultural Philosophies, Ideologies, Values, and Traditions
The educational philosophies, ideologies, traditions, and values of the Centre are shaped by diverse cultures of difference that are represented in the student community and are shaped by an openness to cultures of difference by the faculty who are associated with the Centre. Philosophies, ideologies, and values of the Centre focus on different ways of knowing and different ways of constructing knowledge that represent diverse cultural locations. These
philosophies are based on notions of community, interdisciplinarity, multiple ways of knowing, and gathering. Underlying each of these philosophies is the notion that each person brings their gifts to the academic community of the Centre, which creates an environment of inclusiveness, and encourages an acceptance and awareness of difference. Culturally informed educational philosophies that differ from Western philosophies are brought from the margins and into the mainstream and privileged. Notions of community, interdisciplinarity, gathering, and the value of each individual’s gift are interdependent in the educational philosophies of the Centre. One of the principle philosophies of the CSCI is to create and support an intercultural and interdisciplinary community.

I think our philosophies and ideologies revolve around the idea that interdisciplinarity requires a community, otherwise, in my view, it doesn’t exist without a community. You have to have a gathering place for people to talk across disciplines […] the very nature of our structure of who is housed here has created a strong community […]. I began four years ago to specifically work on how we could strengthen the community, because I do think that the space here is a pedagogical space for doctoral students […]. It’s working with doctoral students, particularly. How do you want to be in a university? (Faculty, participant one)

Cultural philosophies, traditions, ideologies and values – are very much tied to the Centre in terms of its history […]. I think the value of people belonging. It connects to different philosophies. I think of bringing out or inducing people’s thoughts or personalities or artistic impulses, that being something for everybody to do. (Student, participant two)

The whole thing about community, the social aspect, I think that the Centre feels like a family or at least a community. The Centre achieves community by looking at differences, by celebrating differences. That’s a good thing, whereas there tends to be kind of a uniformity, to not to be different. (Student, participant three)

I think the consideration of the total human being. I studied my graduate work in another department […]. It didn’t matter what else was going on in my life. In the Centre, there has been a lot of community where people are interested about what is going on in your life and we also come together very often. More often than happens in other departments, to celebrate a lot of things that go on either in the Centre or a part of us: a student has a child, we celebrate with them; a student is getting married, we all go and attend that wedding; faculty is leaving like today, we are all there; and sometimes we have speakers
that come, we don’t say ‘oh, that person is in language and don’t come.’ No, we all enjoy it, being part of a community. But what happens in the Faculty of Education in [...] other departments, the barriers are there [...] the Centre simply brings people of different backgrounds, different interests together into a community [...] it has helped me to be more broad-minded, to respect other people’s special efforts. (Student, participant four)

As the notion of community is emphasized in the Centre, each individual gift of culture, of knowledge is seen as contributing to the greater whole of the academic community, not as a deterrent. This philosophy based on each person’s individual gift, the notion of not to try and fit into anything but to be who you are allows for an approach that is more receptive to cultural differences, different ways of knowing and constructing knowledge. The Centre achieves community by looking at and celebrating difference. The philosophy of being who you are is further reinforced by another educational philosophy based on cooperation versus competition.

Our philosophy became for people, don’t try and fit in, because we want your gift to help us envision a larger and perhaps more comprehensive picture of education. So nobody has to try and fit in to any one philosophy or theoretical perspective. We really want a lot of breadth. So we have really acknowledged the potential that people can contribute in this space. I have found that it works very effectively in creating a community if people are working from their gifts. And some of the visions that I have had, we’ve gone way beyond that, way past my imagination, because we’ve got people working together [...]. Given that this is such a strong community, our international students do bring their culture with them, as we have tried to remember that the philosophy is not to try and fit into anything but to be who you are [...] we have enjoyed some wonderful celebrations with many of our international students, and particularly this past year, we have focused on Iran and our Muslim students by having several seminars [...]. It’s been wonderful to get to know the Islam culture right now in the world. Just the beautiful culture that it is, so it’s not constructed for us on CNN. And we value that very much. The year before that we centred and did a focus on First Nations. We have a woman [student], a Sami woman, [...] if there’s poetry reading [...] we might engage [...] in people speaking different languages. I think it’s been a real gift to us. (Faculty, participant one)

My experience, so far, has been that exploring some of these philosophies and ideologies helps understand the philosophies and ideologies a little bit more that are coming into the room in the first place, so throwing some light on
what is not known or understood or the questions that we don’t ask each other. (Student, participant two)

Values are what is discussed and how can we, I guess, bring our history, our knowledge, or way of knowing, and how they’ve been validated. They’re quite diverse. Cultures through education. That [Centre] is a space where we can agree, I guess, on the use of the language. There’s often a sense that our ways of knowing are not valued or simply understood within the rest of the institution. The notion of being accountable to community [...] about being accountable and going beyond the research position [...] as an observer but as an interactive participant that you’re creating knowledge or social justice in this initiative, beyond the research time. That’s a place that people talk about but don’t usually follow through. So there are more people [at the Centre] who understand that than other places… the value of knowledge, different kinds of knowledge [...] if it is white privilege then people say that. There’s a space for wanting to, a willingness to try to understand, another person’s perspective on knowledge, particularly related to place. If we relate to place as in the land, that’s a big discussion that’s going on, and also family and community, so those interconnections are validated, and particularly with access to resources. There seems to be a reluctance, or there’s a cut-off point, where that’s not usually talked about [...] within the institution] [...] The alternative approaches to how we talk about teaching and learning. I don’t see that as a big feature in a lot of the other departments. The notion of reciprocity and relationships are central [...] to respect. (Student, participant three)

Gathering, coming together in a space, a gathering place, a sense of home are all part of the educational philosophies of the Centre.

I think our philosophies and ideologies revolve around the idea that interdisciplinarity requires a community [...]. You have to have a gathering place for people to talk across disciplines [...]. And I also believe that space and place is very important. You can call yourself a program but I think we have a place here and particularly on certain days [...] this place is full of people and it feels like their home to them. I believe [...] the international students, in particular have been a gift to us, where home is very important for them, to have a place where they feel comfortable, since they’re away from home, and we work very hard with having a place, a physical place gathering people [...]. It’s [gathering] part of our philosophy. When we talked about our mandate, gathering was an important word where people can gather together, and you have to have physical space for that. (Faculty, participant one)
5.4 Educational Practices

In the Centre philosophies of community, interdisciplinarity, the gift of the individual, gathering, coming together based on cultures of difference, different ways of knowing, different ways of constructing knowledge inform educational practices and the ways in which educational practices are constructed. These cross-disciplinary, cross-culturally sensitive philosophies are in sharp contrast to more discipline-based, mono-cultural philosophies found in many academic institutes. Institutionalized, discipline-based approaches to education are countered in the Centre by alternative approaches to education. Alternative, innovative educational practices take the form of intercultural dialogue, creating a space and place for intercultural dialogue, celebrating other cultures, education as a total endeavour, research across disciplines, research based on lived experience, student-centred courses, outreach programs and academic activism.

The philosophy of supporting an intercultural and interdisciplinary community within education produces diverse educational practices as a more holistic approach to education, researching across disciplines and sometimes across cultures, alternative practices that are culturally based.

I am feeling the reason why the centre evolved out of the departments was there was realization that there was something missing which was holistic in the Faculty. All the departments are divided along subject lines of specializations but I think there was nothing that embraced education as a total endeavour and so the Centre does that, it makes some of us comfortable who deal with education in a totality [...] everything including the actual practice and teacher welfare and curriculum and all those issues. That makes it different compared with the departments [...]. Part of the Centre now is an interdisciplinary place where various philosophies can be dealt with as opposed to departments who seem to have one goal in language education and so on. So it is different [...]. The students who come here are exploring more than one aspect of education the Centre allows you to go and source the support from whatever quarter you can source that support. I think that most departments do not have that. They think you have everything you need within that department. So if I was in another department, I would have to make-do with the resources I had in that department. I don't think I would be allowed to go outside that department [...] in the Centre if you don't find the resources you think you need, you are encouraged to go out of the Centre and look for those resources and report back and the Centre will confirm whether
those are the right resources, or not, so that makes it unique. (Student, participant four)

With some forms of addressing education, it’s a one-way thing where information is given and then you have to give it back or feed it back. I know that’s a generalization, but - it seems that more people are wanting a different kind of education than what they were given, and it seems that the people who are interested in more interactive and creative expressions are there [Centre] and they are usually committed teachers who want different kinds of learning to happen with their students. (Student, participant three)

Cooperation versus competition. There’s more of a cooperative approach and process-based learning that’s emphasized […] the cultural approach, more like a verb than a noun, a participatory approach, approaches to it that what I would call an idea, an indigenous approach. (Student, participant three)

[Equinox celebration] where several of the students were gathering and talking and celebrating that day and that seemed unusual to take a physical holiday like that and bring it into the educational setting […]. To have that as something that is possible to do for students to celebrate like that […] and there are different conversations that I remember where people would talk about walks in the woods and being outside, and I had meetings outside and I remember one in particular about a piece that was going into the “Educational Insights Journal,” the electronic journal, and I think it meant a lot to me. Outside, to be able to talk, I think it was much more comfortable, felt more creative and engaged. (Student, participant two)

The culture part has been cafes where we’re breaking a fast together, or we’re doing something as we’ve done around African culture. And what’s interesting is that at one point when we did some work around an African dinner we were criticized that we were doing something that was token, only celebrating the food and so forth, and what people didn’t know is that we’d had a study group around Black History. We had done our work around decolonization, but you must celebrate, as well, and one of the things our international students have said is we want to celebrate and we want to share ourselves. And so sometimes you can get criticized for celebrating in the academy. And it’s not a question of just looking at token food or whatever. It’s actually celebrating these people, who they are, what they do in their lives, so they can share. So that was a tough issue we had to deal with. A lot of our African students said, “We want to do this. We want to celebrate”[…]. Celebrating is part of who they are. (Faculty, participant one)
An educational practice of the Centre is to develop courses with the student community based on their research inquiries. Many of the courses develop out of study groups that focus on student research interests that are often based on lived experience and are culturally located. In this way, research based inquiries are shared by all in the academic community of the Centre. The students' reactions to this practice are positive, as they view this as a more student-centred educational practice. Participating in the development of courses that are directly research related are viewed as building on their skills, their way of knowing, seeing, interacting with their environment, and interacting with cultures of difference.

We've had four different study groups, all of these things emerge from the community, they're not dictated in advance - students will come forward with a particular interest and then we'll build a study group around that and gather people. One of the study groups was decolonizing conversations, and we were trying to do more work on First Nations issues and trying to do our homework, given that the University is [...] First Nations peoples land. We also had a study group on academic activism where we looking at how you would be an academic and an activist at the same time [...] these kinds of activities that are in-between space activities. So, in our community, we have interesting courses that I think are cutting-edge, particularly methodology and writing. But, we like to think of ourselves as more. (Faculty, participant one)

So at least there's a willingness through, I guess, investigating our own assumptions about hegemony, the dialogue that happens between people. I notice that the course descriptions are created by the students with the instructors. There are themes that happen like race - anti-racism - education [...] inquiry [...] community and the validation of family experiences [...] it builds on their skills, their way of knowing and seeing and interacting with their environment, highlighting people's skills. I recall more student-centred [...] I'm thinking most of the students have an indigenous approach to research and a lot of students who are like-minded [...] it is actually more interdisciplinary but it's not deemed that way from the Faculty of Education [...] it does have a more of an interdisciplinary focus in actuality. (Student, participant three)

Courses, research inquiries, and methodologies based on lived experience counter institutionalized approaches to education in the academy. Innovative educational practices include alternative expressions of research inquiry, whereby alternative expressions become the sites of inquiry.
Obvious ones [educational practices] around performance and pedagogy, a voice [...] in terms of alternative expressions of research that are not offered anywhere else or acknowledged. It's innovative, whereas a lot of cultures, oral cultures use the body, voice, theatre, integrate it into the daily life, so, in a way, it's [the Centre] like a bridge because it's validating those practices and knowledges and ways of knowing, and yet it's trying to mediate text approaches, and there are some limits about how that can be accomplished. Again, it's a process but we know what our concerns are - I think about the gift, so that knowledge and that uniqueness is not supposed to be somebody else's, so that's validated and recognized. (Student, participant three)

The 'physicalizing' of knowledge, whether it's through performance or pedagogy [...] or I guess art, that's using the space, differently – a huge difference [...]. So in that way, there's cultural norms - about what's normal - what is education. I think about dancing or movement, not dancing in terms of structured form. In a lot of cultures that's part of the engagement with learning [...] you're talking about spatial, social, mental with learning through your physicalization, intense physicalization of the body, cultural, religious things - hard to talk about that in another context because you have to experience it, it's not like a thought process. It's a physical space. I can talk to you about how to do an instruction but until you do it you're going to come away from that with a different knowledge [...] with a different experience. They call it embodied pedagogy, or way of knowing. The body has the knowledge, not the head, so your mind has quality of body, it's actually quite obvious. (Student, participant three)

Outreach programs and academic activism form part of the educational practices of the Centre. Such programs often involve going out into the community. Community outreach programs with groups, organizations, and schools are also brought into the academic environment of the Centre.

I brought in a group of very wonderful young people in a project called the Youth Millennium Project who do international work with UNICEF, UNESCO. They were looking for a space across campus - they got kicked out of one place in the law building and they were looking for a space. They came to me - what I said was I don't necessarily have extra space but I have a community. And so they came and spoke to the students in our community and the students moved themselves around to fit them in [...] we love having them in our space. They do wonderful work with youth and right now the Faculty has decided maybe they should not be in the space. So that's how it goes. Here it was supposed to be designated our own space, and we made room for somebody else who we thought was very valuable to our community [...] that message comes to the politics, 'oh, you must have extra space that
you don’t need, we’ll take it back.’ So right now we’re in a negotiation to let them keep the space, and I doubt they will be able to keep the space. (Faculty, participant one)

The spaces in the Centre are primarily office spaces for the Director, graduate advisor, and students, including a small student lounge. There is no meeting space or gathering place assigned to the Centre. As such, it is difficult to find spaces for the Centre’s academic activities, which include seminars, classes, study groups, noonday “brown bag” events, and gatherings. These activities must take place in the institutionalized spaces of the Faculty of Education and as such are shared with other departments and have to be booked in advance. The spatial constructs of the classrooms and seminar rooms of the Education building are in keeping with the institutionalized spaces of the university in that the classrooms are cellular rectangles with or without windows. The spatial arrangement for seating is rows of desks, facing frontal. It is an institutionalized spatial arrangement of classrooms that inform the educational practices of the Faculty of Education. When these spaces are used by the Centre, albeit on a temporary basis, they undergo a transformation, a spatial transformation that informs and coexists with alternative spatial and educational practices. The spatial transformations are reflective of spatial practices that are innovative and alternative to institutionalized practices, and are often reflective of cultures of difference.

One of the philosophies of the Centre is based on the spatial concept of “gathering,” a concept that is present in many non-Western cultures. A “gathering” is a coming together of the community to participate in an event. In the case of the Centre, graduate students and faculty are gathered together to participate in academic activities, cultural events, and personal events. The institutional spaces of the Education building are often transformed to be commensurable with the event that is taking place.

It’s [gathering] part of our philosophy. When we talked about our mandate gathering was an important word where people can gather together, and you have to have physical space for that. And, usually we have particular themes. The café has been a very interesting one and it was the metaphor that I began with [...]. To me, it was sitting down and having conversations with people. We use that metaphorically and we actually do have cafes and it’s an idea of the need to have people gather, and you need to have people want to come. So
you really have to do a good job of setting up some kind of activity or event and making it something that people will come back to. Our cafes are well-known in other communities [...] we have invited Ph.D. students from other faculties, professors from other faculties in our gatherings, our cafes, our discussions [...]. What we’ve done to create a community is a lot more than just the physical space or the resources. We’ve had people gathered around interests, around social events [...]. It takes the people themselves to really instigate and initiate the kinds of gatherings within a space. (Faculty, participant one)

Educational practices that are shaped and formed by cultures of difference coexist with spatial practices. There is a coexistence of cultural practices and spatial practices in an educational context. The faculty and graduate students of the Centre transform the institutionalized spaces of the Education building, albeit temporarily, for a more embodied, experiential learning. Classrooms may be transformed by decentering rows of desks facing frontal, by removing chairs, placing blankets on the floor to facilitate people sitting on the floor, use of candles, burning cedar to clear the energy of the space, and the addition of drumming. Academic inquiry is spatially grounded.

There’s really no ‘place’ for gathering [...] That particular class, I had to move all the chairs out, bring blankets in to change the space, because it was more an embodied, experiential learning that was going to take place. The things in the room would have hindered that process [...]. Two of the things I am always encountering in terms of the cultural difference in educational spaces is - two concerns that come up all the time from a cultural perspective of educators - trying to retain their students in whatever ways that seems to work, but the environments that would help them is drumming - but somebody next door would be bothered by it. Like in a cultural practice, some people burn incense, some people will burn cedar to clear the energy of the space, some people use candles, but generally those things are considered unhealthy - that really downgrades people in other environments where that’s a given. We’re having a meeting so somebody is drumming over there [...]. It’s not seen as an intrusion but an addition. (Student, participant three)

I would say, that the way that some events here transform spaces is very important and very philosophically demonstrative – the cafes - bringing plants in, taking a space that is usually more sterile, institutional and taking time to change it [...]. Phenomenology and writing, and thinking about the best ways to foster writing. That’s what I think his [the Professor’s] article was about. We were very conscious, she and I, about creating a space that matched the topic of discussion, and we used flowers and candles, some people might have
brought snacks, and dimmed the lights. We deliberately made a particular aesthetic environment and led the discussion in a way that we were hoping would match the topic, as well. Sort of a calming aesthetic, and quieted to make sure that people had time to think and they had time to bring up things if they were usually quieter, if they were usually not heard because they don’t jump in right away. (Student, participant two)

Study groups and courses that focus on lived experience are inclusive of cultures that privilege oral traditions as oral histories. The spaces where students and faculty gather to share oral histories become “spaces of inquiry.” As emphasized by the participants the pedagogical space becomes the site of inquiry. When the educational practice focuses on a more embodied form of learning, such as performance as pedagogy, the space of performance becomes the site of inquiry. The transformed space then informs the educational experience.

If you think about the physical, mental and social spaces, what we’ve tried hard to do is see the interdependence of them and not separate them out. And a lot of our students have said I can bring my spiritual lens with me. It doesn’t have to be separated out that this is academic space [...]. We’ve had courses around spirituality, we’ve had study groups around spirituality. And so we see the interdependence around those three constructs. Instead of trying to falsely separate them out we accentuate the interdependence among them, among the three. I think people bring their culture, people bring their background, and their spiritual beliefs with them and it’s going to be part of the discussion. You can’t think that you can talk, have a good discussion especially with First Nations people, if you’re not going to engage in the spiritual side. It’s important. The same with our Muslim students and our African students [...] you bring who you are completely, in a more holistic kind of way, and I think that’s been really important so people can really feel they can come to a space and be who they are, even from their spiritual side. And the building hasn’t fallen down yet because we’ve used the word spiritual, pedagogy of the heart. (Faculty, participant one)

In trying to understand culture, you can study culture but we have a lot of living practice, here. When we broke a fast with Muslim students, it was part of their practice. It was just wonderful they were so open about sharing that [...] these become sites of inquiry. We had a course that I taught called living inquiry, which was all oral stories and we had many international students and First Nations in the course. We used our own stories as a basis for academic inquiry [...]. I don’t think people would have actually been comfortable in that course if they hadn’t been part of this community and already felt safe
about who they are, and their culture. A couple of our courses have come from study groups where we have really done our homework on looking at culture. And then we move into a course, to bring them out of the margins, bring the study group into the main stream into a course, and these are spaces of inquiry. You gather people and you bring people together and the whole pedagogical space becomes the inquiry [...]. We were listening to a person from Japan talk about space very differently than we think about space. So these were the sites of inquiry where you can bring your story and your life in, so you are not having to read it in a book or whatever. We're actually having a living practice here, of the kind of discussions that come around gatherings where people are inquiring into other perspectives. (Faculty, participant one)

The courses and the practices, I would say, are more open, well, more respectful, and thus more open than some educational experiences I have had in the past [...] in the courses I have taken there’s more of a sense of emotion in the room and as a social and physical space the classroom is more sacrosanct [...] because these things seem to wrap around each other, philosophies and the ideologies and the social space and the physical space, what’s coming into the room, and what’s allowed to emerge in the room, and what leaves the room. (Student, participant two)

I remember a class [...] that was involving oral communication and oral stories. [...] [the class was held] by the constructed creek and water pump in the back garden, and I would say that was very connected. The fact that the class had an oral emphasis, and the possibility, and the comfort, of being outside. (Student, participant two)

There is a shared unity amongst the users of the spaces of the Centre in the perception of the spaces as a supportive environment of cultural differences, an awareness and recognition of different ways of knowing and constructing knowledge.

I would say so. Yes, Very respectful. It’s shared [...]. We think about this as shared space. If we didn’t, if for some reason, this space were taken away for some reason, this community, this group would find another space, outside on the lawn or whatever. You have to have the physical space [...] We’re a community and the community requires space. And we have space. And we find space [...] it will find a space because it already exists as a social space and a mental space. (Faculty, participant one)

We recognize the need to have a space to understand each other and not alienate each other to create advocacy. (Student, participant three)
The questions and discussions in the participant meetings were not centered around politics and space but the responses from all the participants, faculty and students, focused on how political the question of space had become for the Centre within the larger institute of the Faculty. The question of space was seen as an on-going mediation with the Faculty. Spatial issues and more specifically the ways in which spaces are used has been a site of tension.

Space is like gold in a university. I think the negotiation was quite difficult [...]. We’ve been accused of being closed and exclusive from people around and in the Faculty. We don’t see ourselves in that way by any means. We’ve always invited people, but it’s been interesting because of the closeness of our community, people in departments [...] have felt that we’re somewhat exclusive [...]. We’ve tried in our cafes to ask students from other faculties to join us and they have. I remember an interesting conversation with a man from AI, Artificial Intelligence, having a conversation with one of our students on the ‘body of knowing.’ It was fascinating because Artificial Intelligence has no body and they debated that [...] we’ve invited people to our events. (Faculty, participant one)

I think it [mediation] is ongoing [...] the Centre is part of the Faculty of Education, so, I think spatially there is some ongoing co-mediation of negotiation to create a cohesive community [...] having transferred from one faculty to another, I am relatively aware that different disciplines or different educational units at the University often don’t understand each other very well. (Student, participant two)

From my perspective, it [mediation] seems that it’s ongoing. It seems as though the space is developed out of a need to be more alternative. There’s a vision of providing that. I am imagining that there were a group of like-minded people who got together and acknowledged a need for creating space that could offer people more than what is currently being offered. It seems as though a lot of the students have done or accomplished what’s required and want to go beyond that [...]. And there’s a concern for the ones it doesn’t reach and that’s where my research interest is. The ones who aren’t going through the regular education, how do we get validated and acknowledged. (Student, participant three)

Classrooms are used by everybody [in the building]. The only spaces that are used strictly by Centre students are our offices, the workroom, and I think that’s all, and even this lounge is the graduate students’ lounge [for the whole faculty]. So there is a lot of mediation there [...]. The existence of the Centre has become an ongoing negotiation. Right now, there’s an imagining, imagining process of the Centre. Do we need this Centre? There is a
committee called the Futures Committee for the Centre. They are trying to understand that question, the future of the Centre. (Student, participant four)

5.5 Envisioned Changes

Participants were asked if there was anything about the spatial constructs that they would change.

I think, in relation to our faculty, I think we need a place that we can have a social event or eat together or just have a place where at noon if I go there may be four other people at the table that I may have an interesting conversation with. I think technology has precluded a lot of physically getting up and talking to someone else with e-mail and so forth. For me, if I want to talk to somebody, I go see them personally. I think we need more spaces that people can gather comfortably, not a hallway. You see hallway conversations where people need to talk and it's known as a hallway conversation [...] why isn't there a place to sit down. There's no place for people to talk to each other [...] I would like to see more open space, more open space in the centre of things. Light is important. We've got a couple of seminar rooms that have no light in them and it's miserable [...]. I think, from time to time, little things like colour. I had a choice in my office of getting white and grey [...] Vancouver? A place where in these open places of gathering, places where you almost can't help but come across people in that way, and where you could sit and be comfortable and talk [...]. A welcoming place, throw a little carpet down, make people think you care a little bit. It's amazing how people are put into ugly, horrible offices and expected to create. (Faculty, participant one)

I'm speaking on my feet, here, but that would be nice if there were just more alternative programs [...]. Well, if there were natural materials, something that connects you to the environment, and to people. I think probably community consultation would be required, it would take longer, and cost money but I think that's a way to engage more people and have the whole thing about community. (Student, participant three)

[Chapman Commons, Main Library] I just find, I love it, it's so airy, you can feel the breeze [...] in terms of working space, productive space it's a lot better than anywhere else on campus at the moment. [The Centre] there are a lot of rooms which could be combined into larger rooms, I think the whole idea is to have classrooms [...] classrooms have been subdivided to create offices and this is what this produces [gesturing to the student lounge], rooms without ventilation, have to depend on artificial lighting all the time so I would get rid of those [...]. I would build a whole new complex and [...]
make beautiful full-size classrooms for large classes [...] they would all have access to windows. (Student, participant four)

5.6 Summary

If one walks into a classroom where the desks are arranged row by row, separated from one another, facing frontal to a converging perspective point on a raised platform, the spatial arrangement imparts an order, a disciplinary order, not conducive to interaction, and the focus is on a central point at the front of the classroom. If one walks into a classroom where the desks and chairs have been removed, blankets are on the floor, plants have been added, and cedar is burning "to clear the energy of the room,\textsuperscript{11}" the spatial language informs us that this is a sensory environment conducive to interaction, and as such is a departure to the disciplinary rigour of institutionalized spaces. The spatial practices of the Centre are representative of cultures of difference and provide alternatives to the cultural hegemony of the institutional spaces of the university.

There are numerous spatial problematics that are encountered by the users of the Centre for Studies in Curriculum Instruction. One of the most critical problems is the lack of space. Also, problematic for the institutional organization of the Faculty is that the Centre seeks to transform its institutionalized disciplining spaces. Alternative spaces inform and produce alternative modes of educational practices, which are not in keeping with the Faculty's institutionalized spaces and practices. There is considerable resistance to spatial changes engaged in by the Centre.\textsuperscript{12} The Centre is a site of alternative educational philosophies and practices which are culturally informed and that differ from Western cultural approaches to education and space. Different ways of knowing and of constructing knowledge embraced by the Centre, decentre and challenge Western educational philosophies and spatial practices. Many of the alternative philosophies and practices of the Centre are culturally and spatially informed.

The Centre as a site study represents a microcosm of what takes place in the larger site of the university. As the notion of an intercultural and interdisciplinary community is emphasized in the Centre, each individual gift which is valued for its difference, as noted by several participants, is seen as contributing to the greater whole of the academic community not as a
deterrent, which is the position set forth in the 1992 Campus Plan. Philosophically, and in practice, the Centre breaks through the barriers of a block structure, it goes against the grid system by taking an institutional classroom and covering the walls with wall hangings, placing carpets on the floor, adding plants, changing the lighting, changing the quality, or lack of quality of the air by burning cedar, changing the space in every possible way without taking a hammer and breaking through the walls to let in the light and air. Over and over again they change the institutional spaces through a spatial transformation that informs and produces alternative educational practices. These culturally informed and transformed spaces often become the sites of pedagogical inquiry.

Philosophies and educational and spatial practices of the CSCI are reflective of current discourses in education that are more inclusive of cultures of difference such as discourses around critical pedagogy, critical inquiry, and cultural studies. Stanley Aronowitz, Henry Giroux, and Peter McLaren argue that educational institutions have become sites of resistance, sites of cultural resistance.\(^\text{13}\) Stanley Aronowitz, a sociologist, views the dominant educational systems of the U.S.A. as environments where the melting of cultural differences occur where environments of exclusion are determined by race, class, and gender.\(^\text{14}\) He argues that schools are obliged to recognize the preservation of cultural difference as a human right. He advocates student-centered learning whereby curriculum builds upon knowledge derived from cultural resources that students already possess. He further argues for cultural relevance in curriculum that is inclusive of marginalized cultures, and that recognizes that other kinds of knowledge exist, as knowledge acquired by oral traditions from the narrative within the community. Educator, Henri Giroux’s concept of border pedagogy describes a pedagogy of postmodern resistance “located within those broader cultural and political considerations that are beginning to redefine our traditional view of community, language, space, and possibility.”\(^\text{15}\) Border pedagogy is inclusive of knowledge forms emanating from the margins and emphasizes the inclusion of experiences of students who often find it impossible to define their identities through the cultural and political codes of a single unitary culture. This pedagogy of resistance critically engages the knowledge and experience through which students author their own voices and construct social identities. It is a pedagogy that encourages students to speak from their own histories, collective
memories, and voices. Educator and cultural theorist, Peter McLaren's work is based on Frierean pedagogy which examines the role of university teaching and the role of educator as a cultural worker.¹⁶ McLaren views educational institutions as pedagogical sites of cultural struggles.¹⁷ His work critiques hegemonic discourses that are non-inclusive and that marginalize cultures of difference, more specifically as related to race and ethnicity.

Critical inquiry and critical pedagogy in the field of education emphasize counter narratives, which function in opposition to “master” and “metanarratives”; they produce counter practices. In CSCI participant narratives are counter narratives to mainstream educational narratives. The Centre strives to bring alternative narratives in to mainstream education by building curriculum around them, by inclusion. Giroux argues: “the construction of curriculum knowledge and pedagogy provide narrative space for the understanding and critical analysis of multiple histories, experiences, and cultures” that offers a multiple perspective approach to learning.¹⁸ In the case of the CSCI many of the narratives are spatialized.

Cultural Studies emphasizes inclusion, encompassing cultures of difference, groups marginalized by race, ethnicity, or gender and whose histories and knowledges have been left out of mainstream education. It has had a strong commitment to disempowered populations. In this sense, Cultural Studies is concerned with lived experience, “the every day terrain of people,”¹⁹ the interrelationships between separate cultural domains. One of the claims of Cultural Studies is that it is not only interdisciplinary but anti-disciplinary. It is not restricted to one field of study but “draws from whatever fields are necessary to produce the knowledge required for a particular project.”²⁰ Cultural Studies then becomes an apparatus to analyze hegemonic discourses, textual and spatial. The principle philosophies of the CSCI are intercultural, interdisciplinary, and inclusive. Through a spatial process of gathering, the Centre brings together students representative of cultures of difference. The cross-disciplinary, cross-culturally sensitive philosophies and practices of the Centre go against the discipline-based grid, both textual and spatial of the university. Cultural Studies has had a profound impact on educational research in the academy but the application of research and inquiry to practice has been a slow process. It is in emergent spaces as the CSCI where these
alternative educational and spatial approaches are taking place. The Centre is seen by both faculty and students, who are connected with it, as a counter space, an alternative, to the disciplinary spaces of the Faculty and the university. The transformed spaces of the Centre for Studies in Curriculum Instruction subvert the institutionalized spatial “norm” of the university.

Notes

1 Architectural drawing for Faculty of Education, 1961. UBC Campus and Community Planning.
2 Markus, Buildings 229 -244.
3 Interview, Winston Hunter, Faculty of Education Building Administrator, UBC, January, 2004.
4 Faculty, participant one, participant meeting, 2002.
5 Winston Hunter, interview; University of British Columbia, Faculty of Education Master Plan (Resource Planning Group, 1989) 5.
6 UBC, Education Master Plan 33.
7 Faculty, participant one, participant meeting, 2002.
8 Ibid.
9 Faculty, participant one; and student, participant four, in participant meetings.
10 Faculty, participant one, participant meeting, 2002.
11 Student, participant three, participant meeting, 2002.
12 Faculty, participant one, participant meeting, 2002.
16 McLaren, Multiculturalism 42-74.
17 Ibid.
19 Grossberg, 1992, 11
20 Ibid., 2.
Chapter Six

Healing the Site: First Nations House of Learning

The slow and often bitterly disputed recovery of geographical territory which is at the heart of decolonization is preceded—as empire had been—by the charting of cultural territory.

Edward Said, 1994, 209

We do not own this place – we belong to the land. It is an intensely personal relationship. The out-of-place feeling is just forgetting our place. We have a place, it is here.

Eber Hampton, 1995, 39

6.1 Site Description

University Boulevard and Main Mall are the main axes of the university. According to the campus plans, the intersection of these two axes forms the centre of the campus. From this central axis, descending University Boulevard to West Mall, turning sharply to continue north along West Mall, passing buildings positioned at right angles, and several temporary buildings, the site opens up to a circle. One is led into a circle of paving stones, passing between clusters of rocks and plants. From this elevated vantage point the site, sloping downwards, reveals the roof structures of two buildings, a library and a longhouse (a third building is not visible from this position). In the centre of the circle is an opening. An open cedar post and beam structure projects through the opening of the circle. From the lower level four supporting cedar posts project outward through the opening on the upper level, supporting four posts which converge toward the centre. A fifth non-supporting cedar post projects diagonally through the centre of the open space. Looking down through the centre of the circle, one sees on the lower level a circle of stones, recognizably stones that can be found on the shores of the Pacific Northwest. From this position the sound of falling water can be heard.

Looking out over the site from the upper circle, the line of vision follows the rooftopline of the longhouse, the form of the roof opens like the expanded curve of a bird’s wings. (fig.16.) On the north side of the longhouse, the roof is framed by cedar and pine trees. Following the path of the upper circle leads to a spiraling staircase down to the lower level. The lower circle
forms the centre of the circular library. At this level the sound of falling water is louder. One can feel the dampness and smell the freshness of the water. The waterfall is splashing on to boulders and very large uprooted trees, rising diagonally from the waterfall. There is a cedar boardwalk leading from the lower circle, past the waterfall, along the longhouse to the entrance. The interior lights of the longhouse give a glow to the 6:00 p.m. landscape. The smell of cedar permeates the misty, cold, crisp air of a Pacific Northwest Coast March evening.

The site of the First Nations House of Learning (FNHL) is inclusive of three buildings and structures, the longhouse, Xwi7Xwa library, and Sacred Circle. It is located on the north part of the campus between West Mall and Lower Mall surrounded by temporary and semi-permanent buildings to the north, east, and south and a parking lot to the northwest. (fig.17.) The terrain slopes downward from West Mall to Lower Mall. The House of Learning site, as the university site, is on traditional Coast Salish and Musqueam territories. The First Nations Longhouse is “the first of its kind on a North American university campus.”

6.2 Histories of Spaces
First Nations’ histories, as related to what is now the geographical site of the University of British Columbia are cultural and intellectual property of First Nations peoples. They are to date unpublished. As Dolores Hayden notes: “physical traces of Native American landscape are very hard to find” near urban areas. She maintains that one approach to reconstructing “place” is “to focus on features of the natural landscape that were [are] important” to Native American culture, “such as the river, the hills, and the indigenous plants [...].” Issues around land and Aboriginal Title in British Columbia are highly contested, as the province for the most part is unceded territory. Governments of Canada and British Columbia did not enter into treaties nor agreements with Aboriginal peoples in this geographical region. The University of British Columbia is situated on traditional Coastal Salish and Musqueam territory. The Musqueam Declaration on rights to this land dated June 10, 1976 is on full view in the Museum of Anthropology at the university.

We, the Musqueam people openly and publicly declare and affirm that we hold aboriginal title to our land, and aboriginal rights to exercise use of our
land, the sea and fresh waters, and all their resources within that territory occupied and used by our ancestors [...]. Neither we nor our ancestors have ever given up, extinguished nor diminished our aboriginal rights and title by treaty or agreement with any foreign government or power [...]. We have never accepted or agreed to the right of governments of Canada or British Columbia, or their agents, to tell us how to run our affairs or determine how we should live our lives. We, the Musqueam people, hereby declare our intent to exercise our aboriginal rights, to restore to our own use sufficient traditional resources to enable us and our descendants to live as distinct and independent people in our own land [...]. We announce our intent to establish control of our own communities and our own resources in order to control, determine, and guarantee our future. This is our aboriginal right; a basic universal human right.5

The accompanying map with the declaration indicates the Musqueam names for the area of land that is now occupied by the University of British Columbia, as Z’azu7um,’ Q’ewum,’ and Zucul’i’q.

Traces of relationships between First Nations peoples and the university exist in the archives of the university but such histories, which were hitherto erased need to be reclaimed and reconstructed. An early relationship existed between First Nations traditions and sports history at the university, in the use of the Thunderbird emblem for the sports facility, which dates back to the 1940s. Another early connection was the presence of a totem pole on the campus by First Nations artist and totem carver, Ellen Neel. The totem pole was located between Brock Hall and the Student Union building, until it was recently vandalized. A restoration project by the FNHL is under way to replace this totem pole. Some of the earliest First Nations’ programs at the university date back to the late 1960s and early 1970s such as the totem carving shed, which existed before the opening of the Museum of Anthropology. This museum now houses totems representative of many Aboriginal communities of the Pacific Northwest. In September 1970 the Indian Education Resources Centre was established, a forerunner of the NITEP program established in 1974 which was one of the university’s early alternative programs, designed to provide culturally relevant teacher preparation for Aboriginal peoples. Ts’kel, the First Nations Graduate Program began in 1984. The First Nations House of Learning as an entity within the university came into existence in 1987. Prior to the opening of the longhouse, these programs were all housed in
old army huts around the campus. Some of the army huts occupied by the House of Learning were located behind the Education building.⁶ (fig.11a.)

One of the principle objectives of the First Nations House of Learning was to have a building, which would house First Nations programs, and provide a home away from home for Aboriginal students. As former Director, Verna Kirkness states our dream was “to have a place of our own.”⁷ A home for the FNHL came about not because of a change in government policy (provincial or federal), nor a change in university policy but as the result of a dream, and the driving force behind that dream of First Nations peoples. This dream was met by the generous support of Jack Bell. As a result of his donation the House of Learning building project was eligible to participate in the UBC World of Opportunity Campaign, a campaign whereby the provincial government matched funds for capital projects. Prior to Bell’s donation, this building project had not been included in the campaign.⁸

The site that was selected for the House of Learning had been an arboretum since the early history of the university with specimen trees from all over the world. (fig.18.) The arboretum was gradually encroached upon by a parking lot with the trees surrounded by asphalt. By the late 1980s, the condition of the site was such that the root systems of the trees of the arboretum, in an attempt to survive, had broken through the asphalt. The terrain became an undulating pattern of root systems and cracked and broken asphalt. This was the condition of the landscape in March of 1990 when it was selected to be the site of the First Nations House of Learning.

Under the guidance of the First Nations community, the site went through a healing process. The House of Learning, which opened in 1993, was designed by the architect Larry McFarland and his associates with the First Nations community of students, Elders, faculty, and staff. In addition to the longhouse and the Xwi7Xwa library, the House of Learning also includes the Sacred Circle structure (indicated as the Spiritual Renewal Hall on the architectural drawings). The buildings are placed on an east-west axis and positioned in such a way as not to damage the trees of the arboretum. The east-west axis cuts diagonally across the site, which divides it into a public and a private side, the private side being the spiritual
The Sacred Circle, which is a sanctuary, a place of reflection, is placed on the spiritual side of the site surrounded by towering pine and cedar trees. (fig.18.) The longhouse also houses the First Nations childcare centre, S-Takya, which opened in 1995.

Oral histories are privileged in First Nations culture. Histories of the spaces of the First Nations House of Learning were narrated in participant meetings by a former director and the architect for the buildings. The narratives document the oral histories of the site and the buildings.

Upon receiving a substantial grant from Jack Bell, which was matched by the university and the Provincial Government, the House of Learning decided that they wanted to build a new home for the First Nations House of Learning.

The concept of the building was a part of the First Nations House of Learning objectives. The House of Learning was established in 1987. I'm not sure when building a longhouse for students came to be an objective but it was there for a few years [...] it must have been about 1989 when the university was undertaking the world opportunity campaign and there was interest from Jack Bell, a major donor at the time, to contribute to the capital campaign and to designate one million dollars towards First Nations. And it was the former director who organized a meeting of various people to talk about how that money should be allocated [...] The House of Learning had as its objective, one of its objectives [...] a need for a physical space for all First Nations' programs to begin with, but maybe having more a place for students to be able to call their home, seemed to be important, a desirable thing to have [...] the location was determined by a group of staff, students, Elders who took a visit, a site visit, to sites the university said we could have and they each talked about the advantages, disadvantages, and the location of the current site was chosen. (Faculty, participant one)

The First Nations House of Learning was given a donation by a man named Jack Bell [...] he wanted to make a donation to something that he felt would benefit the people of British Columbia, in general. And I think, if I remember the story, his daughter, ultimately recommended that the First Nations House of Learning or a First Nations’ program would be a very valuable way of investing in the future. So he made his donation. I think it was a million dollars. At the time, there was a matching grant program so the university, the provincial government matched that and all of a sudden there was two million dollars [...] the first thing they wanted to do was build something, build a new
home for the First Nations House of Learning. It had been existing in huts that are strewn around campus left over from the Second World War. (Architect, participant two)

We were interviewed along with other architectural firms. We went to that interview trying to demonstrate our approach to all of our work which was trying to demonstrate our ability to listen rather than our ability to talk and tell people what they want. The process was obviously successful from our point of view because we were selected to do the project. But the interview was an interesting one from our point of view because it was not your normal executive committee. It was students, Elders and administration people. It was more like a bag lunch, a pot-luck lunch in which we sat around and talked about things. We just sat and listened and had some felt pens and flipcharts and as they said something we thought was particularly relevant, we noted it down. They got to know how we were going to work. (Architect, participant two)

One of the first challenges for the architects was to determine what the client wanted and what the university wanted.

We had considerable discussion with the university that - well we don't know what kind of program they want, we don't know where they want to build this building, we don't know what they think of themselves in terms of a presence on campus. (Architect, participant two)

The spatial constructs of the FNHL were determined through communications with numerous First Nations communities, Elders, faculty, students, staff, a longhouse building committee and architects. The design/planning team was made up of the architects and First Nations communities inclusive of Elders and First Nations students. There was also the involvement of a university representative from Campus Planning and Development. The architects held planning sessions on the objectives, functions, and the image of the First Nations House of Learning.9

A lot more communities contributed to the construction [...] developing the spatial construct, and I think of the students and they represent various communities, so do the staff, so do the Elders [...] so we would certainly cover many, many aboriginal communities. (Faculty, participant one)
The architects held different planning meetings where anyone was invited to the First Nations community on campus to come and give their views about what would be the functions of the longhouse, what did they see would be the priority needs - library, childcare centre, various activities they wanted to happen in the longhouse. All that was discussed and so based on that feedback the architects came up with the functions, the different rooms that would accommodate the different needs of the longhouse [...]. Then they also had a session that talked about the image of the longhouse itself, or the image of particular rooms, how would you feel when you walked into a particular room, the particular ideologies or values that people wanted this to feel like. It was a kind of welcoming place, yet they wanted some dedicated space that was for classroom use or an area that was more a quiet space. (Faculty, participant one)

Largely it was the design team, and I don’t just include architects and planners, I include [the former Director] and I include the students and I include the Elders because we all talked about the issues and their responses to our physical understanding of facts [...]. So our first four months of work consisted of meetings, just informal pot-luck lunches, bag lunches, coming out and at these meetings there were Elders, students, administrators, First Nations students from virtually all over the world because there were people from South America, people from Alaska, people from down in the Southern states, as well as Canada, well-represented obviously from Canada. And during that period, we identified four areas of interest. We established the spatial needs, what they thought the First Nations House of Learning should have in it. We looked at how they saw, how they wanted to see their identity expressed on campus, we discussed the images they wanted to portray to the campus, and we discussed what was important in their site. (Architect, participant two)

The first step was to find an appropriate site for the new buildings of the First Nations House of Learning. The architects were familiar with the campus as a site. They had a lived experience of the site.

My associates and I are all graduates of the University of British Columbia, studied with the architecture school, here. [...] Because no site had been selected and our terms of reference were to look at four sites that had been selected around campus, one adjacent to the Museum of Anthropology, one near Thunderbird park, one near the Pan-Hellenic centre, and one in the parking lots out at the south end of campus [...] we walked these sites, we happened to walk by this particular site [...] and we said, ‘here’s a wonderful site. It’s close to the heart of campus [...] it’s not in a parking lot, it’s not following the notion of Thunderbird Centre, picking up on that theme,’ and so
we put it on the table, and the university said: ‘Yes, go ahead, look at it.’ We took all the people in the planning group, Elders, students, and administrators, and we rented a bus and we took them from the existing First Nations House of Learning hut and we went to each of the sites [...] then we set up a chart and we evaluated them in terms of how did this meet their image statements. How did this relate to their ability to provide the functional resources there. How would this site contribute to their identity and we ranked these various components and evaluated all five sites. (Architect, participant two)

Of all of the sites that were looked at, the site adjacent to the Museum of Anthropology was rejected regardless of its beautiful view looking out across Howe Sound, as the First Nations community “did not want to be seen as a culture that is represented in a Museum. They are a living group of people moving towards their own maturity in terms of students growing up, and the culture as well.”

A number of factors contributed to the selection of the final site, the site as an arboretum, the notion of healing the site, and closeness to the heart of campus.

It’s close to campus, to the other parts of campus so students would have easy access to the building and [...] their classes. There were some other very lovely sites but they were on the edge of campus and it was felt they would take way too long for students to go back and forth [...] it was ideal for students being in the nice part of the campus, and being in the beautiful area of the arboretum [...] a gorgeous arboretum, all these trees from different parts of the world. (Faculty, participant one)

It became clear that this site was the one, the one the building is on, and for probably a variety of reasons, the most significant of which, though was the notion that the site had been an arboretum, part of an arboretum that was planted in the early 1900s [...] and since then, given the presence of the automobile, it had been filled with asphalt and so there was parking all amongst these wonderful trees, and when you looked at the site you could see that the trees were fighting back because the asphalt was completely torn up from the root structure of the trees. I mean, it was virtually impossible to walk through the parking lot because the asphalt was just up and down and cracked and broken, and one of the strongest things was the notion of healing a site rather than destroying a site by putting a building on it - or the image of destroying a site [...] they also saw that this site in terms of the healing aspect was close to the heart of campus, and if they are going to be seen as having a positive image on the campus, they felt it important to be close to the centre. And if you were looking for the geographical centre of the campus, you take Main Mall and Agronomy Road, it isn’t where 16th or Chancellor comes in, it’s a little bit north of that so they’re very close to the [geographic] centre of
campus, they're certainly very close to the main libraries of the campus.
(Architect, participant two)

There were several planning issues that had to be considered by the architects and the First Nations planning committee. As the site had been an arboretum for some time, preserving and healing the trees was a consideration in the planning of the buildings.

We only had to remove I think a total of five trees out of the 55 that were on our site. And three of those were, in fact, re-located and two of them were cut down, and one of the ones that was cut down forms part of the waterfall at the end of the building [...]. There’s a tree on the end of the building down by the daycare [...] it was considered incredibly valuable because it was brought from Asia [...] It was considered, do not damage that tree, and every day I have come out here for the last twelve years, and I look at that tree and just thank heaven it’s still there, it’s still healthy, it’s a beautiful tree. (Architect, participant two)

Other planning issues included cultural issues such as the positioning of the building on the site, differences in building cultures, architectural styles of the buildings, respecting that the site is traditionally Musqueam land, spiritual relationships between building and land, and the presence of water on the site. In the site analysis the architects took into consideration the histories of the site, not only the history of the site as an arboretum, but going further back into the histories of the site as traditional Musqueam land.

We did a detailed analysis of the site [...] we looked at the history, what was here, who was here. The land is traditionally Coast Salish, for the building [...] Elders suggested we needed to go to the Musqueam Band and get their approval to build a building on this land. We went to a council meeting [with] the Chief at the time. We made our presentation and she said they would be honoured to have the building built but they would like to see the building follow the traditional Coast Salish design rather than the more common six beam Haida style longhouse. We had a Coast Salish Elder on the committee, a man named Vince Stogan and so he certainly supported that. Once we got into the detailed site analysis, we did a detailed inventory of all the trees, and all the site services surrounding development [...] as we went through the site analysis we identified certain factors that seemed to be very important. When we started to plan the building, one of the most important concepts was the importance of the circle, the sort of holistic approach to planning, the importance of the cardinal compass points in the orientation of [...] buildings [...] cultural responses to the environment [...] sometimes they’re buildings,
sometimes they're just ceremonies [...] we said, let's take that as a starting point in the planning of this site. Well, having done that we realized that our building was going to be about 17 degrees off the regular campus planning grid that was prepared by a surveyor [...] having done that we struck a line from the corner of the site, from West Mall [...] if we took that east-west line, we struck right through the site and we divided what was the arboretum into two halves. There was a side that had coniferous trees, mostly the kind that you would find indigenous to the Pacific Northwest, and on the south side the deciduous trees that were largely of European and Asian descent [...] all of these little things reinforce themselves to create a spirit for the planning of the building. (Architect, participant two)

The proposed axis, which cut through the site and divided the arboretum into two halves, was not within the university grid system of right angles and block structures. And as the architect has stated, it was an east-west axis as opposed to the north-south axis of the original campus plan, and on a diagonal as opposed to a right angle grid. (fig.17.) This site plan met with opposition from the university, which I will discuss further in relation to mediations with the university. The response by the First Nations community to the university grid system was in keeping with First Nations building culture and recounted by the architect:

Let’s see, well, the campus has been here for 100 years, we’ve been here for 10,000 years so let’s put the building the way we want it rather than the way the newcomers want it. So the building was shifted off the campus, planning grid. The fact that by doing that we were able to divide the site between the coniferous and deciduous forest was even better because we took upon that the notion that the spiritual side of the building was on the north [...] The public side is where we have the deciduous trees where people going up and down between the residences and the main campus walk by [...] the deciduous trees provide the shade in the summer when it's hot but in the winter when it’s cool [...] and most of the leaves are gone, it allows that light to come through. And if you go out onto that site right now and you’re standing there looking back at this building, the building would appear to disappear, because what you’re seeing is the reflection of the forest on that side [...] so the building on the south side is transparent whereas from the north side it’s a solid piece of screening for the spiritual side - those are probably the two most significant planning issues. (Architect, participant two)

In considering planning issues in relation to the site, the presence of water was an important issue.
Simon Baker, one of the Elders on the committee, said that water was an important aspect that had to be represented on the site [...] along the edge where the rocks are, as you walk along the walkway, to represent the dry riverbed. Often our longhouses were by water, near water. (Faculty, participant one)

One of the Elders, Simon Baker, was very concerned about having water on the site. As a young man [...] he’s since deceased, but he actually took dug-out canoes up [...] showered or bathed in the waters of the creeks coming down the mountains for his spiritual events, and he said if we have a site we’ve got to have water flowing, and so you’ll see by the library, there’s a waterfall. It’s not as big or as grand as we wanted it to be but the campus was concerned [...] that water is intended to have flown down the site and the vestige for where that water was supposed to end was right there [near the entrance]. As you approach the building from the campus you follow the stream and go to your place of learning. Simon felt this was a wonderful experience to be following the path of water to achieve your education, and so the boardwalk area is, in fact, intended to be a bridge [...]. It looks like you’re walking along a creek bed and there are things going under it. (Architect, participant two)

One of the objectives of the First Nations House of Learning planning committee was that the site be close to the heart of the campus. In turn the FNHL also wanted to present the image of reaching out to the campus. Taking the library out of the longhouse and situating it on the site closer to the flow of people along West Mall was an action of reaching out to the campus. (fig.17.) The architecture of the Xwi7Xwa library reflects the interior Coast Salish architecture of an underground pit house. (fig. 20.) Traditionally, the logs would have been covered over with earth and branches.

The other aspect of that was the notion that they wanted to reach out to the campus, [and] the First Nations House of Learning did, so what we did was take the library out of [...] the building [...] we said there’s a tradition on campus of building libraries in the ground. The old Sedgewick library is buried in the ground there on Main Mall [...] if we take the library and we bury it in the ground then we’ll make a level platform with West Mall, that you can see the building and you can go down into that kekuli house not in the traditional manner but through a stairway and come down at the main level of the building. The earth-sheltered building is a style indigenous to the peoples of British Columbia, the plains people of North America - in that they buried their buildings in the ground to avoid the extremes of temperature [...] we have that, but now we’ve turned it into the library which has been taken out of
the building and pulled towards the heart of the campus so that people who are wanting to use the resources, they are reasonably close to them as they approach, as they come from the main campus. It also created the opportunity to have a landmark on West Mall that is the kekuli house skeleton that is up there […] the site and the planning, they were all so carefully thought about […] just getting into the notion of what was important. (Architect, participant two)

The materials used in the buildings and structures of the First Nations House of Learning were traditional materials married with contemporary materials of glass and concrete where necessary. It was an identity statement to use the materials appropriately and where it’s a natural material to use it in a manner that is consistent with First Nations' culture. In the building process, and as part of the healing process, trees that had to be removed from the site were used in the structures.

A couple of the trees had to be cut down, so they were used in the building itself, and around the waterfall. (Faculty, participant one)

One of the images and identity-statements […] was that we should be building a building in which the materials presented are honest. In other words, you don’t try and make a building look like something it isn’t, taking material and using it in an inappropriate manner. Everybody recognizes that this is the 20th century, there will be the need for materials that are quote ‘non-traditional’ - where material was traditional use it in a traditional manner and where it is contemporary use it in an appropriate manner - that drove us to make decisions like the aluminum of the window frames is the colour of aluminum, it is not the colour of the leaves or the forest floor […]. The concrete is left as concrete […]. Even the ceiling tile […] was chosen because of the multi-couстic properties and the fact that it’s a relatively natural material. It doesn’t require painting or anything. We’re very much getting into what we now refer to as sustainability and green design; use the materials without a lot of painting or things that create VOC’s, off-gassing of chemical and things like that. That was actually an image or an identity statement that said ‘use the materials appropriately and where it’s a natural material use it in a manner that is consistent with their culture […]. Well, clearly, the notion was to use the First Nations building material of choice, and that is, wood, and in the Pacific Northwest, it’s cedar. (Architect, participant two)

The form of the longhouse building follows the traditional Coast Salish architectural style. The FNHL longhouse is representative of the coming together of a traditional style and use
of materials with contemporary materials and technology. In some cases traditional building methods preceded contemporary technology. The spiritual response to building and connectedness to the land was an important part of the building process and development of the site. The shape of the roof taking on the form of the wings of an eagle contributed to the spirituality of the building.

The West Coast style is more like the plank longhouse in that it is a longhouse, but what happened in the longhouse could be more contemporary, of course. (Faculty, participant one)

We were able to come up with a design that responded to the Coast Salish traditional style, which was a shed-style as opposed to a gable end building. Gable ends are typically Haida, Kwakuitl, Nisga'a buildings. Their buildings were low on one side, high on the other side, and as our research indicated [...] Simon Fraser and David Thompson had been coming down the Fraser River and encountered villages of Coast Salish people that the longhouse might be 600 feet long [...] [the former Director] wanted to build a building that students, Elders, children, administrators were all equal in. The Coast Salish social structure was very much an egalitarian society, the Haidas [...] was a hierarchical society, this fit the notion of a building in which you have the founding family, and everybody that comes along, everybody that marries in, just adds another bay onto the end of the building, and it just keeps growing and growing and growing. And that's why these longhouses in the Fraser Valley were up to 600 feet long, and that was a clue to how we wanted to approach this building. (Architect, participant two)

One of the issues that we found most exciting was that the Coast Salish are a people that built their buildings on a style that we consider nowadays very contemporary. What they did was they built what's called a curtain wall, in other words you build the structure of the building and then outside the structure of the building you build a skin to keep yourself away from the elements [...] this way the structure is on the inside and the skin is on the outside and that's the way we build buildings, nowadays. So I think they understood long before we even got here how to build buildings and we have just taken it and applied it. (Architect, participant two)

I think the spiritual response is very important in the development of this building and the site. We use it a lot to get into the spirit of the site and what our client wants to get from it, out of the site [...] the site led us in this direction to create a building that's slicing diagonally through the campus. The way the building was designed in reality with this bisecting of the site [...] Because we had established this axis through the site [...] from one
corner of the site to the other corner of the site with our building. The form, we have, basically two aspects of the building: we have the anthropologically correct Great Hall, the Sty-Wet-Tan, which looks to all intents and purposes as a traditional Coast Salish building might have looked. Although larger in scale because they would not have had the technology to build or mill the timbers that are in that space, that was driven by program, in other words, they wanted to have x number of people in there. We weren’t going to get them in there unless we had a reasonably large volume and so we used the style, but upgraded the scale […] on the other side of that creek that runs through the site which has got the boardwalk, which is now a glass creek as it separates the traditional building from the contemporary interpretation of the Coast Salish shed building […] On the far side […] all of our services run under the ceiling over there, a very simple structure, the low ceilings. But in this intermediate bay, we were very concerned about having too high a volume in the space […] we needed to create a spiritual space so what we did basically is we just bent the perimeter beams down at each end which allows the form to start low at the two ends and then work its way up to a high point in the middle. The symbolism of that to the Elders was really quite a joy to watch in being interpreted because it was seen as a bird with its wings outstretched and then the ends of the wings of an eagle […] that tip up at the ends […] that was not the metaphor that we started with, it was simply an interpretation of the Coast Salish form going from a shed that slopes one way rising up to a shed that slopes the other way that engages the pedestrian scale at the two ends and engages the Great Hall in the middle. But once that form had been seen it became quite apparent that this provided that spiritual excitement to the building. So we went into looking at how are we going to finish a roof that has no straight lines in it, really, and we looked at various roofing materials and found […] a two-ply torch-on roof membrane - that is, in fact, covered in copper. Copper is an integral part again, of the First Nations culture […] we couldn’t afford copper on all of it so we would put the copper only where we have that dynamic curving form but also where you would be able to see it as you approached the site from West Mall. (Architect, participant two)

The roof is copper […] copper is a prized metal amongst the First Nations; so that’s why they used copper […] along the roof. You can see the roofline has a structure - in the shape of an eagle’s wings. (Faculty, participant one)

The First Nations House of Learning buildings and structures are used for academic, social, cultural, and ceremonial purposes. The principle users of the spaces, those who “inhabit” the spaces are Aboriginal students both undergraduate and graduate, Elders, faculty, and staff. Aboriginal students now defend their Master’s thesis and Doctoral dissertations at the House of Learning as opposed to the rooms of the Faculty of Graduate Studies. A number of First Nations educational programs are housed in the longhouse, as the graduate program, Ts’kel
and the Aboriginal teacher preparation program, NITEP. The longhouse, in particular the Great Hall, Sty-Wet-Tan, is frequently used by other university groups, and is also rented out for events to the general public.

[Students] they’re the most important users of this space [...] certainly Aboriginal students at UBC, those operating Aboriginal programs at the university, university groups themselves. The general public for renting the facility because we do have rentals of Sty-Wet-Tan Hall. If somebody wants to have a wedding they can have a wedding. We’ve had international conferences, music festivals, weddings, there’s been funerals, you name it something’s been done, there. (Faculty, participant one)

My understanding is that it’s primarily [for] First Nations students as an administrative and spiritual focal-point on campus. The term home-away-from-home was one of the goals, [...] part of the role of this building was to encourage First Nations students to feel that they belonged on the campus so that they didn’t drop out. Many of the students come from communities that are so small, 600, 800 people and all of a sudden you’re in a city of 50,000 people out on this campus [...] The Great Hall has turned out to be a major meeting space on campus, particularly [...] dealing with subjects - I remember when we were discussing this - First Nations law issues, they should not be being discussed in your boardroom, courthouse, or Faculty of Law building. They should be here on this site, and so that’s what this building has become, a place to learn in a setting that’s appropriate for the subject matter. I think my own experience has been very much that there is a spiritual side to healing, not simply a physical side to healing, and the building provides the First Nations with the opportunity to demonstrate that. (Architect, participant two)

6.3 Cultural Philosophies, Ideologies, Values, and Traditions
First Nations philosophies, traditions, values, and ideologies inform spatial constructs and building practices. Cultural philosophies and spatial constructs and practices are not only interrelated, they are viewed as one in the same. The building culture of the Coast Salish people contributes to the philosophies of the longhouse, as in the notion of the extended family. Interaction of children and Elders with students is seen as part of this philosophy. The philosophies of the House of Learning as a home away from home, the idea of helping people to learn, to be supportive, and the idea of being together in one house, all of these contribute to building a sense of community. The Coast Salish community is based on an egalitarian philosophy. The philosophies and values of respect, reverence, responsibility and
their relationships are very important to creating the space. It is also important to have the presence of Elders to continue traditions, philosophies, and values of cooperation, working together, and respect. 

[Philosophies, traditions, values, ideologies,] all of these are together in the architectural traditional style of the Coast Salish longhouse [...] the physical structure of the longhouse contributed to the spatial construct, with that is the notion of the building, it becomes a home for people. The other construct that's based on a philosophy, tradition, ideology or value - the idea that extended family is very important for helping people learn and to support. And the idea too of being together in one house was important for the various program activities to have a space where they could come together with other programs. (Faculty, participant one)

We have these different values that are talked about now of reverence, of respect, of responsibility. Respect, reverence, responsibility, and the relationships. I think all of those are very important to creating the space. It certainly was important to have Elders involved in this to be able to remind us of the traditions, philosophies and values [...]. Cooperation and working together, respect for each other, respect for our culture, respect for diversity, sharing of culture, and respecting this philosophy of a holistic education that we develop the intellectual, the physical, the spiritual and the emotional realms of oneself. (Faculty, participant one)

Elders are an integral part of the learning process, they teach to a large extent and so there was a desire to have Elders in the building, on the campus, and they would be seen as a resource not only to the students but also to the infants at the daycare centre. (Architect, participant two)

A large number of the students, some of them mature, those mature students often have children, tough enough to get an education if you're a non-native person, with a native person with children, if you're away from your home, it's even tougher. So, one of the issues was the need to provide a daycare centre on the site. (Architect, participant two)

Cultural philosophies also exist around food as an important part of First Nations ceremonies. In support of a holistic philosophy of life and learning, alcohol is not allowed on the premises of the First Nations House of Learning.
Another one [tradition] was the notion of food, food being an integral part of any First Nations ceremony [...] these were all integral parts of tradition, ideologies. (Architect, participant two)

A rule that there would be no alcohol served on the premises [...] that was important because that’s a way of respecting the traditional rules and philosophies, a holistic way of life, alcohol wasn’t a part of that and since alcohol has had a lot of detrimental effects to Aboriginal societies [...]. (Faculty, participant one)

First Nations cultural philosophies, traditions, and values inform and coexist with spatial constructs and spatial practices. There is a “lived,” vibrant interconnectedness between cultural philosophies and the ways in which space is constructed. Spatial constructs reflect traditional Coast Salish architecture, nevertheless, multiple First Nations cultures are represented throughout the longhouse, as in the Great Hall, Sty-Wet-Tan. Cultural philosophies around the cardinal points and the use of the circle interconnect on all realms: physical, spiritual, and emotional. The significance of the cardinal points is represented in the positioning of each of the buildings and structures on the site. The significance of the circle to First Nations cultures is repeated throughout the buildings and structures, between the inside space and the outside space, from the demarcation of the circle on the floor of the Great Hall, to the circular library, to the Sacred Circle.

Yes, I’d say, there are certainly connections [between spatial practices and cultural practices within the site]. They relate to one another. I don’t see that they could be separate. I don’t quite see how they could be separate at all. When we talk about, say, cultural practices, sharing, working together, the space is used for that [...] Sty-Wet-Tan Hall [...] it’s a gathering place [...] trying to make the place feel comfortable or feel like home, resonate with culture. Students there [Sty-Wet-Tan Hall] see the house posts from the communities that they’re from, West Coast [which] reflect their culture [...] and the lounge, a lot of people usually go there, they have lunch and chat and they can joke around and it’s a comfortable place. (Faculty, participant one)

We are dealing with a building that’s very specifically representative of the Coast Salish culture, it’s hard to image turning a corner here and not seeing that from a design point of view. (Architect, participant two)
Philosophies, traditions, ideologies, values contributed to the spatial constructs of the site [...] the circle [...] the cardinal compass points [...] the holistic nature of the First Nations culture [...] the approach to the building, the relationship between the inside space and the outside space particularly from the Spirit Renewal Hall to the Great Hall [...] in the Great Hall, although it's anthropologically correct from the north side, from the south side we took the skin away and put glass in so we could look out onto the plaza and have a relationship with the grade and it was the natural setting which in reality is [...] a non-traditional First Nations approach to building to have that strong relationship to the outdoors because typically there was a lot of security involved in the home or in the longhouse. You had a controlled entry point [...] In our case, what we tried to do was strip the skin away from the building so that you looked into it almost like a diorama [...] the events inside could open to the outdoors because we had such a beautiful setting. (Architect, participant two)

The Spiritual Renewal Hall [Sacred Circle] which is the hut in the back of the building is on a north-south access with the centre of Sty-Wet-Tan, the circle. One of the things that we wanted to provide for the building because there's dance [...] formal dancing is also a major aspect of First Nations culture. Typically, you go to an event on a reserve or First Nations community - you'll see a family come out of the back of the van all dressed in traditional regalia, and they have to change in the van [...] they have no place to go to change or have a shower or anything like that so when we created the building [...] the washrooms have change facilities in them and showers so that those people who had performed could remove their regalia in a place other than the backseat of a pick-up - just an appropriate place to change. And the Spirit Renewal Hall is on an axis division - being that performers would go there, put their mind in a correct place and then come in and do their performance within the space. (Architect, participant two)

The connectedness of cultural philosophies to the land is reflected in the use of and respect for natural elements in the buildings of the House of Learning. In re-establishing and healing an asphalt covered, rectangular shaped university site as a “home away from home” for First Nations peoples natural elements were emphasized and carried through into the buildings as a reminder, a connectedness to the natural environment. The longhouse, day-care, library, and Sacred Circle all inter-relate with the natural environment around.

It was, I feel purposeful, in that way the arboretum was also chosen because it's a beautiful site to be within nature [...] the library, itself, even though it's made of concrete, it has that nice open window and the remnants of what’s supposed to look like a pit home [...] it’s in a very lovely setting, so certainly
I think there are connections between the space and cultural practices [...] Then we have the childcare which has more of a natural playground and that was on purpose. And the waterfall, that's all nature to have a sense of serenity. And the wood, the cedar inside, the big houseposts, the round posts that have already been carved. And then the back of the spiritual area, that's all natural, so that's going to be with nature, to be able to enjoy nature so it provides a more serene, more calming kind of environment and atmosphere. (Faculty, participant one)

The library is a circular building that again has the cardinal compass points that establish the front entry on the east [...] it's naturally cooled because it's sitting in the ground and has the waterfall to the side, which from a cultural point of view is all that the First Nations people had. That's the reason why they put the buildings in the ground, the Plains people. So again, we were trying to make that happen, when you're approaching that building [...] from the walkway up above, you have to consciously just step across gravel, big rocks, because the pavement will stop. Again, it's to make you think about where you're walking, and referring also to that creek or path of water that you're supposed to be traveling on to get to the front door of the building. (Architect, participant two)

6.4 Educational Practices

First Nations cultural philosophies and spatial constructs inform the educational practices of the First Nations House of Learning. Spatial constructs and spatial practices reinforce a holistic philosophy of teaching and learning and the multiple ways in which that manifests. A holistic approach to culture and space, First Nations ways of knowing, reflecting the teachings of ancestors, community, connectedness to the land and nature are all interrelated, forming a lived experience that in turn informs the educational practices.

They're all inter-related, I don't see a huge difference between cultural and the educational practices. (Faculty, participant one)

Well, I think the building, itself, is an educational resource. Not only for the First Nations people in terms of giving them a sense of pride and place on the campus, but also for the non-First Nations components of the university that use this space, that keep it a setting that addresses the culture. (Architect, participant two)

As Elders, students, and faculty represent numerous First Nations communities there may be differences in educational practices but there is a commonality in shared philosophies and
values. A shared philosophy amongst First Nations cultures is a holistic educational approach. Integral to the educational practices of the FNHL is respecting the philosophy of a holistic education that develops the intellectual, the physical, the spiritual, and the emotional realms of oneself. Educational practices focused around a holistic education reflect the voices of ancestors and the teachings of Elders. The presence of Elders on the site is an important part of the First Nations educational process.

For example when people are introduced to Sty-Wet-Tan Hall, I use to introduce the houseposts - they reminded us of traditional teachings and how that related to whatever activity was happening in the longhouse that day - and carrying on with extended family, and helping one another. So, again, it's holistic, developing the intellectual goes along with developing the emotional, spiritual and physical. The kitchen for food [...] support services - that deal with emotional counseling and other types of relation supports are also offered [...] a rule that there would be no alcohol served on the premises [...] that was important because that's a way of respecting the traditional rules and philosophies, a holistic way of life, alcohol wasn't a part of that [...] we try and pass those teachings on to others. (Faculty, participant one)

Traditional ways of knowing of multiple First Nations cultures are reflected in the various educational activities that take place in the FNHL as in the form of traditional ways of life, gatherings, dancing, and ceremonies.

We have a specific area in the building called the Living Area Cultural Room and that was intended for students who want to deal with their traditional values in terms of whether it's at work carving [...] the very traditional ways of life are offered [...] And that's one of the reasons it opens up onto the sweat lodge. The Pre-event area was largely seen as the link between the traditional space of the Sty-Wet-Tan and the contemporary space on the other side of that glass walkway, ribbon that runs through to the other side of the building. And the notion was that when there were ceremonies going on in the building people would gather there before they go into the main areas, go into the actual event. (Architect, participant two)

Educational programs, activities, and practices are student centred and are linked to what students are studying in other faculties, in order to present a First Nations perspective to issues that are studied and discussed. The educational activities may take the form of guest speakers, films, current videos, and gatherings.
Educational activities that happen in the longhouse [...] are really linked to whatever the students are studying in their faculties [...] if they’re talking about residential schools in history classes, there have been activities that happen in the longhouse dealing with those residential schools and survivors of residential schools, and there’ll be a film [...] on residential schools, a video that just came out, there might be a gathering on that or there could be guest speakers. There have been all kinds of really good guest speakers over the years, Thomson Highway [...] they are studying some of his plays, [in] English [...] and he’ll speak at the Longhouse [...] where anyone is invited, so it’s a nice way the House of Learning can work with the faculties in offering or extending the education that the students are receiving when they take classes in their particular faculties. (Faculty, participant one)

Spatial design, spatial arrangement, spatial practices of the FNHL are all culturally informed and produce an environment that informs the educational activities that take place, whether that be gatherings, using the library, eating lunch, or meeting with people. The notion of gathering is integral to First Nations cultures and as such the FNHL has many places for gathering as the Great Hall, which is a designated gathering place for both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal activities at the university.

Sty-Wet-Tan Hall – classes can be there but there aren’t rows of desks or bulletin boards, for example [...] you have chairs that can be put in a circle or they can be put theatre-style, very much like a standard classroom, even if the table is in there, people can work from that, so it’s very much an open space and flexible. You can change it to meet the learning, or the size of the group, and the learning activity that’s happening there. (Faculty, participant one)

A relationship with nature and the environment is part of the cultural philosophies and spatial practices that inform educational practices.

The notion of walking on the bridge of the water, traveling along the water to move through life or to seize your education or to become capable of dealing with some of the challenges of growing up was certainly a metaphor that Simon Baker thought of in terms of putting the water at the east end and traveling along it. (Architect, participant two)
There is a unity of conceptualization as to the use of the FNHL spaces by First Nations communities. Unity based on respect, cooperation, sharing, respect for spiritual and sacred spaces, and respect for the FNHL as a home away from home.

First we would have to make them [students] welcome, it’s a home away from home for students […] the practice of what happens in the building […] students say it’s a home away from home, they can go in there and use the lounge, they go to the computer lab, they can book Sty-Wet-Tan for activities, they can use the library, […] they’re the most important users of this space. (Faculty, participant one)

[The former director] was very much looking at […] organizing [the space] in an egalitarian manner. Her office is no bigger than anybody else […]. All the staff, administration, students and the Elders go to the same lounge area, although there is an Elders’ lounge. Everybody who is in the building, other than the Elders has a common lounge area. […] They recognized that we all need to learn, or have respect for what other people are doing and the building itself is very open […]. There is no true separation except for those spaces, which are on the north side, which has the drop ceiling over it because it’s hiding mechanical services. But in any of the offices out here, the student space, the Elders lounge, the Great Hall, they were all connected and in many ways that was a very good thing because the noise of one permeated the other and you learned to be careful, respect it. (Architect, participant two)

Tensions have arisen over the use of the FNHL spaces between users and non-users, in the sense of visitors to the longhouse; the public wandering into the FNHL who do not have the sensibilities to respect the spiritual and sacred areas, or activities in progress. Tensions have also developed from rental of the Great Hall to the public. Modifications have been made to the open concept of interior spatial planning to help alleviate these problems.

There’s been tensions that arise because sometimes somebody uses Sty-Wet-Tan, maybe from an outside group, and for a while that caused tension because of the noise carry-over. And then we decided not to have rentals, outside groups in the hall during the day, Monday to Friday, but we could rent it out evenings and weekends. We didn’t want to create continued friction, with that noise carry-over, when problems arose because of the competing use of the space - sometimes students have felt it wasn’t their home […]. There is a longhouse building management committee, and they meet and there is student representation on that and so issues arise and can be dealt with by that group […] it’s problematic and that’s why we had the new addition put into
the foyer where it has [created] a smaller little longhouse within a longhouse to give more privacy to the students, in the lounge, and in the Elders’ room. People come by, for example, just tourists, and they’re looking around, and they should be able to look around, but you don’t want to be on display [...] so we needed to have a little bit more privacy [...]. Would you go look in the Jack Bell building, the social work building, and yet you see the longhouse and come into it? Our building is beautiful, I guess, so people walk in and yet they don’t have a sense that this is a university building. I wouldn’t walk in like that to some other building, and why should I think I can walk in here and get service [...] we tried to work things out so we could hire students to be student-hosts, and again budgetary restraints. (Faculty, participant one)

6.5 Mediation and Coexistence
The objectives for and conceptualizations of the spatial constructs of the buildings and structures on the FNHL site had to be mediated with the university on numerous levels: planning issues that dealt with the positioning of the buildings on the site; the Coast Salish architectural style; materials used; inclusion of water on the site; food facilities; and the presence of Elders and children. Mediation took place with the President’s Office, Community Planning and Development, and the Board of Governors of the university.

From the point of view of being mediated with the university [...] because of the building - there were compromises made in their [university] organizational structure of the campus to accommodate Elders, to accommodate food, to accommodate water, to accommodate children, that weren’t there [in the organizational structure of the university]. But even when it came down to the planning of the building [...] the university, at the time, was going through a new master plan. The master planners were from Toronto and they looked at our design [...] we just had a design, it hadn’t been built, and [they] confronted us with the notion that of all the buildings on campus this is the only building that does not go with the grid that’s planned, and they really did not think that was appropriate. We explained to them the role of the building and decided [...] that yes, this is very appropriate. This building, it doesn’t fit the campus grid. It wasn’t intended that way but once we found that line through the site, it became a very important aspect. (Architect, participant two)

One of the issues was the need to provide a daycare facility on the site. The university did not really like that idea because they have a daycare centre for faculty and staff [...] and they weren’t exactly keen on it. (Architect, participant two)
Another one [planning issue] was the notion of food, food being an integral part of any First Nations ceremony. And when we talked about providing food services and a barbecue and kitchen on site, University Food Services basically said: ‘no, we provide food on the campus,’ [...] these were all integral parts of tradition, ideologies, and the University Planning Department [...] would say, ‘well, you really shouldn’t be doing these kind of things, if this is what you’re writing into your program, don’t expect it to be supported.’ But we presented it to the Board of Governors of the university and basically said if you’re intending to build a building that’s going to represent the culture of First Nations people and be a long way from home then you can’t ignore these aspects of their culture. Otherwise, you’re building a facility [...] you’re building a building that’s a symbol but has nothing to do with the way people live or want to live [...] the Board of Governors [...] said if we’re going to do it, we’ve got to do it right, and they supported it. (Architect, participant two)

The 1992 Campus Plan stipulates that priority is given to groups of projects that combine to reinforce the campus structure as laid out in the plan. In this way “the genius loci of the site is clarified, and each project contributes to the particular character area in which it is located.”³² The Campus Plan further states that although these projects are considered as meeting the “private needs”¹³ of the respective faculties, they are required to meet the greater needs of the campus: “first, by being sited and distributed as defined in the Campus Plan, and second, by meeting the Planning Strategies”¹⁴ as set out in the plan. As the proposed First Nations’ buildings and structures on the site were positioned off-grid by 17 degrees, it was considered by the master planners that they did not reinforce the campus structure as laid out in the campus plans. It was also determined that as such, the proposed buildings did not respond to the “genius loci” of the site. What then is the “genius loci” of the site? An arboretum where the trees are surrounded by asphalt, where the trees have to fight against the asphalt to survive – is this the “genius loci”? Imposing a Western European grid system of block structures on an undulating rain forest topography – is this the “genius loci”? Is it appropriate for master planners to come from a region that is five thousand miles away and tell First Nations peoples that their Coast Salish buildings are not appropriate on coastal lands, a region that has a history of Coast Salish architecture?

The Campus Plan states: “West Mall has suffered the most from expediency and the lack of following a long range plan. It has been the site of ‘temporary’ buildings since its inception.”¹⁵ The campus plan further stipulates that each project contributes to the particular
character area in which it is located. The character of the area in which the First Nations' site is located is one of temporary and semi-permanent buildings to the east, south and north with a parking lot to the northwest. Paradoxically, in order to meet the "character" requirements of the Campus Plan, the First Nations House of Learning would have to have been a temporary or semi-permanent building, or a parking lot. The Plan also states: "arbitrarily individualistic architectural statements are inconsistent with the emerging campus fabric, and should not be permitted to compromise a more cohesive campus image."16 The Coast Salish architectural style was seen as an arbitrarily individualistic statement and not in keeping with the emerging campus fabric. Such a planning statement does not allow for difference nor the possibility of difference, nor diversity. It does not allow for the acceptance of difference.

The mediation of the site was difficult and complex given the university emphasis and adherence to a block and grid system, and conforming to a prescribed "norm." The mediation also became political. Placing the First Nations House of Learning on the site of the arboretum was controversial, regardless of the fact that the trees of the arboretum were surrounded by asphalt, and regardless of the First Nations philosophy of healing the site.

I think for a while there was a bit of a protest about some trees needing to be cut down. We approached the President in dealing with that, but in the end I don’t think we cut down very many trees [...]. The university determined the ways in which the site and the building were mediated. (Faculty, participant one)

The site was an arboretum, and once the site had been selected, [it] then became quite political [...]. The mediation of the site was an interesting one [...]. Once we had selected this site, we were confronted with two different concerns. One was the residents of Totem Park and their concern about parking [...] possible noise from the Great Hall [...] they had a nice little setting over there and didn’t want to be disturbed. The bigger concern was from the Department of Geography who was across the street [...] because they saw this as the destruction of a major learning resource on campus, the arboretum. The way the building was designed in reality with this bisecting of the site. We only had to remove I think a total of five trees out of the 55 that were on our site. And three of those were, in fact, re-located and two of them were cut down, and one of the ones that was cut down forms part of the waterfall at the end of the building. So, we assured them that we would do our best to avoid damage. We had an arborist. They had an arborist come through
and talk all about the site and the fact that the building would interfere with the natural micro-climate of the site [...] what we did is we just moved the foundations. Although, the buildings that are very close to the trees, very close in some cases - we cut the building foundations back and stepped them around the trees so we didn't expose the trees to any undue stress from the foundations. There's a tree on the end of the building down by the daycare that [...] was considered incredibly valuable because it was brought from Asia [...] It was considered, do not damage that tree [...] It's still there, it's still healthy, it's a beautiful tree [...] there was a great deal of concern about the loss of it. When we started construction on this site, we were afraid that we were going to have a blockade by the Geography Department of the construction of this building [...] there was a certain amount of irony that the non-native community, the Geography Department, putting up a blockade to stop the native community from building their building. It didn't happen, luckily, because I think cooler heads prevailed. We did things like the patio, the outdoor public area off the Sty-Wet-Tan is made out of wood with gaps between it, so, that the stuff that comes from the trees, and the rainfall and the rot of deleterious materials that come off the trees go back into the ground, and the trees are not covered with asphalt [...] they are not fighting for their life, anymore. (Architect, participant two)

Mediation of the First Nations House of Learning within the spatial and organizational structures of the university is on-going in the sense of respect for and inclusion of First Nations ways of knowing.

One of the objectives of the House of Learning is to create access for Aboriginal people to the university so certainly you need to work with faculties to increase ways that more Aboriginal people can enter their faculties, work with the Registrar's Office, admission policies, work with other student service units like the Women's Resource Centre, Disability Centre, Equity Office, Alma Mater Society. The same goes for outside the university, the House of Learning does a lot with other post-secondary institutions whether academic discussions, or research, or providing linkages to talk about transition between sites. So, certainly the House of Learning does a lot of that, not only with Aboriginal institutions, but other community groups. (Faculty, participant one)

6.6 Envisioned Changes
After using the spaces, “inhabiting” the spaces of the First Nations House of Learning, there have been some recommendations by the users to modify the spatial constructs. Modifications centre around issues concerning more space for students. The need for space
for students can be partly attributed to the success of the FNHL, and increased numbers of
Aboriginal students, which was one of the original objectives. After “inhabiting” the spaces
for some ten years now, the academic spatial needs of the students are more defined.

To provide a bigger space for students [...] another room [...] either a bigger
computer lab or quiet study areas, not individual offices for students but a
bigger room where students could actually come, those who aren’t working on
a computer, for example, but needing to read or study, could do that. And [...] maybe ways of really having quite a separate site, Sty-Wet-Tan being separate
from the rest of the building, then you wouldn’t have to worry about the noise
carry-over at all [...] that was a big issue [...] and just that there wasn’t
enough student working space, students really use the computer lab, a lot, and
I’m sure they find that could be a bigger space [...] having maybe more
classroom space [...] there needed to be an in-between space between the
boardroom and Sty-Wet-Tan Hall that could be a multi-purpose area,
classroom, or smaller activity room, and certainly more offices. (Faculty,
participant one)

Other recommended spatial changes have emerged due to the popularity of the FNHL on the
university campus and with the general public, the problematics that arise from sharing a
university academic space with the general public. One of the main objectives of the First
Nations House of Learning is that it is a home away from home for Aboriginal students on
the UBC campus. In the function of the House of Learning as a home it became necessary to
create a “threshold,” a physical and visual screen to separate the public spaces of the home
from the private spaces. When the Pre-event area and the Great Hall are used by the public as
in rentals, their function changes from FNHL activities to public use. By establishing the
spatial construct of a “threshold,” the Elders’ lounge and student’s lounge become private
spaces.

Unfortunately, the success of the building, in terms of inviting people into it,
was starting to lead to a problem in the building. The people for whom the
building was designed were being admonished for making [noise], disturbing
events going on in Sty-Wet-Tan. So we were called back to see, how can we
deal with this [...] what would we change. Well, the other aspect of it was the
Pre-event space [...] Too many people who saw the building [...] would
come in, and not respect the privacy of the students in the lounge and the
Elders. It was too transparent, you could walk in without sort of stepping over
a threshold that said, no this isn’t for you. So what we did, and we had two
things we had to deal with - we had to create the screen which is a house front in the Pre-event space to make it feel that people were going through a doorway down a corridor to get to the Elders’ lounge and the students’ lounge. It also created a visual screen so people couldn’t just see in and say ‘oh, can we come in’ [...] In the other case, we created a glass barrier [...] to control the sound so the noise of students being students in the student lounge didn’t disturb an event someone was organizing in Sty-Wet-Tan and conversely, the other way around [...] Most First Nations people live with the noise that comes from there [Sty-Wet-Tan], in a lot of cases, it’s a beautiful noise, there are choirs, there are events going on, that add life to the building. (Architect, participant two)

Some aspects of the original spatial design were not realized due to budgetary constraints. The perception is still very strong about the benefits of incorporating the original concept of lighting.

The Great Hall [...] there’s a series of light fixtures in the building that were not supposed to be quite like that. When we were getting towards the end of the project, we were running out of money. What was supposed to be happening in there - was in a traditional longhouse, Coast Salish - was a family place where many families lived, and under the ceilings of those spaces, clothes were drying, food was drying, things were hanging - what we wanted to do was create a series of baffles, they were to be copper sheets with a bunch of holes punched in them so when you looked up at the ceiling you didn’t see the ceiling precisely, you saw these hanging sheets of copper with holes punched in them so the light would filter down like you would [see] in a traditional longhouse, filtering through the cracks in the building, evoke all that stuff hanging in the rafters and the structures but much to my disappointment [...] we needed the money to do other things with the project. (Architect, participant two)

The First Nations House of Learning responds to the spirit of the place, the “genius loci” by healing the site, and by gathering into the site spatial histories respective of First Nations cultures, land, and environment.

6.7 Summary
One of the driving forces behind the realization, the creation of a place for First Nations peoples on the university campus was the founding Director of the House of Learning, Verna Kirkness. She credits the university for their collaboration in the realization of this dream and
maintains that “the University of British Columbia set a precedent not only in having a culturally sensitive building for its First Nations students but also in entrusting First Nations people to direct and guide the project.”

The building culture of First Nations peoples with its emphasis on a connectedness to the land and nature is often incommensurable with Western cultural approaches to building. In making a place for First Nations peoples within the university it is important to respect, to recognize, and to realize First Nations building culture. First Nations building culture is not commensurable with a Western cultural approach of block structures within a grid system. The planning issues for the FNHL were numerous from situating the buildings on the site, the architectural style, use of natural building materials, water on the site, inclusion of food, and the inclusion of children and Elders.

The spatial constructs and spatial objectives of the FNHL were viewed as inappropriate by the planning team for the 1992 Campus Plan. It was determined by the FNHL planning committee and architects that the spatial constructs and objectives were “very appropriate.”

Vine Deloria, spiritual leader and scholar, maintains that the corresponding question faced by Aboriginal people “when contemplating action is whether or not the proposed action is appropriate. Appropriate includes the moral dimension of respect for the part of nature that will be used or affected in our action.” The approach to the selected site was that of a healing action, to heal the site. In the site development there was concern for the impact on the existing natural environment and the arboretum. Control of the site was also a consideration “in the sense of the building establishing a presence without being dominated by the surrounding built environment.” The building culture and architectural style of Coast Salish architecture were respected. As the longhouse is also on traditional Musqueam land, cultural protocol of the Musqueam was respected throughout the building process.

The use of natural materials in the construction of the longhouse was also an issue. It was determined that red cedar would be used as it is indigenous to the Pacific Northwest Coast. There was a process of selection for the cedar logs used in the buildings and structures; harvesting and processing of the logs took approximately a year. Placement of the rough-
hewn cedar siding horizontally is in keeping with Salish architecture. Copper as a traditional valued metal to Coastal peoples was used on the roof of the longhouse, and copper wire encircles the posts symbolizing lashing of the posts with cedar ropes.\textsuperscript{22} This choice of materials was not in keeping with the 1992 Campus Plan, which stipulates that “the dominant building material should be masonry, in keeping with the long standing academic tradition in North America and Europe.”\textsuperscript{23} The use of natural materials is part of the building culture of First Nations people. “Having the natural materials, that inter-relationship, connectedness of nature, we’re guided by that. And ensuring that we keep that in mind, as we do our different program initiatives, that we always have ways to have respectful relationships with all the resources of nature. That’s always present in this building.”\textsuperscript{24}

Although the architecture of the longhouse is representative of the Coast Salish shed-style, many West Coast First Nations cultures are represented in the Great Hall, Sty-Wet-Tan, in the wood carvings of houseposts, carved ends of roof beams, ceremonial doors, and the doors dividing the Great Hall from the longhouse. Cultural traditions of the Haisla, Tahltan-Tlingit-Tsimshian, Tahltan-Tlingit-Nisga’a, Gitxsan, Haida, Hcutlsuk, Musqueam, and Coast Salish are all represented in the Great Hall. The uses and names of the rooms of the longhouse speak to First Nations ways of life, ways of learning, as in the Great Hall, Pre-event room, Elders’ lounge, and Living Cultures room. (figs.19a, 19b.) Sty-Wet-Tan, the Great Hall means “spirit of the west wind” which welcomes people from the four directions.\textsuperscript{25} The Great Hall is the focal point of the longhouse, the space for gathering the community.

Community is an important philosophy of First Nations. The notion of “being,” as in “being” as a community is very strong. “People are there to support one another, so the idea of extended family comes out as a cultural principle. That is common to many First Nations, that way people can get some support from people who are part of this community. I guess we see the longhouse being like a community of people because traditionally it was a community, a big family, an extended family, and what we have here is a community that does care for one another [...]”\textsuperscript{26} The notion of community extends beyond the FNHL community of the university to the “home” communities of Elders, students, and faculty. “We’re always thinking about First Nations community, where we come from, so that we
ensure that what we are doing will benefit First Nations community. We are not here just because it is a cognitive activity. We are here because there is a need in First Nations community to help improve the quality of life to community development, but not to be the experts to go back to our communities, but to be there to provide service to our communities." First Nations educator, Eber Hampton maintains that service to the community is a standard of First Nations education. Education is to serve the people, the community, not for individual advancement or status.

The philosophy of “being” as a community and an extended family are reflected in the educational practices of the First Nations House of Learning. The presence and involvement of Elders is an integral part of educational practices. “Elders are the best living examples of what the end product of education and life experience should be.” The First Nations philosophy of the extended family is a very inclusive philosophy and extends to the inclusion of students, of gathering students together in their home away from home. As such students’ voices are included in decision-making processes. This was the situation in the conceptualization of the House of Learning, students were included in the planning stages and in the building workshops.

As the First Nations House of Learning houses Elders, students and faculty from many First Nations communities, differences in educational practices occur. Cultural differences and different ways of knowing are welcomed as opportunities for the benefits of diversity and cultural sharing. The knowledge that people bring with them is respected and acknowledged “as an important dimension in their learning.” “This place is open for everyone, and when we are doing a First Nations activity of any sort it may come from various cultures, and people are encouraged to share their teachings that have come from their cultures. So certainly there probably are differences but we look at differences as an opportunity for the benefits of diversity where there is a sharing of cultures and there is a recognition that there could be different practices and ways.”

On the First Nations site there is a coexistence between cultural philosophies and building culture that inform educational practices. “The teachings that our place follows, the various
curricula and principles [...] the teachings of the circle, the openness, having this as a welcoming atmosphere, and that they need to have a spiritualness. We created that within the physical space not only outside but inside [so] that there is this feeling of spiritualness to the building, and a sharing of cultures [...]." There may be differences in educational practices amongst First Nations communities but there is a commonality in shared philosophies and values. A shared philosophy amongst First Nations cultures is a holistic educational approach that "combines the cognitive, emotional, ritual, and physical domains that guides us in what we do in the sense that students are here studying their different fields, but we also need to address the spiritual and emotional needs." Spirituality "is respect for the spiritual relationships that exist between all things." A spiritual emphasis is an important aspect of First Nations holistic education. A holistic philosophy of life and learning is represented in the spatial construct of the circle, symbolic of wholeness and wellness; it is present in all the buildings and structures of the First Nations site, from the exterior to the interior. Access to the site from West Mall is demarked by a circular arrangement of paving stones, which leads down to the lower level of the library, which is circular in form. The circle is represented in the Sacred Circle, which is on an axis with the circle on the floor of the Great Hall. The circle or medicine wheel conveys "concepts derived from introspection and illustrate the pathways to self-discovery [...] they speak, in the silence of the unknown, about the progressive growth of self through a cyclical journey of repetition, experience, and construction of meaning."

A holistic approach to life was part of the building planning process, as in the spatial constructs of the circle and the importance of cardinal points in the orientation of the buildings on the site. East is the beginning and starting of things. The longhouse is on an east-west axis as opposed to the north-south axis of the university. During the planning stages the development of the form of the roof was seen as the outstretched wings of a bird, of an eagle. The symbolism of the eagle represents "the highest attainment or highest achievement level." The longhouse roof resembles the wings of a bird in flight. One copper wing sweeps towards the past, to our cultures that have existed for many thousands of years, and the other wing sweeps toward the future, signifying the blend of new knowledge to our cultures.
Eber Hampton describes the standards of Aboriginal education as spirituality, service, diversity, culture, tradition, respect, history, relentlessness, vitality, conflict, place and transformation.\(^\text{41}\) "Place" is one of the standards of Aboriginal education. A sense of place, creating, making a place for First Nations students and peoples on the university campus was an important objective of the building project. The FNHL is seen as a gathering place, a spiritual place, a place for reflection and spiritual renewal for First Nations students and faculty on the university campus. (fig. 21.)

Vine Deloria Jr. maintains that the Aboriginal world consists of two basic experiential dimensions, two concepts, that of place and power. He defines the Aboriginal meaning of place and power as spiritual power or life force.

Power and place are dominant concepts – power being the living energy that inhabits and/or composes the universe, and place being the relationship of things to each other.\(^\text{42}\)

Deloria describes power and place as producing personality, meaning that the universe is alive, the universe is personal, and must be approached in a personal manner. "The personal nature of the universe demands that each and every entity in it seek and sustain personal relationships."\(^\text{43}\) This spiritual aspect of knowledge teaches that relationships must not be left incomplete. This underlines one of the principles of Aboriginal knowledge, the principle of correlation. This principle is based on "the psychological behaviour of things in the world and attributing personality to all things, [...] to observe and remember how and when things happened together,"\(^\text{44}\) the sequencing of things. Aboriginal education recognizes the importance of a sense of place, land, and territory.\(^\text{45}\) Hampton emphasizes the importance of a place for Aboriginal students within the institutionalized spaces of Western sites of higher education, "a place where one is free to relax from the conventions of white society and be one’s native self is essential to well-being."\(^\text{46}\)

Deloria observes that the educational journey of Aboriginal people is one spanning two distinct value systems and world-views. The basic premise of First Nations metaphysics is
“that the world, and all its possible experiences, constitutes a social reality, a fabric of life in which everything had the possibility of intimate knowing relationships because, ultimately everything was related.” First Nations people navigating Western cultural systems of higher education must absorb a great deal of factual content, and they must also place that knowledge into the context of their own community traditions. Western knowledge constructs are often incommensurable with their own cultural constructs. First Nations students are also required to navigate the spatial constructs of Western educational institutions that are incommensurate with First Nations cultural constructs of space and spatial practices.

The same applies to the institutionalized spaces of the University of British Columbia where First Nations students must navigate the institutionalized spaces of the university, which are representative of Western culture, spaces that are often “out of place” with their culture. “What we may do in this building could be very different from than if students are going to a class in education in the Scarfe building, it’s like two different worlds. And so they do try and bring their perspective into the Scarfe education world, and sometimes it’s pretty successful and other times it’s a real struggle.”

The FNHL coexists with the university in many positive ways. Nevertheless, the greater challenge lay in the inclusion of multiple ways of knowing, teaching, and learning by the university at large. “What I am most concerned about is that in other parts of the university we create some kind of learning space within those faculties that can respect our cultural knowledges, and where we can feel that we belong, and that we are not on the margin. And that we can recognize that yes maybe things are done differently in other faculties but we can accept differences and diversity, as long as ours can also be accepted and our way of learning and doing curricula.” An objective of the FNHL is “to extend support services and cultural inclusion to the First Nations students in all UBC programs.” In making a place for First Nations students on the university campus, one of the objectives of the House of Learning is to continue to make a place for First Nations students within the larger site of the campus, within the multiple and diverse disciplines and disciplining spaces of the university.
Cultural philosophies of a holistic approach to life, spirituality, extended family, community, diversity, respect for First Nations cultures and peoples, respect and a connectedness to nature, the land, and the environment, are all part of the building practices, the spatial constructs and spatial practices of the First Nations House of Learning. Spatial constructs and spatial practices of the House of Learning inform and coexist with educational practices. They are viewed as one in the same. Through a holistic approach to life and learning, through spirituality, and through a process of healing the site, the House of Learning has created a space, a place for First Nations students within the university, and in doing so has renewed the spirit of the place. Within the First Nations site there is a sense of place, an engagement with the landscape. The site speaks to the senses: sight, the visuality of the structures and use of natural materials, the connectedness to the land; oral, the sounds of the waterfall; smell, the scent of cedar which permeates the longhouse, exterior and interior; touch, the tactile quality of walking over paving stones, creek pebbles, cedar boardwalk, and the tactile quality of the rough-hewn cedar exterior and interior. There is a personality of place.
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Chapter Seven
Changing Places:
Centre for Research in Women's Studies and Gender Relations Site

The difference between the sexes is a space: a place where inequality is rationalized in order to be transcended, a place where events shape reality, an imaginary and imagined place that pictures, fictions, and documents describe in very different ways. Davis, Farge, 1993, 4

7.1 Site Description
The problematics around spatial issues for Women's Studies at the university are manifested in an on-going quest for adequate facilities to house programs and activities for faculty, staff, and students. What is now the site of the Centre for Research in Women's Studies and Gender Relations (WMST) was previously the Disability Resource Centre (DRC), and before that a Memorial Garden. When Rick Hansen raised funding for a Disability Resource Centre, Campus and Community Planning had only six months to have a building up and operational for the summer of 1990. The intent of the building was to provide temporary offices for the Disabled Advisory Group. As such, a temporary building was assembled to meet the immediate spatial needs of the DRC. When the DRC moved into new more permanent accommodations, the Women's Studies Program at the university negotiated the space in 1993 for a Centre for Research in Women's Studies and Gender Relations (WMST). The building that Women's Studies inherited is a temporary, premanufactured building.\(^1\) This small temporary building with bright yellow awnings is centrally and strategically located on the north part of the campus. (fig.22a.) Surrounded by the main library, Student Union building, and buildings that house the university registrar's office and student services, it is situated on a main pedestrian route and as such visible. The use of temporary, prefabricated buildings on the UBC campus is a response to spatial needs and building time constraints. Building at the UBC campus is program-driven. When a program receives funding there is the immediate need of space to house and run the program. "Programs outstrip facilities."\(^2\) Often the response time for the Department of Campus and Community Planning to meet the spatial needs of programs is six months to a year to design, approve, and build accommodation for a program.\(^3\) As it is difficult to find funding sources to build more
permanent buildings, the prefabricated buildings are a substantial building alternative as they meet building codes and are seismically stable.\textsuperscript{4} They are expedient in achieving a six-month deadline.\textsuperscript{5} However, for all their time expediency they are costly to build. A prefabricated building, as used by UBC, is factory built and mounted in modules. It involves two contracts, one contract for the factory construction, and another contract for installing services such as plumbing and electricity. The cost for a prefabricated model of modest size with a building occupancy load of less than sixty people, as used for the Disability Resource Centre, is around five hundred thousand dollars. The use of temporary pre-manufactured buildings is a building alternative that the university frequently implements to meet program-driven space needs. Even costlier prefabricated buildings have been constructed, as in the case of the Law building and Engineering building, which have subsequently been replaced with permanent buildings.\textsuperscript{6} Regardless of the success and interest by faculty, students, and women’s groups in research, programs, and activities around women’s studies and gender relations, the Centre for Women’s Studies still faces the same spatial problematics it did a decade ago. In effect issues around women, space, and the university have existed since the beginnings of the university.

7.2 Histories of Gendered Spaces

In the original, 1912 design for the University of British Columbia, provisions were made by the architects Sharp and Thompson for a Women’s Area. (fig.3.) Provisions for a Women’s Area were also retained in their subsequent modified plans. (fig.4, fig.5.) As documented in a report to the UBC Board of Governors dated November 10, 1913, the Women’s Precinct was to be inclusive of a college, dormitories, and an athletic field situated on campus in proximity to a residential neighbourhood near Tenth Avenue.\textsuperscript{7} The report, which was authored by the Commission appointed to examine the general design for the university prepared by Sharp and Thompson, further indicated provisions for an immediate building program which would begin with two dormitories, one of which was to be used for women until their own building complex was ready. Some thirty years later the Women’s buildings were still not realized, including residences for women. In 1945 Dr. Norman MacKenzie, University President at the time wrote to the Premier of BC, John Hart, outlining additional buildings and facilities required at UBC, including the need for women’s residences.\textsuperscript{8} The following year, 1946, as
recorded in the minutes of a meeting of the joint committee on the University Building Program, Norman MacKenzie reported that costs “for new buildings were considerably in excess of original estimates in the Building Program, consequently it was necessary to reconsider the future program,” and that there were no funds available for women's residences. As the emphasis of the building program centred on an addition to the Science building and an additional wing to the library, it was suggested that plans for a women’s residence be eliminated from the building program. The Dean of Women, Dean Dorothy Mawdsley requested a revision of the building program to be inclusive of women’s residences. Dr. MacKenzie suggested that, instead of constructing a new building for women, Fort Camp could be used for the women’s residences, which Dean Mawdsley declined as not suitable. Fort Camp refers to the huts that had been given to the university by the Department of National Defence at the end of the war. These huts had been constructed during World War II as temporary army barracks, which remained on the Fort Camp site. The “obvious structural, environmental, and aesthetic deficiency” of the huts has been subsequently documented in university reports. At this meeting Dean Mawdsley requested that the Board of Governors be asked to consider the urgent need for accommodation for women students on campus. In a follow-up letter from MacKenzie to the architect Thompson of the same year, he writes: “The Board noted [...] money for buildings [...] left no funds for the Women's residences.” Dean Mawdsley continued to point out the lack of adequate provisions for women on campus in a further letter to the President in 1949, in which she brings to his attention that women majoring in sciences have no provision for common rooms in the buildings in which they work. She wished for the President to carry forth her concerns: “since I am not on any planning committee which has to do with the erection of these buildings I am writing to you in the hopes that this suggestion might be passed on to the right quarters.” Over this period of time university minutes concerning building programs do not indicate a single woman sitting on any of the building or planning committees. In 1950, a Women’s Dormitory named Mary Bollert Hall was constructed with the assistance of funds raised by the University Alumni. The dormitory was not situated on the university proper, but on the periphery of the university, across Northwest Marine Drive, on an escarpment. The architectural drawings for the building indicate provisions for a House Mother, as well as specifications for window hardware, which restricted window openings to
In a building surge from the late 1950s to 1975, over fifty new buildings were constructed on campus, none of which were allocated for women. The buildings that were constructed during this surge do not take into consideration the presence of female students on campus and are lacking in providing basic, minimal facilities for women such as common rooms and women's washrooms. Still today, in the twenty-first century, women students on campus are using washrooms as in Buchanan Block B that were originally designed in the 1960s for men, where the only change made since is the wording on the door from “men” to “women.” Several times a day, every day on this campus women students walk into washrooms, indicated for “women” and are confronted by a wall of urinals. From a female perspective a wall of twenty some urinals makes an impressive spatial statement. It is a constant visual and spatial reminder that the university is a male space. It is concrete evidence of a spatial design, a spatial arrangement that reflects a dominant male ideology, a male body, and one of the multiple ways that women are reminded on a daily basis that the university is a male space.

Given the number of women students on campus since the 1960s, the action, or lack of action of refurbishing, or refitting men’s washrooms for women contributes to an environment of impermanence for women, a marginalization of women on campus. A continuity of impermanence for women still exists at the university, and is spatialized in many ways.

The first Women's Studies' courses at the University of British Columbia can be traced back to the early 1970s. In 1971, a non-credit course was given, followed by a three-year approval for a course on “The Canadian Woman.” In 1976, the Faculty of Arts formally approved Women's Studies' courses. A major in Women's Studies was established in 1991, and subsequently a minor was established in 1996. A graduate program in Women's Studies was just recently launched in 2000. Spatial histories of the Centre for Research in Women's Studies and Gender Relations were narrated in participant meetings by users of the space. The narratives document the oral histories of faculty and graduate students who are “users,” who “inhabit” the spaces that make up the Centre.

This particular location, I know it was quite controversial building on it at all, because it was the site of a War Memorial Garden - the Disability Centre was only here for a couple of years. There was a very nice sunken garden here.
with beautiful plants and benches and a lot of people came here to eat their lunch. A lot of people were very upset when people were allowed to build here because I think students or alumni had raised money for that garden after the war. So there is still some kind of expectation that this is a temporary building because at some point that garden is supposed to be restored. (Faculty, participant one)

When the Disability Resource Centre moved in to the new Brock Hall building, female faculty members of the university negotiated the trailer space for Women’s Studies with the assistance of the Provost Office. Prior to this Women’s Studies’ programs and activities were spatially fragmented throughout the university.

[Female faculty] negotiated that we, Women’s Studies, would get this space. And the reason that they were interested in this space was primarily it is a central location. I remember the other options that were suggested at the time were all peripheral, quite far out on the campus, and we really wanted to be in a place where people would see us. And even though it’s a trailer, these yellow awnings are very recognizable, and we would always just describe it, as the building with the yellow awnings and everyone would know what you mean […] we’re opposite the SUB [Student Union building] and next to the Registrar’s Office so we’re really near the hub. We’re part of that hub on the campus so that makes us feel central […]. It’s very easy to go over and get food, it’s a good observation point, quite interesting, actually. You see lots of squirrels, you feel close to the ground. (Faculty, participant one)

The Centre for Women’s Studies has "inhabited" this temporary building for over a decade now and is continually trying to subvert the prefabricated, prescribed, modular spaces in which they find themselves. Even though they are grateful to be in their own space, it is an on-going challenge to physically model their programs and activities within the small modular spaces of the trailer. When WMST inherited the temporary prefabricated building they made only two modifications, as indicated on the key plan of the as built architectural drawing. (fig.22b.) One modification was to divide part of a large reception area in order to create an additional office. The second modification was to partly close off the reception area by the addition of a high counter affording the receptionist some work privacy.

It is a trailer. It is a temporary pre-fabricated building […]. The original design was done for the Disability Centre, not the Women’s Centre. So, I think that accessibility was a very big part of that philosophy and one that
we’re happy to have inherited both in terms of it being ground level and being centrally located, and also having ramps and things for Disability Access [...] It also makes it feel like quite a spacious area, the hallways are wide and the doorways are wide for that reason. It’s very accessible which is good [...] Otherwise, I imagine it’s very light. It’s a very light building. It does get quite hot in hot weather but that’s the downside of having a lot of windows, which does make it bright. It makes it a bright space, it doesn’t feel gloomy when you come in [...]. We added an office because that [reception] area was very big. We needed another office. We’ve reconfigured the secretarial area. The secretaries used to be facing sideways to people coming in. And now she’s facing more forward. It’s better the way it is now. And we put a higher counter so she also feels a little more private. (Faculty, participant one)

Well, it’s a prefabricated building. I know that we have rats and raccoons living underneath it. We hear the noises, in fact, a rat recently. We had to put some mesh over there so it couldn’t get in [...] it ran around for a bit but it disappeared. We didn’t want to put poison so they suggested we put barriers so it couldn’t get back in. We’ve also had an ant infestation for some strange reason. I think all of this is a result of having this empty space underneath. (Faculty, participant one)

It always reminds me of [...] army housing. That’s what it reminds me of, a barracks kind of look about it. And it has a sort of impermanence because of that. Well, they could pick it up and move it somewhere else. (Student, participant two)

All I can say is by looking at it that it looks like a traditional portable [...] I don’t find it a particularly creative layout of space [...] Poor [construction [...] look at the walls in this room, they’re just awful, the lights, everything. Vinyl, I’m not sure, on the ceilings and these fluorescent lights are so horrible [...] the main room or the entrance area where there’s that round table and those cubicles, those cubicles actually have lights. You don’t actually need the horrible fluorescents on. (Student, participant three)

Users of the Centre for Women’s Studies, those who “inhabit” its spaces include faculty, faculty associates, visiting scholars, staff, graduate and undergraduate students, and women’s activist groups. The graduate program, which was launched in 2000, contributed to increased enrolment and use of the space. It is pre-dominantly a woman’s place on campus with a few males participating in the programs.
Well, there are three categories of people. There’s one person, [a Professor] at the moment who is entirely in Women’s Studies, and then there are the two administrators here for most of the time, one for the Centre and one from the Program. Aside from that, there are about six other people who are cross-appointed to Women’s Studies. It means that they are officially Women’s Studies professors but they’re also in another department so they’re shared. And then there’s a third category which is the Faculty associates who are not appointed to Women’s Studies but who have made some kind of formal commitment to be involved with our graduate students and our activities whose research is in a relevant area. (Faculty, participant one)

We are in two Faculties, we are interdisciplinary and we have faculty associates from many faculties [...] it’s primarily office space, so that people are using this space to do office work. There’s the administration of the program that’s here and faculty members are here [...] Student advising takes place here, a lot. Faculty meet with students on a one to one basis [...]. We do get a wide variety of people, including people from the community who come here. And then we have a visiting scholars program. Every year we have visitors, maybe about ten visitors who come from up to one month to a year from many different countries [...] they come here, they study here, they also come here for social contact [...]. And then often we have sessionals here teaching evening classes [...] we had a woman with a great big dog and that was a question of whether a dog was really welcome here [...] there were visitors from Asia or Africa who were really afraid of dogs, even very friendly ones [...]. Undergraduate students who may not necessarily be Women’s Studies students but they are from the Social Justice Movement. They have had some meetings here. It actually has provided a space for some groups that don’t belong to a specific department but need a friendly space to meet in. And we don’t charge anyone ever so it’s free [...]. We do have some men here but very few. We have three male graduate students. We have the occasional male visiting scholar but it’s mostly a very woman dominated space. (Faculty, participant one)

I suspect that it’s many of the professors that are working in other departments and working towards having a space like this [...]. Certainly Women’s Studies students [...] the course I took there were people from Comparative Literature, Asian Studies, Sociology. There was only one man in the class, so I find that it is a resource for women that are looking at not necessarily feminist issues but women’s issues within their own discipline and they can come and get a background and a foundation in that. I notice a lot of undergraduates would just come in and use that area, come and read. I found that interesting [...]. Mostly, but not all women. I get the sense that men feel awkward about it. I think because it has Women’s Studies on it, men aren’t supposed to go in there. (Student, participant two)
7.3 Cultural Philosophies, Ideologies, Values, and Traditions

The principle philosophies and values advocated by the Women’s Studies Centre are a welcoming, homey, open place that is supportive of and encourages women, interdisciplinarity, intercultural, inclusive, and grass-roots based studies. The philosophies of community and sharing underline all the philosophies of Women’s Studies, sharing the spaces, sharing the same support services between two programs under different department heads, sharing ideologies and values.

We have tried to be a very open, accessible space, welcoming to everybody […]. We have a philosophy about being grassroots-based and I think that not being in an ivory tower. My other office is in Buchanan Tower. It’s a very different feeling being at this ground level and also the configuration of the rooms makes it feel somewhat like a home or a house. The fact it has a kitchen and a living room. I think that it has that homey-side to it that might be appropriate. (Faculty, participant one)

There is a very strong sense of inclusion and community within this space. And support which I haven’t found in a lot of places, which is interesting. (Student, participant two)

But what I find a real distinct difference between this and the Buchanan Tower […] [which] is constructed around a central column with the elevator in it, all the offices are really located so that you hardly ever walk in front of anyone else’s office to get to your office. Here, people are walking up and down all the time […]. People rarely close their door. (Faculty, participant one)

The modular spaces of the trailer were specifically configured for a Disability Centre including the decor and furnishings. When Women’s Studies inherited the building, they transformed aspects of the modular spaces to reflect the philosophies of Women's Studies, a welcoming, homey place where women on campus can enter and feel welcome and safe. Spatial changes were limited physically, however, spatial transformations on the mental and social levels were extensive.

Those four great big carrels, which take up half the meeting room we will be getting rid of […] we don’t really need that kind of carrel. It takes up far too much room. So that’s been awkward because we have a meeting room [there].
We want to have our seminars here so that people actually come here for our weekly seminars, that's open to anyone but if a lot of people come they're kind of out in the hallway. It's very bad at the moment. But when we have that room much emptier without those carrels, it will be a lot better. (Faculty, participant one)

Some new furniture was bought, for example the sofa that's here when you come in the front door is covered with a very colourful kind of creton - purple pattern, it's a very comfortable sofa [...]. That was purchased to make that room seem less like an academic reading room and more like a family room of some kind, like a welcoming space that would be a little more feminized. It was a visiting scholar [...] who made the covers herself [...]. And then the secretary at the time [...] was very into plants and she had a lot of plants, and there still are a lot of plants when you come in [...]. And then [one of the former directors] was also very environmentally aware so we do have things like real glasses that we use most of the time rather than paper ones. Real plates, things like that. We do recycling, we collect bottles and so that philosophy was part of it. And also the signs that were put up, the way they are worded is different than other places [on campus] it doesn't say 'do not do this' or whatever. It will say 'please do not leave the window open because someone might come in and steal our computers.' It's a less strident bossy-tone [...]. The other thing is, the doors are wide because of wheelchair access, and they're sliding doors but they're glass and people very rarely close, or shut the blinds. It's mostly a space where people can actually see what other people are doing, but I think people are comfortable with that. And the fact we have big washrooms because it was a Disability Centre. One of them we try to keep more for people who are here a lot. People [...] leave their things here if they go swimming, or leave a change of clothes here, it might be something women might do more than men, I don't know. (Faculty, participant one)

I know at one meeting about space at UBC, I think it was with Martha Piper [University President] [...] one of the Women's Studies students stood up and said this is one of the very few places on campus where an undergraduate can come and use the phone or the microwave and feel that that's okay. Of course, this works because only a small number of them choose to do it. We have some undergraduates who come here and eat their lunch all the time. (Faculty, participant one)

Welcoming and homey philosophies are extended to visiting scholars. Efforts are taken to ensure that they feel comfortable and that the environment created is a welcoming, intercultural and inclusive place. In turn, visiting scholars often leave some tangible evidence of their stay behind.
We have a lot of information available for visiting scholars when they arrive, maps and things and we try to actually send somebody with them to the library and to financial services to get their key and that kind of thing so they don’t feel lost [...]. And then the visiting scholars that we have are international so many of them give something to the Centre when they leave, so we have a lot of objects around, especially in the kitchen and the reading room that were left by visiting scholars, things like table-cloths or spoons. We even have that game out there which is from the Middle East which when people come here from the Middle East or Africa, they recognize it immediately. (Faculty, participant one)

The spatial problematics of the Centre in respect to the size of the rooms, the configuration of the modular spaces, and the lack of overall space are extensive. There are only two available spaces for seminars and meetings. The smaller space known as the seminar room holds six people comfortably. It is not big enough for an average seminar class of ten to fifteen people. With ten people it is very crowded, elbow-to-elbow. The larger space known as the reading and meeting room holds up to twelve people. It is an open space and adjacent to the reception area which is problematic, as it is a heavier traffic area with people coming and going and therefore susceptible to noise and interruption. Given the interest at the university in Women’s Studies courses, weekly seminars, and events, the spaces are severely inadequate. Nevertheless, Women’s Studies has attempted to transform the small cellular spaces into a home, a place where women students can go and feel comfortable and safe.

Well, the kitchen is at the end, which is good because it means people [are] usually chatting in there, and then that noise doesn’t disturb anybody. What is not good is having that meeting room with no closing door right beside the secretaries’ reception area. Because then when we do have a meeting and someone is speaking and people are coming and going, it can be disturbing. And also we have one office in the far corner at the other end of the meeting room which is cut off from the rest, which is something we do not really like. And at one time, the sessional lecturers were in that office and we moved them out of there because we thought it was creating a kind of hierarchy. So now at the moment that office is being used for visiting scholars who come and go, so it’s not such a big deal if they don’t use it, if they are not so much a part of what’s going on at this end. (Faculty, participant one)

I’ve held my class in there [seminar room]. Small groups can meet in there like student committee meetings, graduate advisory meetings - which is quite a nice room and it’s got a round table, and we have some very pretty
tablecloths for when you have a meal in there [...] when there’s a lunch or something [...]. It’s small enough. It wasn’t big enough for my class so that my class met in that room down there [meeting room] but that was nice because [...] we could stop in the middle and have coffee and go ahead and make it in the kitchen. But we sat in a circle so that people didn’t have anything to lean on to write, which might be seen as a disadvantage. We didn’t have a table or chairs but people didn’t seem to mind. They actually liked having it here. And we keep the TV in the kitchen so that often students or visiting scholars will come and watch videos in the kitchen, which basically makes you feel like you’re at home. On the other hand, when we need the overhead projector or power point in the large meeting room it gets awfully crowded [...]. So it’s almost as if we have the benefits within like a house but also the inconvenience that the rooms don’t feel like a very academic space. (Faculty, participant one)

There are other contributing factors as to why this pre-fabricated building is not an ideal space for Women’s Studies. One consideration is that faculty have to share offices and work out schedules to consult with students. There is a lack of space and facilities for students. With the development of the Women’s Studies Graduate Program spatial problematics have become more critical.

We don’t have much space for students really, except there are some computers for their use in that meeting room. (Faculty, participant one)

I think that it is also important to remember that I was in the first class of formally recognized graduate students in Women’s Studies because it was just started [...] in September of 2000 [...]. There isn’t great space for graduate students, here [...] if I needed to work on a computer that was problematic for me [...] They had one computer out there which was not a very good computer [...] in the front room there’s that little room with a computer or two in there for visiting scholars and I found that graduate students [...] often we weren’t given access to that [...] depending on the scholar and their respect for, concern for students [...] either would let us in or not depending on their individual personalities [...] with some scholars I could go there and use that space and with others I couldn’t even if they weren’t there. And I find that to be not very conducive to a feminist creation of space when we should be trying to help each other and also respectful of students’ needs, graduate students’ spatial issues. (Student, participant three)

I’ve definitely had conversations with students about challenges around getting together to discuss what’s going on in the class or what’s being taught [...] how we get together with students [...] bringing together graduate
students to discuss what’s going on [...]. And I think some of that is probably
due to the physical construction of the space [...] there’s not a student
common space [...] there’s no great student space here. (Student, participant
three)

A critique of the Centre is that there is no space for children, there is not a daycare nor
facilities for women students with children.

I tend to look at space both physically and [...] socially and mentally in terms
of comfort or acceptable for women with children and I don’t necessarily
think this space does that [...] although in a portable it might be quite difficult
to physically create it that way. (Student, participant three)

To encourage, to be supportive of women, women’s issues, and feminist issues, to provide a
safe academic place for women within the spaces of the university, to foster an awareness
and recognition of multiple genders, and to be inclusive of cultural differences are all strong
philosophies of the Centre for Research in Women’s Studies and Gender Relations. The
Centre is viewed as a safe place, a refuge by many women students.

We have a statement in all of our course packages about anti-racism and
homophobic attitudes not being acceptable [...]. I think this is a place where there
is a conscious effort to be aware of anything in our behaviour, or in our space, or
so, that might appear unwelcoming to people from minority groups [...] quite a
few of us have done the gay and positive space workshops - that have these signs
up saying lesbian and gay positive space. (Faculty, participant one)

I think it is pretty obvious that it [gender as a cultural construct] is a pretty
strong culture. I guess all the discussions I’ve had here have always been
prefaced with the idea of this is what I am saying about this particular thing,
and not trying to speak for people of other race or sexual orientation, and not
denying that those different positions exist as well. (Student, participant two)

I think just in the way the place is decorated, it’s very intercultural and shows
traces of people who have passed through [...]. The fact that it’s a bit like a
home or that it’s a non-intimidating space is an attempt to be welcoming to
maybe non-traditional learners or people who are not necessarily familiar with
the university environment [...] we had a First Nations visiting person here for
a whole year and that was different [...] that was an interesting affect on
space. (Faculty, participant one)
Grass-roots women's studies and activism are educational philosophies of Women's Studies, a philosophy of not only a women's space, but also a feminist space that encourages openness, a freedom to discuss issues, and open to political activism. It is a space for women and feminists to "safely" express and to discuss their views on political issues and anti-racist issues.

Yes, to be engaged and involved with community activism because it's the root of Women's Studies – it doesn't mean that we don't have a strong theoretical and intellectual component. (Faculty, participant one)

I feel that there are really strong, political, social ideologies here, which I found I was not always comfortable with [...]. It's not as if I disagree with that but I feel that if you're creating a women's centre isn't that about that women should be able to make their own choices [...]. Not that we're on different sides of the fence but that we're not all on the same side or all at the same place. (Student, participant two)

Yes, I definitely see this space as a safe space for expressing progressive ideologies, for expressing views different from the mainstream. After the terrorist attacks in the States, there were quite a lot of alternative viewpoints expressed here that challenged what mainstream media was presenting. So that was a safe place to do that in the classes in Women's Studies. (Student, participant three)

Social change does not come about without some level of advocacy and activism. Social and political activism as a philosophy of Women's Studies has on occasion thrown the Centre into the media spotlight.

It was a bit scary because after [a Professor's publicized speech on continuing Western imperialism] we were getting all these threats and then it died down [...] we had people sticking obnoxious notices all over the doors and there was a bomb scare at one point. [a Professor] was getting threats, all kinds of threats, horrible ones but that was an unusual period. (Faculty, participant one)

Despite the severe spatial problematics of the Centre for Women's Studies, philosophies of interdisciplinarity, intercultural, and inclusivity have contributed to a safe place on campus, a community where academic women have the openness and freedom to discuss a multitude of issues from a women's situatedness and a feminist perspective. It is a space where there is an
awareness and inclusivity of difference, where patriarchal institutionalized hierarchies are
decentred, hierarchical structures are avoided, and where barriers between personal, domestic, and
academic space are broken down.

I would say interdisciplinarity is a very big one [philosophy]. We use to have
a big board showing all the different interconnections between people here
and it really did spread like a big spider’s web all over the campus and the
community. I think interdisciplinarity, trying to avoid hierarchical structures,
while recognizing that there are power structures at play. Inclusivity, while
recognizing that there is no such thing as a safe place, really. But I think the
main thing is a level of awareness because we have pedagogy workshops and
things like that. I think there is more awareness around those kinds of issues
than in a lot of other units […]. I think that sitting down and having a cup of
tea together is a very woman thing to do in the kitchen. But often that’s when
intellectual conversations can take place; it’s breaking down that division too
between personal, domestic space and the academic space. And, again we try
to be non-hierarchical. It does not mean that we always succeed because in
fact the sessional lecturers are not here at the same time as the regular faculty
so there is not as much cross-pollination as you would think. And we don’t
want to ignore the secretarial reception. (Faculty, participant one)

7.4 Educational Practices
Philosophies of a women’s space, a feminist space, community, interdisciplinarity,
inclusivity, awareness and recognition of gender differences, recognition of cultural
differences are all integral to the teaching and learning processes of the Centre for Women’s
Studies. These philosophies are spatially grounded and inform the educational practices of
Women Studies. The principle philosophy that it is a women’s space, a woman-dominated
space informs the educational practices. Educational practices that support a welcoming,
homey space that is an open and accessible space, and that encourages interchange and
interaction.

I guess the purpose is to encourage women, I think women’s work, especially
in an academic environment. Where in courses that I have taken, quite often,
in talking to other students, you feel marginal within a department. I get the
sense that they’re trying to address that issue in some way here […]. I think
also creating not just space, but a space in some ways where women feel safe
and welcome like that area at the front where you can just curl up and read or
do whatever you want. It’s very homey […] often when I was taking classes,
or would just come by, women are sitting, enjoying the space, reading quietly. Safety is the feeling that I get. (Student, participant two)

The ways in which the cellular, modular spaces have been transformed whether that is physical, mental, or social contribute to educational practices of openness and accessibility.

I think just the idea of having the library area - I don’t know what else to call it - and again where anybody can walk in, and go over and start looking at the books. Somehow it’s available, you don’t have to go through the librarian or give your driver’s license at the door so you can just go in and look, and there is something about that openness [...]. Every time I’ve come in during the academic year they have always had grad students working [...] in the larger library space, they’re there, there’s a computer for them to use, there is a telephone, basics, like here we are come and use it, do not tiptoe around it [...]. And again when you go in the door when the receptionist isn’t there and any number of people stop to make sure if anybody is helping you, there’s always that feeling, the professors, clerical staff, students all kind of stop to make sure that someone’s not standing there feeling lost. It goes well with that communal idea, supportive idea. I think it’s also interesting where the grad students’ carrels are positioned, they are in that space, as well that they are for the grad students, very close to each other that would encourage interaction, as opposed to not having any space. I’ve talked about that with other people in my department that you feel very isolated because there is no communal space to just drop in and share ideas. So that’s a really good thing. I know that they would like more space but they’re there close to each other and also very much part of the Centre. Where other departments that you can go into you never see their grad students because they don’t have any space or they are somewhere else but they’re an important part of the work. (Student, participant two)

I would say the openness of the building like the glass doors and things like that which are a concrete manifestation of a desire to be open. But then occasionally if someone wants to work in a really quiet place which means they won’t come here [...]. If you’re going to be here you’ve got to expect to be interrupted because that’s part of being open to interchange, interaction with other people but sometimes it can mean you don’t have time to do things you should be doing. There’s kind of a time-space thing here when you’ll find at very busy times of the year there will be fewer people here because they’ve gone somewhere else [to work]. (Faculty, participant one)

The space is perceived as a woman-dominated space although there are men on site.
It was interesting because there was a man in the group who was doing graduate work here at the Centre. Initially, I found that very heartening, I guess, that he was interested in gender relations as a field and that he would be included within the Centre for that. Eventually, I got the sense that, and I cannot say whether for certain that this was because he was a man or male, or a particular ideology, or whether it was basically a personality conflict but I certainly got the sense by the end of the course that he was - the word is 'tolerated.' And that could have been a personality thing, not a gender issue, but I think it was there. (Student, participant two)

Cooperative, participatory, and sharing knowledge are all educational practices that are implemented by women’s studies and feminist studies and are viewed as practices that subvert patriarchal educational structures and practices.

I’ve found educationally it’s very, what’s the right word, cooperative, not your basic lecture, take notes, that participation was very much encouraged among the people in the class. And that was valued in terms of being a learning opportunity not just for students to learn how to express what they wanted to say but other students learned from each other. There were always interesting discussions around that which I really valued. (Student, participant two)

In keeping with a more participatory knowledge sharing approach to education, knowledge constructs and educational practices centre around lived experience inclusive of personal experience, praxis informs theory.

I felt this push and pull when I came here. And that the initial class was ‘well tell us about yourself,’ not just what department you are from but where do you come from, are you married, what do you like to do, as well as your field of research [...] and people would say that’s really interesting [...]. And there was a genuine interest, that I also had in other people’s work, that you would talk about on breaks as well as in the class [...] that kind of sharing and support that I really haven’t found anywhere else [...] you certainly weren’t pushed to divulge something you obviously didn’t want to talk about. But other people would in my estimation be very personal and I’d think okay I could never say that out loud. It was interesting, there was another woman a little older than myself in the class, and she was a brilliant woman. And she was the same sort of way, you got a little bit more about her as the course went on because she felt more comfortable, as I did, to share more personal experiences where I think most classes they don’t actually want to know - they just don’t really care. (Student, participant two)
Patriarchal dominant structures and hierarchies are also subverted in Women’s Studies through women and feminist centered spatial practices that inform their educational practices. Trying to decentre spatial hierarchies is an on-going process within the spaces of the Centre. When possible the spatial hierarchies of the university are subverted by changing the location of a course or seminar from the more institutionalized spaces of the Buchanan building to the spaces of the Women’s Studies Centre.

As I said you don’t find it [openness] everywhere and it makes the learning, the educational experience quite different. The course that I took initially had been booked into a classroom in Buchanan and the professor was, ‘I really hate it there.’ She felt like she was always thrown in to the traditional structure of teacher-class within those classrooms [...]. So we would meet in that library space [in Women’s Studies] and make a circle of chairs and meet there which in some ways was difficult to take notes sometimes, but it was really encouraging of equality and interaction instead of everybody facing one way and not each other [...]. It was a three hour class and we would have a break in the middle of class and each week it was somebody’s turn to bring the cookies, or whatever. Some people brought sushi, or some brought fruit or vegetables or whatever they felt like bringing. Again it made it more personal instead of everybody going off somewhere and coming back. It encouraged you to stick around and talk still about what was going on, or going back over something. (Student, participant two)

So, is it less hierarchical, I’m not sure. I mean, it’s still within the confines of an incredibly hierarchical male-dominated institution, not male-dominated by the men, male-dominated by its traditional male-system of organizational hierarchies. But there’s a lot of talk around trying to create educational practices in this place that are different that are not as hierarchical and I think some of the professors do that more so than others. Some professors [...] really base their educational models on what I would consider feminist practices, pedagogical practices by having you set your own goals for the classroom of what you want to learn and how you want to learn it with the understanding that what you’re learning is what has been agreed to in the classroom [...] my assignment and learning goal can be very different from another student’s assignment and learning goal. And other faculty set out exactly what the assignments are [...] not everyone’s paper is on the same subject but you’re going to have one paper due at the end and it’s worth this, and the presentation is worth this percentage, and your class participation is going to be worth this percentage with no negotiation at all, that to me doesn’t feel particularly feminist, at all. Where other professors open that up for negotiation the first day of class which feels much more like an adult-based educational system and much more feminist [...] we’re all grown people here
and you can set your own goals [...]. I think some faculty do their educational practices in what I would consider a more feminist manner than other faculty, I don’t necessarily think that means they’re not feminist, I don’t know that we all incorporate our feminist ideologies in all aspects of our life, and I don’t know if that’s easy to do. (Student, participant three)

Culturally dominant Eurocentric philosophies and ideologies are also decentred through spatial practices and educational practices.

I think that the space, maybe not physically, but mentally and socially encompasses culture beyond gender. I think that what I really appreciate about the Centre, and I’m using the word Centre really broadly here [...] is that it encompasses more than gender, it encompasses, I believe, anti-racist philosophies or ideologies, that are necessarily bound up with culture, it challenges cultural constructs, beyond just gender constructs. So it looks at how gender is socially created, how race is socially created, how gender is socially constructed, how race is socially constructed in ways that create male euro-centric powerful and dismissive - dismissive of women and non-western ideologies - so it challenges that, and that to me has been the most valuable thing about being in this space [...]. I think as a woman in our society it’s hard to not see the world through your female glasses, to see how the world is gendered and sexist. As a white woman, I don’t necessarily come into the world seeing it with anti-racist lenses [...] and so this space, I feel, has put on those lenses for me, too. So my glasses are thicker if you will or more complexly coloured [...] I believe that this space and what I have learned through my classes and through my readings both in my classes and outside my classes has created that for me and I am really grateful for that. (Student, participant three)

The philosophy of community as an interdisciplinary, intercultural, inclusive community extends beyond the physical, mental and social boundaries of the university through a number of educational practices which include inviting visiting scholars from other academic communities, pedagogy workshops, outreach programs, book launches, and events such as symposia and conferences that bridge between academia and women’s communities.

They [visiting scholars] come here, they study here, they also come here for social contact. We’ve tried at different times to have a coffee morning, or a lunch where [...] they get to meet each other when several arrive at once. There is a social interaction function [...] our events, our seminars are open to anybody and we do have on our mailing list community groups as well as academic groups. And we also invite community people to give seminars as
well as academics. And another thing is on the notice board, announcements that go out on our list-serve [...] about rallies or community activities as well as about academic activities. We feel that that is appropriate. (Faculty, participant one)

I know that there are interactions with other groups not on campus [...]. I don’t feel that it’s [the Centre] isolated from the community [...] other students that I’ve been talking to that are involved and their work is involved outside of here, whether it is a medical eating disability or sports oriented. I know that there’s [...] educating and involvement with that. (Student, participant two)

The fact that we have worked very closely with the Centre for Research in Violence Against Women and our students are placed there for internships. We have a practicum so a lot of our undergraduate students do a placement in a community organization. And then we have a community visitor program where every other year a person working with a NGO in the lower mainland comes here for a month and we pay their salary [...] it’s something we see as important to do. And some of our visiting scholars are not necessarily academics, they could be people with the women’s movement, and then we have them going to classes. We have a lot of visiting speakers [...] the kind of conferences that we’ve put on [...] international conferences. The first one was on women film-makers. We had women film-makers come and people involved in the industry, documentary-makers, and we had a film festival of women’s films along with the conference that was open to anyone. And then the second one was called Women’s Studies Asian Connections and we had a lot of people come from the local community. And we always try to use catering services from the Philippine Women’s Centre [...] We have a refugee group that makes the bags for our conferences [...] Women in Print - We’ll certainly have them always do a display when we have a conference. We try to support our local women’s businesses. And then the last [conference] was on Narratives of Illness and we had [...] disability performing arts people come. So, that we’re trying to bridge those in between, not just academic disciplines but between academia and the community. The arts community as well, we have people do readings here, too. We don’t have the funding for a writer-in-residence but it would be great if we ever did. But occasionally we’ll have a visiting scholar who is a writer or an artist. (Faculty, participant one)

Activism is an important educational practice of Women’s Studies, whether it takes on a sociological form of direct involvement in the community with women’s groups and women’s movements or whether activism takes on a more political form. Women’s Studies is
a women centred, feminist centred space that is actively used to engage in social issues, anti-racist issues, and political issues, which inform their educational practices.

We have been accused by some people as being activist rather than academic but we don't see those two things as being mutually exclusive. (Faculty, participant one)

If you walk around you see lots of anti-war posters or anti-racist, or information around anti-racism or around feminism, around violence against women, around various things such as that that I do think necessarily informs educational practices, by that I mean how education takes place, how education takes place in different places. (Student, participant three)

Again, like I said previously I did feel that there is a real sense of a social ideology [...] a global ideology is perhaps what I feel. I think that I said a political ideology before, that idea of how society should work. There was just a general agreement about where it didn't work for most women and how to address that. (Student, participant two)

I think, because there was this strong support system for women here, and the women felt they could be politically active because of that, or not that they could be politically active maybe, but that they were more comfortable being politically active because there was a support network. So that just might be a generational thing that I am sometimes amazed at the confidence that young women bring that I find a lot of women my age don't because they haven't been trained to do that or allowed to do that [...] but it's encouraging to see, well, maybe things will change. (Student, participant two)

The coming together of a philosophy of openness with a philosophy of activism has created tensions and challenges in coexistence.

The one time that has been challenged was when there was all that attention to [a Professor's] speech ... and we got all that press coverage. And there were strangers coming in wanting to look at our course outlines and wanting to look at everything. And we had to start challenging people, 'who are you and what do you want' which was very different than our usual attitude would be. Especially men. (Faculty, participant one)

I talked to the professor about it. I felt comfortable enough that I could say this is how I feel about a particular discussion. I guess that I had the advantage or disadvantage of being in the class after September 11th, during that and
afterwards, and the immediate aftermath of that was felt strongly in the Centre. People were very politically active about it. I don’t know if it’s always that kind of feeling. (Student, participant two)

I don’t think there’s fabulous meeting space here [...]. We do it, but I don’t find it overwhelmingly fabulous. But having said that I do find that it is a comfortable space and a safe space to engage in good conversation that’s challenging, politically challenging conversations, left-wing political discussions, progressive, anti-racist politics that I support. (Student, participant three)

I am grateful for what I learned in this space, space being perhaps broader than this building […] in the thought processes that go on in this building and the Women’s Studies classes […] this room […]. I don’t think it’s [the space] that great in terms of working for educational practices, for educational purposes, physically. (Student, participant three)

Overall there is a shared unity amongst the users of the spaces of the Centre on the importance of having a space for women on campus, a safe, supportive place for women. However, perceptions as to the ways, or the effectiveness of the ways, in which the spaces of the Centre are used can vary between faculty and students.

I know when we had someone come speak to us about whether we were willing to move to this other building eventually, there was a very strong reaction among people that we did not want to lose this sense of being a unit which is definitely associated and labeled Women’s Studies. We did not want just to be merged with something just called interdisciplinary studies. We wanted to keep that Women and Gender in there and we wanted people to know that that is our identity, and we want to feel in control of the space of who we allow in and don’t. I think it does make a difference for a lot of people who feel more comfortable here. The fact it is primarily a women’s space, and not just women but feminist women. It’s something people choose to do. There is some sense of a shared ideology just from choosing to be in Women’s Studies and it is something that people choose to do. It’s not like other departments and that they are there primarily because they can get a better job basically. For a lot of people that’s not really where they want to be, whereas here people really want to be here. Very often they see this place as a refuge, as an escape from somewhere else. (Faculty, participant one)

I suppose on one level naturally it would mean different things to different people. I think on another level there is sort of a unity in terms that the people I’ve spoken with, and in class, and other people I’ve spoken to that come to
the Centre, if they are women they tend to see it as a refuge, somehow, and not just a place of mutual support but something really important that should be on campus. (Student, participant two)

[In relation to the male student in the class] On one level, yes, it seemed that he had good relations with the other grad students and the staff and faculty knew him, but I think on another level, no, that he always felt outside just by virtue of his sex, that somehow he could never fully empathize so that it always made him ‘other’ which I found interesting, the man is the ‘other,’ all of a sudden. He was very up front about his past where he had been in the military, he had come out of sciences, sort of male-dominated spaces, he knew that he brought baggage with him […]. He was very sociable, socialized with women here, supportive of what people were doing. (Student, participant two)

You’ve got independent thinking, bright, women who use this space and periodically, men, bright men, and I think they don’t necessarily use it with the same ideologies, philosophies, feminist principles […]. I think some faculty engage in more political activism than others so they see the space as being more, they’re more open to or more wanting to put forth a political agenda within the space than other faculty. I think that could be true of anyone who occupies this space, some may see it as more visibly active as an activist space and others may see it more as an intellectually stimulating place, or both of those things could be happening by one person at the same time. (Student, participant three)

Inhabiting space within the larger site of the university is an on-going mediation of present and future spaces, with and between other academic communities, in and outside of the university. Two Women’s Studies units come together in the Centre, representing different faculties, different deans, but they share everything, the physical structure, spaces, and support staff.

We share this half and half with the Undergraduate Women’s Studies Program, which is a separate unit in the Faculty of Arts. And I think it’s a really rare example of two units, in which another circumstance might be one department, together functioning with different administrative structures and responsible to different deans but sharing the same space and the same support staff. And when we were both reviewed a couple of years ago - we were asked whether it was inconvenient or a little awkward [as a structure], but in fact it works so why change it. The Director of the Centre has a slightly bigger office than the Chair of the Undergraduate Program so I suppose that this person is sort of in charge but decisions are always made in a consultative and shared fashion. But the other faculty have to share offices which means that they
don't spend much time here except for [one professor] who is entirely in Women’s Studies because she’s half in the Centre and half in the Program. She’s the only other person who has entirely her own office, and the administrators. But the other faculty tend not to be here as much as they would if they had their own office. They’re all in another department as well where they have an office to themselves. If they really want to work they probably go to the other office, which they have entirely to themselves rather than the shared one. But they see students here so that has to be worked out. (Faculty, participant one)

Just from knowing in the sense that professors from other departments spend six months to a year here, internationally, or even on this campus that most don’t tend to work just here, there is always that negotiation of how much time they can afford […]. I think that there are so many levels, aren’t there. On one level both from a faculty and student standpoint that being able to come here, whether they’re visiting scholars or scholars from departments taking a year working here, or going back and forth [between departments] I think again it offers some kind of respite. I keep coming back to those words, don’t I. (Student, participant two)

There’s a lot of mediation around [the new space ] because we got a grant so I know there’s tons of mediation going around the university with that. (Student, participant three)

There has been an ongoing mediation between the Women’s Studies Centre and the university for additional space to meet their enrolment and program requirements.

In the original proposal for the Centre, we wanted it to be adjacent to or connected to the office for Women Students but there were problems with that […]. So that didn’t work out […]. And then recently when we wanted to do this expansion we wanted to have it right behind here in the basement of [old] Brock Hall because then we could have easily linked up our walkway which is already there to the doorway over there. And that space isn’t being used by anybody but they wouldn’t let us have it because it was their jurisdiction, Student Services, and we’re an academic unit. So you do run into these issues of who has control over the space and some people don’t want to give up anything, even though they’re not using it […]. Now, there are times when we realized we are running out of space and we talked to planning about extending this building or making it bigger, and they said that is not possible because it’s a temporary building and because of [a] fire right of way here. It’s complicated. So that’s why we had to look for another location when we put in an application for [what] we’re calling an ancillary centre – SAGA, Studies in Autobiography, Gender, and Age. (Faculty, participant one)
I certainly have got the sense that there was and still is a discussion around whether it [the Centre] should exist at all, and negotiating that in an academic space. It’s not really because it’s not a department or a faculty, it’s not really quite academic, a poor cousin, I guess. (Student, participant two)

I don’t know about this site, I know that the new site they’re talking about, that has been the case [mediation] […] we thought we were going to have a space in Brock Hall or the Main Library […] and somebody else from campus got it because of who they are, you know universities are pecking orders, and we’re not high in the pecking order. (Student, participant three)

The physical distance of the university site from the city centre has also created spatial problems for Women’s Studies more grass-roots, activist based program.

UBC and SFU did a proposal that really came from UBC to have a Centre for Research in Violence Against Women, it was one of the five national, regional centres. Although it was supposed to be a joint operation with SFU, it initially was based at UBC because we were the ones that got the funding. But this was too far from downtown for the community groups to come out here, to really be connected to the places where these issues were being dealt with or discussed, so in the end it moved to SFU Harbour Centre. So that was a problem of us actually being located rather far away from a lot of women’s groups. And now what we’re thinking of is possibly having some kind of activity happening at Robson Square Centre to bring in people who are downtown but that would be more high-end, more courses for professional women who want to find out about Women’s Studies. But we’re also somewhat linked to activities on the Downtown Eastside. We have students who volunteer or work [there]. Sometimes we feel a little bit cut-off being right out here on the campus but at the same time we are a university unit so it makes sense that we are here. (Faculty, participant one)

I have to say that I almost never use other spaces on this campus. I go to my classrooms in other buildings when I have to, I go to the SUB when I have to […]. I go to the library when I have to […] this campus is so cold, so boxy and square and uninspired and uncreative, it’s just horrible. And this beautiful environment, there’s no use of this beautiful environment. That’s not entirely true, if you’re over on the west side looking over the water, there’s some beautiful spaces but overall it’s pretty miserable. (Student, participant three)
7.5 Envisioned Changes

Participants were asked that if given the opportunity of sitting on a planning committee with a group of architects what changes would they envision. The changes varied considerably between faculty and students.

One of the things we would like to change if we could have more offices so cross-appointed people could have an entire office here. But UBC has gone the other way saying that people should not have more than one office. At the same time they are saying they want interdisciplinarity and people, cross-appointed. It’s a bit of a contradiction […]. The other things I would like to change would be we’re going to get rid of those carrels so that we have a bigger meeting room and reading room. The same room but there will be more space so people won’t be overflowing into the hallway with the chairs. We need more ventilation. Really we love this space we just wish it were a little bigger basically […] we’ve expanded. When we first occupied it, there was no graduate program. And there were way less faculty, only two people, now there’s about eight. It really has grown quite a lot. We would like to have the garden restored that was adjacent to us that would be nice […]. I wouldn’t want to have another level. I’d like it to stay on one level […]. I think the ideal space would be something like this trailer but in the form of a quadrangle where there would be an open area in the middle so that everyone could still see each other and come and go, almost like cloisters. But there would be an open area in the middle, and still have the glass doors but at the same time have some more spaces where people could talk intimately with a student. The space is so shared right now that it’s difficult to find privacy. And a shower […]. Some people would like to put a shower in one of these giant washrooms but I don’t think we have the money to do that […] we’ve been asked if we would consider being part of a new building that’s going to be a wrap-around building of the old main library called the Learning Centre. And that’s possible down the road but if we were to move we would really want to keep this street level accessibility. We really kind of like that, that people can just come in and out. (Faculty, participant one)

I would actually like it to be a permanent building or that it actually looked like a permanent building because somehow I think there’s that feeling that it could be moved at anytime, that maybe it should be. That you don’t really belong so, eventually we will just move you out of here. A solid building that gives a little weight to what’s enclosed in it and a permanency. (Student, participant two)

But one could envision if you were to construct the space out of whole cloth, a space that was more inviting for lots of different people, mothers with children, women’s groups […] we need our own constructed building by a
feminist architect [...] child-centred feminist architect, because I think child-centred spaces are more creative, and I think more conducive to creativity and thinking outside of the box [...] Why not have a whole room with arts supplies? If you’re a feminist space talking about different educational ways of learning why not have a whole art room? Doesn’t cost a fortune [...] it just clears your mind, to paint or draw or get rid of steam, I don’t know why not have a room where students can paint on the walls. Students can create, imagine what that would look like, if there was this awesome room where women could just create in the room. They could paint on the floor, on the ceiling, on the walls, wouldn’t that be awesome [...] Women are great creators, as are men, but this is a women’s space mostly. I just think it would be great to have a space where creativity was flowing. It necessarily would not involve political action, it would be creativity on so many different levels. I would love to see what they do. (Student, participant three)

7.6 Summary

The university as a male space, a site of education for men is part of a greater cultural ideology of male dominated cultural and social systems. Historically in Western culture, education has been spatialized according to gender. As Daphne Spain states women have been kept out of the spaces where knowledge is acquired which has contributed to the subordination of women in Western societies.¹⁹

The importance of space in gender relations and in the education of women was recognized by one of the earliest known feminist writers, Christine de Pisan. In Christine’s published work of the early fifteenth century, The City of Ladies, she uses building as a metaphor to create a City where women may be protected and educated, and where their intelligence, courage, strength, endurance, justice, and creativity may be recognized. Stone by stone Christine builds the foundations, walls, and turrets of her city for women. With each stone she provides a counter-argument to anti-feminist views of her culture. With each stone she recounts through history, past and present, traversing multiple cultures, the accomplishments of women. Christine’s project steps out of a patriarchal frame of reference to a feminine frame of reference in which she constructs a reality in which women emerge as powerful and authoritative in all areas of human endeavour. In Christine’s allegorical city she builds spaces and places designed for women to refute the negative social constructs of women and to instill self-worth in women.
Christine's work recognizes the spatial implications of site and building in the stratification of gender. She breaks down the barriers of the home as a site for women and creates instead a city as a site for women. A city with all its multiplicity of spaces evokes mobility and is a powerful image, a powerful vision for women given the context of the spatial containment and confinement of women in private and public spaces in the Middle Ages and early Renaissance. Christine is aware of the implications of gendered spatial segregation and the corresponding implications for the education of women in the late Middle Ages: "That if it were the custom to send little girls to school and to teach them all sorts of different subjects there, as one does with little boys, they would grasp and learn the difficulties of all the arts and sciences just as easily as the boys do." 

Historically, in Western culture the education of women has taken place outside of male spaces. From 1500 to 1800 the principle places of education for girls was within the confined spaces of home and convent with instruction predominantly that of domestic matters. Convent schools were the earliest form of education outside of the home but only the wealthy of society could afford to send their daughters there. By the late seventeenth century secular boarding schools began to appear but were aimed at the merchant middle class. The pedagogical focus was "to transform the daughters of the merchant class into young ladies suitable for marriage to gentry." For the poorer classes sites of education were workhouses and industrial schools with deplorable conditions, long hours of work, and only an hour of instruction a day. Industrial schools were spatially segregated as to boy’s schools and girl’s schools. According to Sonnet, from the Renaissance through the Enlightenment, more and more people, both men and women were introduced to reading and writing due to the development of a range of educational institutions. However, it must be noted that the demarcation between the range of knowledge available to men as compared to women was vast.

Women have been limited in their access to knowledge and have been systematically excluded not only from the spaces of education, the spaces of knowledge, but also from the sites where philosophies, ideologies, and values on education are constructed. Daphne Spain observes that the systemic nature of gender stratification can be seen in societies' institutions;
that each of the spatial institutions of dwelling, school, and workplace, has varying degrees of gender segregation across cultures. She claims that these “spatial institutions” form barriers to women’s acquisition of knowledge by assigning women and men to different gendered spaces. Spatial segregation is one of the mechanisms by which a group with greater power can maintain its advantage over a group with less power. By controlling access to knowledge and resources through the control of space, the dominant group’s ability to retain and reinforce its position is enhanced. Thus, spatial boundaries contribute to the unequal status of women.26

In her study, Spain examines the status of women in American colleges and maintains colleges were closed to women until the late nineteenth century on the basis that school attendance endangered women’s health and jeopardized their ability to bear children. Critical to Spain’s argument is that few women were physicians and none sat on college admission boards,27 and therefore were excluded from the spaces where decisions were made and hence the decision-making process. As such, they were excluded from the spaces from where they could challenge the very basis of the decisions. “The location of knowledge in a place inaccessible to women reinforced the existing gender stratification system that relegated women to the private sphere and men to the public sphere.”28 The disciplining mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion were used to reinforce the spatial segregation of women in higher education. As Foucault argues, “exclusion” was a regular modus operandi of disciplinary power from the eighteenth century on, within institutions such as schools.29 Recognizing the impact of such spatial hierarchies on women and education, a principle philosophy and educational practice of the Centre for Women’s Studies at UBC is “breaking down that division between personal, domestic space and the academic space […] to be non-hierarchical.”30

In Spain’s account of the spatial stratification of women in higher education in America, she remarks that when women were allowed to obtain a higher education, it was initially through segregated women’s colleges. The spatial configurations of women’s colleges differed considerably from men’s colleges. “Compared to the relative freedom of dispersed surroundings enjoyed by men, women were enclosed and secluded in a single structure that
made constant supervision possible." When women were allowed to enter coeducational colleges they were assigned to segregated classrooms with different curricula. The number of women attending American colleges was minimal until the mid-twentieth century when enrolment increased. Spain observes that as “women attended the same schools and learned the same curricula as men, their public status began to improve.” Nevertheless, at the beginning of the twenty first century, spatial barriers on a physical, mental, and social level still prevail as to “accessibility” or “appropriateness” of women in male-dominated disciplines. Critical to Spain’s argument is that for women to become more knowledgeable, “they must also change places.” Spatial segregation affects the distribution of knowledge that women could use to change their position in society. Access to education enables women to realize their potential.

Six hundred years after Christine de Pisan’s writings, spatial issues around building and site are still critical issues for women in relation to education. Spatial issues such as the lack of a permanent site, lack of space, lack of basic facilities within the male institutionalized spaces of the university still exist for women. These spatial issues are still prevalent. It is important to note that the revised university plan of 1914 placed the Women’s College and women’s buildings on the periphery as opposed to including them as part of the core buildings. Eighty years later, the university recommended that the site for the Centre of Women’s Studies be located on the periphery of the campus. The response from women faculty involved with the site negotiations for the Centre was to have a more central location, to be part of the hub of the university, not to be marginalized.

The Centre for Women’s Studies and Gender Relations provides a place, an intercultural, interdisciplinary, inclusive space for women faculty and students at the university. It has become a place of respite, a refuge for academic women on campus. The Centre is viewed as a retreat from male institutionalized spaces that are organized and distributed around male ideologies of disciplines and hierarchies. It is a site where male spatial and organizational structures are decentred. As one Women’s Studies student describes the university, “it’s still within the confines of an incredibly hierarchical male-dominated institution, not male-dominated by the men, male-dominated by its traditional male-system of organizational..."
hierarchies. The Centre for Women’s Studies tries to break down barriers between personal and academic spaces, which have separated women’s experiences from academic inquiry. The Centre is seen as a safe space to discuss and debate freely women’s issues and feminist issues without the immediate surveillance of the male academy. It is a space where woman’s issues are validated, a space where homophobic views, ant-racism, and sexism are not tolerated.

The Centre for Women’s Studies is a site that validates both academic inquiry and activism, something for which it has been critiqued. Just wanting equality for women is a form of activism, or a social and political ideology that is often met with considerable resistance within the confines of male institutions. The Centre strives for the equitable treatment of all women, and its programs and activities bridge between academic and non-academic communities bringing women together on a common ground and around common issues. As Sarah Gamble argues the inequitable treatment of women is still prevalent “within a society which is organized to prioritize male viewpoints and concerns.”

The spatial problematics of the Centre and its impermanency within the university, largely registered by its temporary housing, is a barrier to its potential and growth. This study shows that the spatial problems are more extreme for the graduate students than the faculty as students do not have the option of another office. The Centre provides a place for women faculty to share, interact, interchange and be supportive of one another’s academic interests focused around women’s issues and feminist issues. Students benefit from this interaction and interchange amongst faculty. Students also benefit from having a space where activities and programs focused on women’s studies and gender relations come to together under one roof. Undergraduate students, especially female undergraduate students find it a welcoming retreat. Nevertheless, outside of seminars the same opportunity of exchange and interchange does not exist for graduate students due to a lack of space.

The principle aim of the 1989 -1992 Campus Plan is to ensure that there is a cohesive growth to future building projects. The authors of this plan recommend that this should be implemented over the next ten to twenty years. Currently plans are under way, and
construction has begun on a new building program. The scope of that building program does not include a permanent building for the Centre for Women’s Studies and Gender Relations but further fragments this field of study by dividing its programs into multiple centres and placing those centres in different locations around the university. Fragmenting a field of study into multiple centres and programs, disparately located is not a long-term cohesive building program, nor is it a building program with any vision for current and future directions of postsecondary education. It is a “floating building program” whereby programs and centres drift from space to space, building to building, without consideration of the implications to the learning process, impact on graduate students, nor long term building costs. This “floating building program” is the antithesis of cohesive future growth.

Feminists are now beginning to think about space and place in relation to experiences of being a woman. De Beauvoir was intrinsically aware that the subordination of women was interrelated with space, and the necessity of trying to retreat from that subordination if only for a moment. “And to the degree in which she still feels insecure in the masculine universe, she tends to retain the need for a retreat, symbolic of that interior refuge she has been accustomed to seeking within herself.”

Current feminists’ debates around space and place focus on public and private spaces. “Many feminists recognize that systems of difference are constructed in place and different systems are constructed in different places” as in the spatial gendering of public and private places. Doreen Massey argues that spaces and places are not only gendered but also reflect the ways in which gender is constructed and understood. “The limitation of women’s mobility, in terms of both identity and space, has been in some cultural contexts a crucial means of subordination.” She claims that one of the most evident aspects of the interconnection of spatiality and identity in the West has been related to the culturally specific distinction between public and private spaces. In her work Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak examines the gendering of public and private spaces and argues that the public sector still remains more important and hence more masculine. She maintains that educational institutes are viewed as public spaces and therefore masculine spaces. Universities still remain male dominant spaces, where male hierarchical organizational and spatial structures, viewpoints, and
concerns are still prioritized. As Spain argues controlling access to knowledge and resources through the control of space, the dominant group’s ability to retain and reinforce its position is enhanced. For women to become more knowledgeable, “they must also change places.” Women are gaining access to the spaces where knowledge is obtained, and slowly gaining access to spaces where decision-making processes take place. As women gain physical access to these spaces there are still obstacles in place, male hierarchical structures of mental and social spaces within physical spaces still render women silent. For women to be equal participants in the human experience, “she” needs to change places, and to have the freedom to discuss, debate, challenge, and participate in knowledge and decision-making processes.
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Chapter Eight
The Spirit of Place

No aspect of a culture is more vital to its integrity than its means of education.
Eber Hampton, 1995, 7

We build on tradition, because that’s what our building is, physical presence, it has the tradition as our foundation, but we add in to that other forms of knowledge.
Jo-ann Archibald, 1998

If we consider Eber Hampton’s statement that no aspect of a culture is more vital to its integrity than its means of education than what do institutionalized spaces tell us of the integrity of Western culture?

Institutionalized spaces are still the dominant spatial construct for educational systems in Western culture today. Disciplining techniques of spatial distribution, hierarchical observation, surveillance, spatial distribution, normalizing judgment, and their combination are still perpetuated throughout Western educational systems. As Lefebvre and Foucault argue, with modern technology these disciplining techniques have been mechanized, and have multiplied and extended throughout Western societies, and throughout educational systems. Together, they have become an integrated system, which has grown into a multiple, automatic, anonymous power that is embedded in Western institutions, including educational institutions.

Lefebvre argues that in Western culture, dominating powers have hierarchized space, as a hierarchy of centres and peripheries. He maintains that the question of centrality “inhabits every aspect of the problematic of space [...]. Centrality whether mental or social, is defined by the gathering together and meeting of whatever coexists in a given space.” Lefebvre claims that in modern society centrality of the dominant space has become a tool of power. This dominant form of space endeavours to mould the spaces it dominates, as the peripheral spaces, and seeks to reduce the obstacles and resistance it encounters there. He views homogeneity as the goal of modern spaces.
From the inception of the site design for the University of British Columbia, a continuum of plans, both graphic and textual, have prescribed a spatial homogeneity for the campus. This prescription from the beginning reinforced Western cultural philosophies, ideologies, values, and institutional traditions of British scholastic life. As Said argues, philosophical and imaginative processes are at work in the production of space. The undulating topography of the original university site was sectioned into quadrangles to accommodate a Western institutionalized concept of block structures within a grid system. Compliance to this spatial organization of one unifying, harmonious scheme has been reinforced from the original design briefs to the currently operative 1992 Campus Plan. The 1913 prescription that the design of the university “must constitute in all its parts a single conception” is still the prevailing prescription today of “the whole is greater than the parts,” which continues to establish the spatial homogeneity of the university by adhering to a spatial norm.

The spatial norm that has been established since the beginning of the university, and which continues to prevail, informs the educational philosophies, systems, and practices of the university. The spatial norm of the university informs the production of education. An institutionalized spatial model produces an institutional educational product. This constituted spatial norm is representative of the philosophies, ideologies, traditions, and values of Western culture, more specifically, a Eurocentric, patriarchal culture. The implications of a dominant homogeneous spatial organization, as that of the university, are far reaching for cultures of difference.

As Freire argues, a relational element between oppressors and oppressed is that of prescription. Guidelines formed by the dominant university culture become prescriptions for establishing control, adherence to a dominant ideology and spatial norm. A spatial norm becomes an autonomous apparatus to control and contain behaviour, and as such controls and contains cultural differences, whether cultural differences are based on ethnicity, gender, or their combination. What happens in the dominant spaces of the university is the containment of culture. Bhabha claims: “difference of cultures cannot be something that can be accommodated within a universalist framework.” He further argues a “norm is constituted,
a norm given by the host society or dominant culture, which says that ‘these other cultures are fine, but we must be able to locate them within our own grid’ [...]'.

The disciplinary power of normalization, which is extended throughout educational institutions, according to Foucault, imposes homogeneity by pressure to conform, and by maintaining everyone in their place, "each individual is fixed in his place." Power lies in the centrality of homogeneity and its spatialization.

8.1 Alternative Sites: Commonalities

The three alternative sites that have been studied all seek to subvert the institutionalized spaces of the university; to subvert, rethink, and reconstruct the disciplining spatial constructs, to create new alternative spaces that allow for cultural inclusion, whether that is based on ethnicity, gender, or ethnicity and gender. These alternative sites of education seek to subvert the institutionalized spaces of the university through spatial processes such as transforming spaces, changing places, or healing the site, thereby, creating places that allow for cultural differences. The Centre for Studies in Curriculum Instruction, in its amorphous state, transforms on a daily basis the institutionalized spaces of the Education building to create a place that is culturally inclusive, for multiple and diverse cultures. The Centre for Research in Women's Studies and Gender Relations, situated in a prefabricated temporary building has changed places from the periphery to the centre, challenging the male institutionalized hierarchies of the university. The First Nations House of Learning through the process of healing a site has created a culturally appropriate place for Aboriginal students and scholars, and in a way, has reclaimed a part of its cultural territory.

Although each alternative site is representative of diverse sets of philosophies and educational practices, commonalities emerged such as cultural inclusion, embracing difference, alternative ways of knowing, alternative ways of constructing knowledge, repositioning "other," community, place-making, notion of homeplace, and creating a spirit of place.

The university is positioned as representing the dominant culture, with the three alternative sites representative of cultures of difference, and different ways of knowing and constructing
knowledge. Throughout this inquiry it became apparent that there was a recurring commonality within cultures of difference in having a voice, in being heard, not silenced; in being able to speak of one's own history, in having that history heard; inclusiveness of multiple stories, multiple histories; and spaces that allow for cultural inclusivity within the hegemonic spaces of the university.

A commonality of all three sites is an emphasis on cultural inclusion, embracing diversity and difference, embracing alternative ways of knowing, and alternative ways of constructing knowledge. Difference and diversity are not viewed as competing interests but as something to be embraced, respected and shared. This is a counter position to that laid out in the Campus Plan, whereby in the case of competing interests in the design of projects the overall campus structure must take precedence over individual projects. Projects that do not fit into the established norm are considered as "competing interests," which are undesirable, as "the unbalanced results do not further the UBC mission."\(^{13}\) In the case of the Campus Plan difference is contained by spatial homogeneity, by producing systematic spatial patterns of domination. In Geertz's concept of "culture patterns" philosophical and ideological culture patterns are programs, which provide a "template or blueprint" for the organization of social processes.\(^{14}\) In this case the campus plans are templates for dominant Western cultural patterns of spatial organization. As both Soja and Bhabha argue, hegemonic power universalizes and contains difference.\(^{15}\)

The Centre for Studies in Curriculum Instruction counters this ideology of fitting in to the norm by creating a counter philosophy of "do not try to fit in" but instead share your unique, individual gift, of your cultural location.\(^{16}\) The Centre emphasizes more of a "cultural approach, [which is] more like a verb than a noun, a participatory approach [...] what I would call an indigenous approach."\(^{17}\) The philosophies of the CSCI are spatialized and in turn inform the educational practices of the Centre that allow for cultural inclusion.

The Centre for Women's Studies counters the spatial homogeneity of the university by cultural inclusivity and by privileging women's approaches to space. "I think that what I really appreciate about the Centre, and I'm using the word Centre really broadly here [...] is
that it encompasses more than gender, it encompasses, I believe, anti-racist philosophies or ideologies, that are necessarily bound up with culture, it challenges cultural constructs, beyond just gender constructs.18

The buildings of the First Nations House of Learning, which are representative of First Nations cultural philosophies and building culture, also counter the spatial homogeneity of the university. The First Nations buildings are culturally appropriate, and are representative of First Nations cultures as living, vibrant, growing, and changing cultures. The House of Learning is a “living, breathing entity that grows and flows from inside out.” (fig.21.)

Building a strong, supportive, inclusive community is a principle philosophy of the alternative sites. Community is based on notions of cultural inclusivity, interdisciplinarity, support, sharing knowledge, and cooperation instead of competitiveness. The principle philosophy of the CSCI is to create and support an intercultural and interdisciplinary community where students are encouraged to work from their gifts. There is the value of people belonging. “The Centre achieves community by looking at differences, by celebrating differences.”19 There is consideration of the total human being. It is a “community where people are interested about what is going on in your life [...] the Centre simply brings people of different backgrounds, different interests together into a community.”20 The notion of the extended family, the idea of helping people to learn, to be supportive, and the idea of being together in one house, inclusive of the presence of children and Elders, all of these contribute to building a sense of community for the First Nations House of Learning. Values of cooperation, working together, respect for each other, respect for First Nations’ culture, and respect for diversity contribute to a sense of community. In both the FNHL and the CSCI, community is spatialized through the process of “gathering” students to the community.

The philosophies of community and sharing underline all the philosophies of Women’s Studies. “We have tried to be a very open, accessible space, welcoming to everybody.”21 “There is a very strong sense of inclusion and community within this space.”22 The Centre for Women’s Studies is seen by both graduate and undergraduate students as a communal space to just drop in and share ideas. This is important to the vitality of Women’s Studies,
having a communal space where ideas can be shared and discussed that privilege women’s ways of knowing and constructing knowledge, which are otherwise dismissed within the male hierarchical spaces of the university.\textsuperscript{23}

All three sites have a strong sense of involvement with communities outside of academic spaces, both in bringing communities into the academy, and by going out and being involved in community work. The CSCI is active in bringing high school and youth groups to the Centre, to share their space with them. One of Women’s Studies’ mandates is to join academia and activism, by bringing women’s groups into the academic community and by outreach programs and involvement with women’s communities. With students of the FNHL there is a strong sense of going back to their community, not as experts but to serve their community. Within the institutionalized spaces of the university, these sites represent counter spaces creating alternatives communities to the hierarchical structured community of the university.

The philosophy of community as presented in the 1992 Campus Plan is based on a “community of facilities inhabited by a community of people.”\textsuperscript{24} It prescribes spatial homogeneity and strategies for compliance. In this position the “spatial community” of buildings is privileged over the “community of people.” The institutional spatial ordering of the buildings takes precedence, and in turn people are placed into that spatial ordering. This becomes problematic in that it privileges homogeneity over difference. All three alternative sites counter this position by privileging difference over homogeneity.

The notion of community as a family emerged from the alternative sites. Within the three sites a commonality emerged around the ideology of family, as helping people to learn, to be supportive, and the idea of being together in a home. In contrast, the 1992 Campus Plan presents an ideology of the campus as a family: “a family of buildings and landscapes”\textsuperscript{25} instead of a family of people. It maintains that each building has individual needs and a separate identity, however, as in a family, each can and should make a contribution and work together so that the whole is greater than the parts. The authors of the campus plan claim “the alternative is that each is designed to meet only the needs of its own special constituency
without reference to the others or, worse, works at cross purposes to the needs of others and to the common good."

The university has presented a model of family that is structured around a hierarchy of people and places. This model of a family prescribed by the Campus Plan, recommends containment of difference and compliance for the common good, so that the whole maybe greater than its parts. Such a hegemonic model is incommensurable with the First Nations House of Learning notion of extended family that embraces diversity and difference. It is incommensurable with the spatial and educational practices of the Coast Salish culture, which is representative of an egalitarian society as opposed to a hierarchical society. Women’s Studies and Feminist Studies also challenge patriarchal hierarchies. As an on-going process, the Centre for Women’s Studies tries to decentre patriarchal dominant organizational structures and spatial hierarchies.

The 1992 Campus Plan states that the alternative to spatial compliance is that each meets only the needs of its own special constituency without reference to the others, which works at cross-purposes to the common good. The common good prescribed is that of the dominant culture. With respect to the First Nations House of Learning, the prescribed common good of the Campus Plan is incommensurable with First Nations culturally informed spatial constructs. In building an alternative to this prescription, the FNHL not only meets the needs of its special constituency but also has achieved the greater good by respecting and healing the site. For all of its architectural individuality in relation to the university prescription, it is one of the most sought after places on campus both by the academic community and non-academic communities. The CSCI is another example where the institutionalized spaces of the university do not serve the common good of cultures of difference; in effect these spaces representative of authority and domination work at cross-purposes to cultural inclusivity. The Centre continually transforms the institutionalized spaces to be inclusive of cultural differences to allow for heterogeneity.

Lefebvre’s concept of space is that space is physical, mental, and social. He argues that space is hierarchized in Western culture as to centres and peripheries, and as such “centrality
inhabits every aspect of the problematic of space."[27] The university wanted to place each alternative site on the periphery of the campus. This physical peripheral placement also has implications for the mental and social spaces of the alternative sites, whereby the physical placement determines accessibility, or lack of accessibility, to mainstream intellectual and social spaces. Said argues that the centre–periphery duality constructs an authoritative position of the dominant culture over marginalized peoples.

Within the discipline-based hierarchy of the university, the alternative sites are viewed as marginalized sites. This marginalized position is contested, as cultures of difference actively seek to reposition the margin from periphery to centre. Marginality is also viewed as a space of strategic positioning "that disorders, disrupts, and transgresses the centre-periphery relationship."[28] According to Soja, the new cultural politics of difference of Cornel West and bell hooks disrupts homogeneity for diversity, multiplicity, and heterogeneity. Both bell hooks and Cornel West choose to envelop and develop marginality, a space from which to build communities of resistance and renewal that cross boundaries and binaries of race, gender, class, and all oppressively "othering" categories.[29] In her work bell hooks positions marginality as more than a site of deprivation.

It [marginality] is also the site of radical possibility, a space of resistance. It was this marginality that I was naming as a central location for the production of a counter-hegemonic discourse that is not just found in words but in habits of being and the way one lives.[30]

Repositioning the centre, as a philosophical process, emerged as a commonality amongst the three sites. As Lefebvre claims, centrality is defined by the gathering together and meeting of whatever coexists in a given space.[31] By repositioning the centre, and situating it within the alternative spaces, allows for discourses to emerge that are otherwise rendered silent within the spaces of the university. In repositioning their cultural, intellectual territory within the university, the FNHL has become a central location for discussions, symposia, conferences, and events, which focus on issues of culture. The centrality of the location of the Centre for Women's Studies, albeit a temporary building, renders it visible. The CSCI repositions the
centre through an on-going process of transforming spaces, bringing cultures that are otherwise marginalized within the university into mainstream educational practices.

In the process of repositioning the centre, the notion of "other" is also repositioned. In cultural studies and postcolonial discourse an emphasis on the exclusivity of cultural differences within Western society is in part a response to the oppositional binary construct of the "other.” In this argument “other” refers to the excluded or dominated subject. A further argument of postcolonial discourse is that the construct of “other” has been a normalizing mechanism for Western society. The constructed “other” also serves as a contrasting image, idea, personality, and experience to the hegemonic norm.

One of the major arguments in Feminist cultural discourse is the traditional positioning of woman as the “other.”32 “Woman” has not only been constructed in Western historicism as an oppositional “other” but has been historically and systematically subordinated and marginalized. Simone de Beauvoir’s argument: “One is not born a woman, one becomes one”33 continues to resonate amongst woman in the male-dominated spaces of the university. From a feminist perspective the university is experienced as “an incredibly hierarchical male-dominated institution, not male-dominated by the men, male-dominated by its traditional male-system of organizational hierarchies.”34 In the feminist and woman dominant space of the Centre for Women’s Studies, Western patriarchal philosophical processes and hierarchies that are dismissive of women and non-western ideologies are subverted. In the process of shifting the centre of the university to the centre of the spaces of Women’s Studies, the man becomes the “other.” “He always felt outside just by virtue of his sex, that somehow he could never fully empathize so that it always made him ‘other’ which I found interesting, the man is the ‘other,’ all of a sudden.”35

Heidegger’s concept of space as location, site, and place, have contributed to current discourse on place. Notions of space and place, which differ from that of the university, emerged as the strongest commonality amongst the alternative sites. Culturally based philosophies that inform the production of space differ radically from the dominant philosophies and ideologies of the university. The CSCI is experienced by students as “a
space for wanting to, a willingness to try to understand, another person’s perspective on knowledge, particularly related to place.”36 The WMST Centre is viewed by many women students as a safe place, a refuge, a communal space for women. For the FNHL having “a place for students to be able to call their home, seemed to be important, a desirable thing to have.”37

Important to Heidegger’s conceptualization of space and place is the notion of gathering; place gathers things in their belonging together. In the CSCI space and place are very important, to create “a gathering place for people to talk across disciplines.”38 This is achieved by transforming spaces: “the way that some events here transform spaces is very important and very philosophically demonstrative.”39 Space is viewed as physical, mental, and social: “what we’ve tried hard to do is see the interdependence of them and not separate them out.”40 Another level of space created in the CSCI, is a spiritual space: “a lot of our students have said I can bring my spiritual lens with me. It doesn’t have to be separated out”41 in academic space. The transformed spaces of the centre inform and coexist with educational practices as “the ‘physicalizing’ of knowledge, whether it’s through performance or pedagogy.”42 The spatial “physicalization” of knowledge is viewed in many cultures as “part of the engagement with learning […] you’re talking about spatial, social, mental with learning through your ‘physicalization,’ intense ‘physicalization’ of the body, cultural, religious […] you have to experience it, it’s not like a thought process. It’s a physical space.”43

The environment created in the Centre for Women’s Studies is a welcoming, intercultural and inclusive place. “I think this is a place where there is a conscious effort to be aware of anything in our behaviour, or in our space, or so, that might appear unwelcoming to people from minority groups.”44 It creates a space that breaks down male hierarchical barriers of the university. It also breaks down barriers between personal, domestic, and academic space. Women tend to see the Centre “as a refuge, somehow, and not just a place of mutual support but something really important that should be on campus.”45 “I am grateful for what I learned in this space, space being perhaps broader than this building.”46
One of the principle objectives of the FNHL is "to have a place of our own" within the university spaces. Place is a dominant concept in First Nations cultures, "place being the relationship of things to each other." A conceptual drawing by the planning committee for the spaces of the FNHL indicates the importance of place to First Nations cultures, as a welcoming place, a spiritual place, a gathering place. (fig.21.) The philosophy of gathering is an important aspect of First Nations cultures and as such the FNHL has created many places for gathering. "When we talk about cultural practices, sharing, working together, the space is used for that. Sty-Wet-Tan Hall […] it's a gathering place."

8.2 Homeplace
In the process of placemaking the notion of "homeplace" emerged for the alternative sites. Homeplace is used to describe the sense of place experienced by those who inhabit the alternative spaces. The word home is culturally invested with meaning, and the meaning changes given the cultural location of the user(s) of the space. To build a new home for the First Nations House of Learning on the university campus was a dream for First Nations peoples, "a home away from home for students." It is part of the cultural practice of the FNHL "to make the place feel comfortable or feel like home, resonate with culture." For the CSCI, which has a large number of international students, creating a homeplace became part of the philosophy. "Home is very important for them, to have a place where they feel comfortable, since they're away from home." The Women's Studies Centre has transformed the cellular spaces of the prefabricated building to create "a welcoming, homey space, that is an open and accessible space." The kitchen becomes part of the academic space. "I think that sitting down and having a cup of tea together is a very woman thing to do in the kitchen. But often that's when intellectual conversations can take place; it's breaking down that division too between personal, domestic space and the academic space."

Homeplace then becomes a site of education. It represents a cultural construct of space, a site of learning and teaching; a location for a "community of resistance." For bell hooks the knowledge and ideologies of her culture were disseminated to her by, through, and in coexistence with constructs of space, that she calls homeplace, a site for education.
In our young minds houses belonged to women, were their special domain, not as property, but as places where all that truly mattered in life took place [...]. There we learned dignity, integrity of being; there we learned to have faith. The folks who made this life possible, who were our primary guides and teachers, were black women [...]. Historically, African-American people believed that the construction of a homeplace, however fragile and tenuous [...] had a radical political dimension [...]. This task of making homeplace was not simply a matter of black women providing service; it was about the construction of a safe place where black people could affirm one another and by so doing heal many of the wounds inflicted by racist domination [...] it was there on the inside, in that ‘homeplace,’ [...] that we had the opportunity to grow and develop [...]. This task of making homeplace, of making home a community of resistance, has been shared by black women globally [...].

This is the story of a house. It has been lived in by many people. Our grandmother, Baba, made this house a living space [...]. She was certain we were shaped by space [...]. Her house is a place where I am learning to look at things, where I am learning how to belong in space [...]. Do you believe that space can give life, or take it away, that space has power? These are the questions she asks [...].

When we speak about homeplace, we are also speaking about the spatial constructs of home, the private and public realms. The spaces of a home are arranged around private and public use, with some spaces being more public or more private than others. The threshold becomes the point of transition between the public and private realms. In the function of the House of Learning, as a home away from home for students, it became necessary to create a threshold, a physical and visual screen to separate the public spaces of the home from the private spaces.

Thresholds between public and private spaces in the university often become blurred and as such become sites of tension. Threshold also implies a boundary. As Heidegger suggests, the boundary also becomes a place from which “something begins its presencing.” In the public and private spaces of the university, it becomes necessary to recognize where the presencing begins. In relation to the First Nations House of Learning public and private spaces became blurred, and there was a need to redefine a visual and physical separation by establishing a threshold. For Women’s Studies, during a time of political tension, when the well-being of students and faculty was threatened, it was necessary to create a threshold between the public
and the Centre. A threshold as a transitional space can serve to indicate where something begins its presencing, as opposed to something fixed and bounded. The issue of boundaries presents a challenge for the university, as faculties and departments clearly present fixed and bounded terrains.

8.3 Spirit of Place

A governing factor of the 1992 Campus Plan is keeping the genius-loci, “the spirit of the place,” which is based on the strategy that “the design of projects is expected to reinforce the genius loci of the site by responding to the essential landscape typologies: Forest, Ordered Malls, Western Slopes, Academic Garden, and Town Centre.” The Campus Plan is formulated as a set of definitive strategies for the realization of the physical aspirations of the University Mission Statement. Its objective is that the buildings and landscapes should “contribute to the composite environment to make the whole campus an efficient place to learn, work and live – a place which uplifts the spirit and is a joy to inhabit.” If the Mission Statement and corresponding Campus Plan are premised on cultural exclusivity based on a hegemonic prescription for “a place which uplifts the spirit and is a joy to inhabit,” then other forms of placemaking and spirit of place are not allowed to emerge.

The genius-loci, the spirit of the place, of the University of British Columbia “is inherent in the patterns of buildings and landscapes.” This notion of genius-loci is based on a prescription, a compliance that does not make a space, a place for cultural inclusion, cultures of difference; everyone is to conform to or comply with the overriding university prescription. This rigid, disciplining position does not take into consideration other forms of placemaking and spirituality. The question is then whose spirit of the place does the university represent?

Raymond Williams’ study of the English and German use of the word “culture,” presents a meaning of culture as “the spirit which informed a whole way of life.” Hence the word “spirit” is invested with cultural meaning. The spirit of a culture is also spatialized in building culture, creating an interconnection between the spirit of a culture and place. It was important for the architects of the First Nations House of Learning to consider ways to create
a spirit for the planning of the building. Heidegger suggests that a building on its own portrays nothing but when cultural meaning is gathered into that building and its surrounding environment, the building then represents the life of that culture. The notion of the spirit of place for the university, as described in the 1992 Campus Plan, is viewed as a way of life that is a well-ordered, disciplined structure within an organizational grid, whereby priority is given to projects which reinforce this structure, and in this way “the genius loci of the site is clarified.” Alternative educational sites within the university grid, which have resisted this institutionalized organizational structure, have constructed different meanings of the spirit of place, by gathering and bringing different cultural meanings into their educational spaces.

A conceptual drawing for the First Nations House of Learning, which outlines the design objectives, defines the building as a spiritual place. (fig.21.) In keeping with the First Nations concept of spirituality, one of the objectives for the architects was “to create a spirit for the planning of the building.” The same drawing also highlights concepts of community and spirituality, and integration with the landscape. The First Nation’s view that “the architecture of the campus expresses a formality and a hierarchy” is also noted on the drawing. The spirituality, or the spirit of place, of the FNHL is not the same spirituality that informs the prescriptive spirit of place for the university. What then is the spirit of the place for the Centre for Women’s Studies and Gender Relations? What is the spirit of the place for the Centre for Curriculum Instruction? What form would the spirit of place take, the form of homeplace, a welcoming place, a safe place, a culturally inclusive place. The spirit of place has yet to be determined but when barriers are broken down there are a multiplicity of possibilities.

In the context of Venturi’s discussion on the complexities and contradictions of content and meaning in architecture he states: “Simultaneous perception of a multiplicity of levels involves struggles and hesitations for the observer, and makes his perception more vivid.” Venturi describes this as a “dimension of space, time and architecture” where space changes meaning as the observer moves through the space and changes direction. To further complicate Venturi’s spatial meanings, I introduce the notion of “cultures of difference” whereby space not only changes meaning as the observer moves through the space but that
there is another level of complexity in that space changes meaning given the cultural location of the observer moving through that space. Thereby, the meanings of the institutionalized spaces of the university, how these spaces are perceived, are not the same for cultures of difference based on ethnicity, gender, or their combination. The institutionalized spaces of the university are experienced differently by different cultures.

In Bhabha's discourse on cultural difference, he claims that differences exist not only in the representations of a culture but also in the very processes of that culture that is different cultures process things differently. Not only are the ideologies, philosophies, and value systems of cultures different but cultural practices are also different. This is also applicable to building culture. By looking more closely at the production of cultural differences and culture practices in relation to architecture and education we can render the invisible visible. And in doing so, we can subvert the dominant centre and reposition the "other" as knowledgeable, authoritative, and as active participants in the cultural archive of humanity.
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Title of Study: A Sense of Place: A Study of the Coexistence of Cultural Constructs of Space and Educational Systems

This research study is part of a requirement for a Doctorate in Philosophy, Interdisciplinary Studies Graduate Program, University of British Columbia.

Purpose of Project:

My dissertation is a historical study of the multiple and diverse ways in which different cultures construct and organize spaces, in particular educational spaces. Educational spaces are spaces used for the purpose of teaching and learning. The purpose of this research project is to gather information on the histories of spaces of culturally diverse educational sites. The premise of this research is that philosophies, traditions, ideologies and values are constructed culturally, and inform and coexist with educational systems that are also constructed culturally.

The purpose of this research is to study the differences in the multiplicity and diversity of the cultural organization of space, and the ways in which they coexist with educational practices. The intent of this study is to encourage an awareness and understanding of cultural differences, and that education and space are culturally constructed.

Research Procedures:

Ms. Archibald will be gathering information on the histories of educational spaces through the reading of maps, archival research, architectural drawings, and observations of the site. An important part of this research is the gathering of information through oral histories of the respective educational spaces. It is critical to the integrity of this study that it be culturally relevant and respectful to all communities participating.

If you agree to participate in this study, Ms. Archibald will be gathering information on oral histories of the educational spaces through meetings. There will be two to three meetings. The overall time required will be between two and a half hours and three and a half hours.
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Consent:

I understand that my participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that I may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without jeopardy to myself or my community.
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Title of Study: A Sense of Place: A Study of the Coexistence of Cultural Constructs of Space and Educational Systems

This research study is part of a requirement for a Doctorate in Philosophy, Interdisciplinary Studies Graduate Program, University of British Columbia.

Purpose of Project:

My dissertation is a historical study of the multiple and diverse ways in which different cultures construct and organize spaces, in particular educational spaces. Educational spaces are spaces used for the purpose of teaching and learning. The purpose of this research project is to gather information on the histories of spaces of culturally diverse educational sites. The premise of this research is that philosophies, traditions, ideologies and values are constructed culturally, and inform and coexist with educational systems that are also constructed culturally.

The purpose of this research is to study the differences in the multiplicity and diversity of the cultural organization of space and the ways in which they coexist with educational practices. The intent of this study is to encourage an awareness and understanding of cultural differences, and that education and space are culturally constructed.

The intent of this study is to encourage an awareness and understanding within the Euro-North American culture of the multiplicity and diversity of 'differences' in spatial constructs, and the ways in which these differences inform educational practices. This study is a contribution to my own culture in developing an awareness and respect for cultural differences. And, it is a contribution, a small step on the bridge to develop discourses based on respect between Aboriginal ways of knowing and Euro-North American ways of knowing.

Research Procedures:

Ms. Archibald will be gathering information on the histories of educational spaces through the reading of maps, archival research, architectural drawings, and observations of the site. An important part of this research is the gathering of information through oral histories of the respective educational spaces. It is critical to the integrity of this study that it be culturally relevant and respectful to all communities who are participating, and that the gathering of information will be inclusive of Aboriginal evidence of Aboriginal histories of spaces.
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If you agree to participate in this study, Ms. Archibald will be gathering information on oral histories of the educational spaces through meetings. There will be two to three meetings. The overall time required will be between two and a half hours and three and a half hours.

At the first meeting, of an hour and a half duration, questions will be asked concerning the histories of the respective site. The meeting will be recorded and then transcribed. A transcript of the meeting will be sent to you. A second meeting, of an hour duration, will take place to review the transcripts, and to ensure that the transcripts accurately and respectfully reflect the histories of spaces as relayed by you. Corrections will be made to the transcripts if necessary. A third meeting if necessary, of an hour duration, will be held to review the corrections. A final transcript will be provided to the respective participant. The meetings will take place at the respective educational sites.

You will be asked for your permission to record the meeting on tape. You will also be asked for your permission for Ms. Archibald to take notes during the meeting.

The First Nations House of Learning will have the option of viewing the final draft of the thesis.

Confidentiality:

You will be asked whether or not you would like your comments to be kept strictly confidential or whether you may be quoted directly in Ms. Archibald's dissertation.
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APPENDIX C

Questions for Interviews

Histories of Spaces of the Respective Pedagogical Sites
1. Can you tell me about the history of this site: (a) building; (b) location.
2. What philosophies, traditions, ideologies, values contributed to the spatial constructs of the site?
3. Who contributed to how the site would be spatially constructed?
4. What building materials were used in the construction of the site?
5. Was the site mediated with other groups/communities? In what ways?
6. Was the site mediated with the university? In what ways?

Educational Practices
7. Who uses the site?
8. Do cultural philosophies, traditions, ideologies, and values inform the educational practices within the site?
9. In what ways do they inform the educational practices?

Coexistence of spatial constructs and educational practices
10. Are there connections between spatial practices and cultural practices within the site?
11. In what ways do the spatial constructs coexist with the educational practices?
12. Is there a unity of conceptualization of space amongst the users of the space?
13. How does the space coexist with university spaces?
14. Is there anything about the spatial constructs that you would change now?
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