Intimate Architectures: A Cultural Geography of Doors

Edward Brookes

Department of Geography, Royal Holloway, University of London, Surrey, TW20 0EX,

Email: mbvb211@live.rhul.ac.uk   Phone: 07581391653   Twitter: @EdBrookesRHUL

Intimate Architectures: A Cultural Geography of Doors

This article seeks to contribute to geography's continued interest in architecture through a focus on the 'intimate architectural space' of the door. Its aims are threefold; the first section seeks to extend knowledge of the door within geographic literature as it becomes a key site in which 'events are gathered' and through which politics can be encountered; the second section takes a 'minor theory approach', using a range of non-western, feminist, and class-based perspectives, exploring the social and political affordances of the door through the themes of 'body' and 'performativity'. Whilst the conclusion uses these discussions to demonstrate how intimate architectures might further develop our knowledge of built spaces, providing an additional framework to engage with the often-overlooked aspects of architecture. In doing so, the door is presented as a site that structures how we move and relate to our bodies in physical space; most notably that the door's capacity as a barrier maintains a distinct exclusionary politics which reinforces class and racial divisions through the built environment.

Keywords: Cultural geography, doors, intimate architecture, body, performativity

Introduction

Architectural geographers have long since engaged with the totality of the building, from Jacobs' (2006) 'Geography of Big Things', Adey's (2008) works on affect and airport architectures to Moran et al (2016) on the banal 'building events' of incarceration. However, this paper takes a different approach, instead considering the role of 'intimate architectures' or individual architectural features and forms in our understandings of built space. Specifically, it focuses on the 'door' in an effort to build upon a growing narrative within architectural and geographic disciplines that moves away from a focus on the 'building' as a bounded site of study (Hurdley, 2010; Jacobs et al., 2008; Short, 2015). Instead it explores how the 'door' as an intimate architectural feature can provide a lens to consider many of the social, material, subjective and political registers of the built environment. Its focus will be built around a 'minor theory

approach'; (Katz, 2017; Stoner, 2012) whereby the central discussion will be framed around examples that foreground the perspectives of minor subjects/subjectivities as it explores the overlooked and marginalised accounts of architectural space. By doing so this paper aims to present an alternative engagement with built forms that complements existing geographical and architectural literature by further examining the exclusionary and intimate nuances of architectural space.

Over the last ten years, more-than-representational architectural geographies have presented the 'building' as a space that is not given but produced, as various materials are held together in specific assemblages by work of various kinds (Edensor, 2011; Jacobs et al., 2008; Jacobs & Merriman, 2011; Llewellyn, 2003). This has led to a range of studies looking at the diverse sorts of work that make buildings cohere: the political institutions they are embedded in (see Rendell, 2006), the material affordances of their non-human components (see Jacobs, 2006), the discourses surrounding particular kinds of buildings (see Lees, 2001), and the spatial experience of buildings by their human inhabitants, users and visitors (see Kraftl & Adey, 2008; Lees & Baxter, 2011; Paterson, 2011). Many of these approaches consider not just what people think about buildings but what they do in them: how everyday practices such as sitting, walking, playing and interacting with others give life to a building, and, how they exceed concepts such as 'symbolic meaning' or 'value' (Kraftl, 2010). However, many of these approaches still retain a focus on the scale of the 'building', overlooking aspects of the many individual features and forms that cohere to make up a 'building event' (Jacobs, 2006). More recent performative turns within architectural geography have tried to address this, as they attempt to destabilise the coherent fixed status of the building, instead presenting architecture as a series of interactions and performances. For instance, Rose et al's (2010) study of a shopping centre in Milton Keynes explores

how the built environment is performed by various alignments of the human and the non-human. They investigate the importance of a certain 'feeling' experienced by visitors to the centre, and how this served to define the built space for shoppers. These ideas are also perpetuated in Dekeyser's (2016) exploration of the artist Gordon Matta-Clark's work 'conical intersect', as performance art is used to uncover the complex political, material and lived aspects of built space. The cone shaped cutting made by Matta-Clark into the side of Parisian house acts to subvert its coherent status as a building. This paper looks to build on this context, as it extends current geographical and architectural theory by examining in greater detail the social and political intricacies of the door as an 'intimate architectural space'.

For some academics this is familiar territory, as Hurdley (2006, 2010) has discussed both the mantelpiece within the home and corridor spaces within a university setting; Rosselin (1999) engages with the domestic space of the apartment hallway and how it structures acts of surveillance; Jacobs et al. (2008) uses the 'window' as a way of exploring the history and social interactions of residents on a Glasgow housing estate; whilst Shortt (2015) presents how stairwells become a refuge from the emotional labour, scripts and rules prescribed by the organization. This exemplifies how material cultures of home and geographies of architecture could unite to better understand our relationship to architectural features and forms. In this respect I consider 'intimate architectural space', a term loosely borrowed from Romano (1999) which I use to discuss the role of interior built features that are not closed off material forms but are distinct architectural spaces. Whilst in isolation they do not constitute 'a building' but through networks of interaction and interconnection become embedded within the larger 'building event' through repeated concentrations of action, interaction, utterances, representation, and materiality. With this as my framework I aim to present the value of

attending to intimate architectures (Romano, 1999) as a complimentary way of undertaking architectural geography. In the case of this paper the focus will be on the 'door' and how it creates an opportunity for geographies of architecture to develop a more nuanced understanding of architectural space.

In order to interrogate the door as an 'intimate architectural space' this paper will situate its discussion of examples around recent (re)turns within architecture and geography that engage with 'minor' literature (Katz, 1996, 2017; Stoner, 2012). Both disciplines have looked to reframe their attention to (re)consider the 'minor' in an effort to question how new knowledges/architectures are produced (Bremner, 2013; Data, 2008; Katz, 2017; Loo, 2017; Stoner, 2012). Specifically, I wish to draw upon Stoner's (2012) notion of a 'minor architecture' and Katz's (2017) reassertion of 'minor theory'. Whilst both positions occupy similar perspectives, they each take fundamentally different strides; Stoner (2012) develops their ideas in relation to the spatial practices within architecture and architectural theory as 'minor architectures' represent operations that make cracks and fissures in seemingly impenetrable structures of power; whereas Katz (1996, 2017) uses their work to call for the critique of geographic knowledge production and its reliance on 'major literatures', stressing the need for developing theory differently using 'minor' theoretical approaches that take into account the emergent practices interstitial with 'major' productions of knowledge. Both positions employ Deleuze and Guattari's (1986) lexicon of 'minor literatures' and use it to destabilise prevailing western narratives. Each presents a situated politics of refusal, where ruptures or 'lines of escape' (Deleuze et al., 1983, p.27) carve out new possibilities and alternative modes of existing and thinking. However, it is not the intention of this paper to unpack the numerous complex debates that currently surround 'minor theory/architectures' (Katz, 2017), instead it takes a 'minor theory approach'

whereby it explores a range of non-western, feminist, non-human, historical and class-based examples of the door from outside the traditional academic canon in order to foreground perspectives from minor subjects/subjectivities. By utilising this framework it attempts to illustrate how the door as an intimate architectural space presents a site of 'rupture' whereby a 'minor theory approach' can facilitate an engagement with the numerous political entanglements that 'unsettle the material social practices of power and cut through the classed, racialised and gendered sedimentations of violence' (Katz, 2017, p.597). In doing so this paper responds to calls by geographers (Katz, 1999, 2017, Leeuw & Hunt, 2018) who seek to decolonise and challenge the production of geographic knowledge within the discipline by pushing for a greater awareness of marginalised and non-western perspectives. This approach will be structured through two central themes; 'performativity' and 'body'; both exploring how our bodies come to structure and connect with architectural space. This compliments existing literature that already looks to destabilise coherent notions of the building and develops it further by incorporating 'minor' or marginalised perspectives of architectural space. The contributions of this article will therefore be threefold; as the first section will look to extend existing geographies of architecture scholarship through a focus on the space of the door, as it becomes a key site in which 'events are gathered' and through which politics can be encountered, negotiated and ritually performed (Rugoff, 2008; Shortt, 2015; Teyssot, 2009). The second section will focus on how a 'minor theory approach' provides a lens through which to engage with the door, as it delves deeper into considering the multiple experiences of space that can tease out many of the marginalised and political engagements we have with architectural space. Whilst the conclusion will summarise how 'intimate architectures' provide an additional framework through which geographies of architecture can continue to build upon in

order to explore the social and political dynamics of individual features and forms within the built environment. I now turn to consider the door in greater detail looking to provide additional context around how it has been theorised by other disciplines.

Defining the Door

The 'door' as a concept has largely eluded the attention of geography. This is despite calls by architectural geographers for greater attention to the 'localised' details of architecture, such as window seats, doors, corridors or lighting sources (Kraftl, 2010; Kraftl & Adey, 2008). A focus on such intimate architectural spaces would arguably attend to how places are lived, politicised and performed on an everyday scale (Kraftl & Adey, 2008). That is not to say that the 'door' hasn't been discussed by other disciplines, as Latour (1992) writes about the socio-technological history of locking mechanisms, whilst Hetherington (2004) uses it as a metaphor in theorising the role of waste networks in the home. Yet in both examples the 'door' as a space and as a specific site of meaning is not clearly defined or discussed. The preoccupation with 'doors' in wider academia has largely been by 20th century architectural theorists (Stalder, 2009); Simmel's (1994) seminal essay, 'Bridges and Doors', Walter Benjamin's aphoristic notes on metaphorical and physical thresholds in his Parisian Passagen-Werk of the late 1930s (Benjamin, 2002) and Victor Turner's (1969) writings on social threshold situations and rites. Yet despite such interest, there is a lack of literature which provides a synthesis of the multiple engagements and meanings of the 'doors' in our everyday lives. Such an engagement would arguably provide architectural geography a means to uncover the unique lived and performed politics of boundary and interior spaces. By building upon both home and architectural geographies it would address the lack of attention on localised material structures of the home (Blunt, 2005)

and further engage with how intimate architectural spaces are lived, politicised and felt.

In terms of understanding what we conceive a door to be, online dictionary definitions point to the 'door' as material entity; 'a piece of wood, glass etc. that is opened and closed so that people can get in and out of a room, building or car' (Merriam Webster, 2020). Yet the 'door' by itself is arguably not enough, for a 'door' to function as the dictionary would have it there needs to be a space for it to go. To develop this further Latour (1992) wittily conceives the 'door' as a hybrid of wall and hole, serving to regulate access to a series of walls. This introduces the idea of the doorway or threshold, or the material frame in which the 'door' becomes a means to open or close (Pizzi, 2003). The 'door' is intimately related to the threshold; allowing access too and across the threshold, whilst the threshold gives meaning to the 'door's' function. Therefore, each concept arguably serves to define the function of the other, whilst still remaining unique entities. Yet such definitions reduce the 'door' to an object, comprised only of material elements.

To address this simplistic definition involves clarification of the term 'threshold'. Theorised by Wilbur (2013) it can be seen as a transitional state between contingent spaces across time in accordance with the movements of the body. Whilst the 'threshold' is manifest in different forms and scales, such as a sign of entry on a building or a horizontal feature such as a grave, the most common is arguably the 'door'. The 'door' facilitates a vertical and physical transition across such a threshold (Wilbur, 2013). In this sense it is a particular manifestation of the threshold concept and becomes more than a physical 'switch' over material threshold. It could be seen as a space in its own right, an assemblage of material parts; it becomes a space of transition and a 'place' of decision (Vogler & Jorgensen, 2005). This spatial definition of the 'door' presents itself as a linkage between the space of human beings and everything

that remains outside it, transcending the separation between the inner and the outer (Simmel, 1994). Understanding the 'door' as a space presents a prevailing sense of ambiguity, as it simultaneously becomes a border and a crossing point (Stalder, 2009). It is this state of ambiguity or being in-between two binaries (inside/outside) that the 'door' embodies the concept of liminality (Shields, 1991), which in Latin '*limen*' translates as on a threshold or boundary (Shortt, 2015; Turner, 1982). Thus the 'door' as liminal space encourages a variety of ritual performances which serve to constitute how we know and define such spaces, for example the taking on and off of shoes in a stranger's house or removing a hat. Thus, social relations and our own ritual actions also constitute how we come to define and know 'door' spaces.

'Doors' also present a symbolic and representational power, as 'doors' are frequently used in art and sculpture to depict concepts of defence, sexuality and death (Moore 1981). Such understandings also enrich our definition of the 'door' as like its material characteristics its metaphorical ones also serve to reconfigure literal space. Evident in the use of 'door' shaped gravestones or 'stelae' by Greek cultures in the 6th century B.C. due to its connotations of death (Roosevelt, 2006). What becomes clear is that the 'door' is not a simple concept to define. It is from such varied and multiple interpretations that the rest of this article will attempt to develop the notion of the 'door' as an interesting and dynamic concept worthy of attention by cultural and architectural geographers. The subsequent sections will turn to address the themes of 'performativity' and 'body', positioning the door as a lens through which to encounter both 'minor' and marginal perspectives of architectural space and how these in turn shape social and political relations.

Performativity

Performance, movement and architecture have become central concepts to one another in recent years as each comes to emphasise the role of movement in understanding architectural spaces (McCormack, 2005; Smitherham, 2011;). Through attending to contemporary understandings of the performative, we can look at how it is used to re-describe how we experience space, as being of equal importance to the end product of architecture. This is exemplified in the writings of Leach (2006) and Borden (2001); Leach, for example, explores how our daily performance allows us to adapt to space, rendering the unfamiliar familiar. For Borden, our performance in everyday architectural space, such as the act of walking up a flight of stairs, brings the stair into being. In the same way I look to how the 'door' as a liminal space can be seen to encourage a variety of performances that constitute how we know and define such spaces. This section therefore uses the concept of 'performativity' as a means to examine how intimate architectures are socially produced and reproduced (Gregson & Rose, 2000). My focus here is on asserting the unique politics of the 'door', using various historical, international and cultural ritual performances in a variety of contexts to examine how intimate architectures are invested with social and political meaning.

For instance, the door has long been a site of ritualistic significance in Armenian culture between the 6th century B.C. and 20th century A.D. (Essabal, 1961). In particular it was seen as an important strategic point in the fight with demons and spirits as it offered them a potential entry point into the house (Essabal, 1961). Thus, ritualistic practice was used in order to deny them access to the home and promote good luck. One such example, in the case of sickness, was the sacrifice of a rooster or lamb, which was killed before the 'door', usually a church door (Essabal, 1961). Conversely it was also the site to let good spirits in, as newlyweds were showered with rice and raisins before

stepping over the doorway with their right foot first, so as to promote good luck for the couple (Essabal, 1961). The door therefore represents an entrance way in which good or bad luck/spirits could flow. Ideas also reflected in 5th and 6th century carvings on Greek and Roman stelae, in which the door was associated with death and represented a point of transition for spirits to enter to 'the other side' (Roosevelt, 2006). This engagement and meaning associated with the 'door' in turn feeds back into its deployment within Armenian architecture, as Essabal (1961) states that typically the Armenian home would have just one door and one chimney so that both climate and spirits could be efficiently regulated. Whilst the decorative schemes of early Greek and Roman doors (6th- 5th century B.C.) used a lion or gorgon's head to hold door rings. Whilst functional, such features were also symbolic protectors of the threshold, protecting the house from spirits and arguably imbuing the 'door' with a certain degree of power or status (Walsh, 1983).

A more modern and similar study by Li and Smith (2011) looking at the Dong nationality in China also introduces ceremony into the way performance and 'doors' are interrelated. As a ceremony named, 'opening the door of wealth' must be performed before the householders move into a new house, celebrating the symbolic importance of the threshold. Like the other examples the 'door' is seen to communicate between the inside and outside, providing the passageway through which good and evil energy goes in and out (Li & Smith, 2011). The Dong building like the previous example is 'made secure' through both its physical construction and the ritual ceremonies that have empowered it. This highlights a process in which the 'space of the 'door' is 'sacralised' to deter the 'other' (in this case as spirits or unwanted animals or children) and foster a sense of security. Such performances and forms of sacralisation are not unique to such

historical representations. When considering Turners (1977, p. 61-62) definition of ritual as;

> 'Formulaic patterns of symbolic action for ordering or controlling relatively disorderly situations…because they directly model, in their own structures, the hierarchical mechanisms of control that forms an intrinsic part of the structure of the situations in question.'

It is easy to see how this also reflects western engagements with 'door' spaces, as the partial dressing and undressing before entering or leaving the front door can be seen as a ritual activity which regulates the public from the private (Lawrence, 1984). The carrying of a bride over the threshold can arguably be seen to mirror the Armenian equivalent above, whilst taking one's shoes on and off before entering the home maintains the hierarchy of inside and outside, as dirty shoes are prevented further access to the house (Lawrence, 1984). A paper by Wood & Beck (1990) highlights many of the conventions and rules that shape many of our engagements with the 'door'. Taking a case study of one family in particular they chart the rules that arise as they engage with it; as the door is not a site of play, it is not to be slammed or opened to strangers, but it is to be opened to friends and family, only the 'initiated' may enter. Such power of the space of the 'door' is commented on by Walter Benjamin (2002, p. 141) as he talks of the 'despotic alarm of the doorbell that reigns over the apartment, gaining its power from the magic of the threshold.'

Teyssot (2008) highlights that for Benjamin, the possibility emerges of a collective interior, an interiority made up of external things, as the world of outside forever pervades the interior as it is regulated by the space of the 'door'. Thus, the spirits, dirt and demons that the 'door' regulates come to represent this metaphysical

externality in which the 'door' becomes a means to control. This performance is highlighted aptly by Wood and Beck (1990, p.13) as they conceive of the 'door dance';

> 'It's a dance, a door-and- window dance (with fans: It's a fan dance); it's a glass, wooden, aluminium, and fiberglass round dance, a dance around the seasons, a dance around the days, a dance done to the song sung by the voice of comfort.'

This dance emerges as a result of the ritual opening and closing of the door in tune with the seasons in an effort to regulate the occupants and climate of the home. Thus the 'doors' liminal character as a space on the boundary between inside and outside contributes to the performative rituals that gather there. The marking out of spaces creates a politics of whom and what is or isn't allowed in, whether that is spiritual, material or social, again reinforced by ritualistic display.

The idea of the door as a site of regulation is also reflected on by Hetherington (2004) as he links the door to the act of disposal, as it becomes a crucial site in structuring performative acts of waste management. The door providing a threshold in which rubbish or surplus is made invisible through spatial displacement. It offers a means to order the materials in our lives as it becomes part of the representational ordering work that is undertaken to dispose of matter out of place (Hetherington, 2004). Waste is taken out through the 'door' whilst commodities and useful objects are allowed in. The same can be applied to the dead; the act of passage through the 'door' becomes a process of ordering. Most obvious in sacrifice, linking above with Armenian rituals highlighted by Essabal (1961), as sacrifice to the threshold becomes a means of getting rid of unwanted things and to stabilise social categories in making something absent (Hetherington, 2004). Yet this process is continual, it never ends, (Hubert & Mauss, 1964) as it does not stabilise categories forever. It is when such boundary processes stop that unsettled spirits emerge (Hetherington, 2004), that 'nightmare' can exist,

(Bachelard, 1994) as doubt emerges as to the certainty of inside and the distinctness of outside. Thus, performative acts of disposal and sacrifice temporarily affirm the binary distinctions that we impose upon the door and distinctiveness of 'inside' and 'outside'

These processes of regulation and spatial ordering are also manifest in the way the door is involved in the ritual politics of private property. As Durkheim (1957) suggests there is a close rapport between taboo and property, as by claiming the right of property is to mark it as one's own and create a threshold. It is through such activity that the origins of taboo arise, its etymology being 'Ta-Pu' to 'mark with intensity' (Naginski, 2010). The 'door' arguably embodies this principle of exclusivity as it becomes the space where exclusivity is enacted and performed. The 'door' becomes the space where those who are strangers are denied access whilst those who are friends may find sanctuary. It is such everyday acts that define the limits and notions of private property and thus the sacred nature of space and the 'door'. Scaling up these ideas to consider the role of the state, nearly all states protect by law the threshold between public and private. To be able to control a door, to control access to space, is one of the everyday supports of self-esteem, freedom and self-confidence (Vogler & Jorgensen. 2005). However, the act of being able to exercise control over a 'door' is inherently unequal, as class-based divisions increasingly come to structure the built environment. In recent years this has been typified by numerous accounts of controversial 'poor doors' in major cities across the US and UK (Licea, 2016; Osborne, 2014; Wall & Osborne, 2018), whereby developers of mixed-income residential developments opt to physically separate the wealthier residents from those on lower incomes by building separate doors and entrances to their buildings (Licea, 2016; Mcfarlane, 2019; Osborne, 2014; Wall & Osborne, 2018). Typically, this has taken the form of residents having to access their own homes from the back or from side entrances, whilst also being

excluded from other services that may be present within the building (Mcfarlane, 2019). The 'poor door' regulates urban spaces according to the logic of the wealthy, which in turn is reinforced by the protection of private property and the 'threshold' by the state. It presents a site at which the local community is excluded, positioning the door as an intrinsic part of capitalism's control over access to space. The door as an architectural form provides a mechanism through which class-based categories are both maintained and reinforced, as it becomes the physical site at which class structures are designated and ritually performed.

What emerges from the various ritual and social interactions we have with the 'door' are the ways in which intimate architectural spaces serve to regulate and structure social and political relations. It presents the power of the 'door' to facilitate public interactions with the built environment, whether that be to set aside 'waste'; cast out evil spirits; or signify and segregate the poor. The door comes to signify a locus of struggle, as it represents a site of religious, capitalistic and social control over space. This reinforces the door as a site of valuable interest to geographers, as it becomes a space of (im)mobility and exclusion, its power to exclude underpinned through ritual acts of performance.

Body

Like performativity the body has also been a major concept in understanding our experiences of built space within architectural geography (Kraftl & Adey, 2008). Our bodies are not only moving within architecture but generating spaces produced by and through their movements. Exemplified by writers such as McCormack (2004) and Imrie (2003) who present how our actions become an intrusion of events into architectural space, as architectural forms imply a space for the body to move whilst our body shapes

what form architectural space can take (McCormack, 2004). At the same time different bodies are afforded different statuses based on how architecture and the built environment is structured, and whose 'body' is deemed 'appropriate' (Adey, 2008). Building upon these ideas, this section uses the rhetoric of the 'door' to engage with ideas of the 'body' and how it shapes our understanding and engagement with interior spaces of the home, politics, the female body and the non-human.

Historically the symbolic significance of the 'door' has played a part in shaping artistic expression and cultural practice. The house has long been a universal metaphor for the person and the body, as Vickery (2008) highlights in her essay on boundaries in 18th century London, the doorway, windows, chimney and hearth all become bodily orifices. Conversely the body itself has also been equated to spaces of the threshold as Luce Irigaray's (1993 p.98) reflections that man 'does not even remember the fact that his body is the threshold, the portal, for the construction of his universe or universes'. Whilst the carved doors of the Igbo in south-eastern Nigeria offer another example of how doors represent a physical extension of the human body or family. Made of oak panels each Igbo door is unique, hand carved with numerous patterns depicting diamonds, squares and rectangles. Such designs upon the 'door' are a means to publicly proclaim the status of those within, or notable elders of titled rank (Neaher, 1981). They also come to suggest the ideal physical and spiritual state of the family inside as the carved doors are seen as the 'skin' of the household as the carvings provide a means to make the family visible to the community (Neaher, 1981). Linking the materiality of the 'door' with that of the body as it becomes an 'organ' in the smooth running of family life, making the politics of the body explicit on the 'doors' surface. This reinforces how each doorway is a unique assemblage of material and human characteristics which serve to concretise particular bodily histories, material cultures and memories.

Typically, it is the female body that the 'door' and its subsequent imagery has come to symbolise, as Freud (1959) has suggested the penetration into narrow spaces and the opening of closed doors are among some of the more common sexual symbols. Moore (1981) reflects on this point, highlighting Salvador Dali as mirroring such ideas with works such as 'The Font', 'Memory of the Child Woman', and the 'Surrealist Poster'. Each uses keys or doors as a means to represent a part of the subconscious mind or body (Moore, 1981). In particular 'The Anthropomorphic Cabinet' by Dali (1936) shows this more explicitly as the female body is reduced to a set of drawers, the loin having a keyhole. Other artwork such as the 'The Morning Toilet' by Jan Steen (1663) also serves to objectify the female body, using the 'door' as a frame for voyeurism. It depicts an open 'door' in which you can see a woman getting dressed, becoming a site of male control and female objectification (Siegert, 2015). Both images also make explicit that whoever controls the 'door' or 'keyhole' has control over the female body. A point also raised by Vickery (2008) as she highlights how the lock and key were tools of domestic control, as despotic husbands liked to play jailer, locking women in or out in campaigns of abuse. Thus the 'door' and its connection to the domestic sphere make it a space of male control, domesticity and sexuality.

The interrelationship between 'door' and body also extends beyond symbolic and artistic representation. Vickery (2008) highlights how ink thrown on windows and excrement daubed on the 'door' were seen as visceral attacks on the person during the 18th century. Therefore, the physical act of marking or inscribing the 'door' can be seen to constitute an attack on the individual body. Such ideas mirror a number of historical precedents; through Nazi inscription of Jewish doors with swastikas and propaganda; the marking of the doors of plague victims with a red cross in the 17th century (MOL, 2011); to biblical accounts of the Israelites putting lambs blood on their doors during

the first Passover in Egypt to protect them from God's judgement. Each example serves to demarcate the 'other', as the 'door' and the boundary it marks becomes physically inscribed. This inscription reinforcing the exclusive boundary the 'door' provides by making its politics explicit. A more recent example is depicted in The Telegraph (Brewer, 2016), as asylum seekers in Middlesbrough became the victim of similar segregation. A G4S associated housing firm became the target of sharp critique for painting the doors of asylum seeker properties red (they justified this as a means of rapidly locating the properties). Yet like the other examples the extension of the 'door' beyond its material, architectural space to the site of the body, marked the asylum seekers as 'the other' opening them up to stigma from racist communities. This also reflects the earlier example of 'poor doors', whereby 'poor bodies' are marked out as 'other' by only being able to access their homes through specific entrances that segregated them from richer residents (Wall & Osborne, 2014). This highlights how the door becomes a site of both class and racial segregation, as cost cutting exercises in the name of capital accumulation serve to demarcate the 'other' and stigmatise those within. This further reinforces the 'door' as a metaphor and physical extension of the human body. Each example emphasises how the boundary the 'door' implies or physically creates becomes a site of power struggle, where those who are marked as the 'other' become objectified, contained and repressed.

Considering our bodily engagement with the site of the 'door' is also an important understanding in defining the role of 'doors' in our lives. In one sense opening a 'door' presents us with a moment of unknown physical expenditure, as getting inside means grabbing, leaning, and pulling. The door handle is the site of our physical meeting with architecture, the moment when we guess the weight of the door and adjust our touch accordingly (Pizzi, 2003). This links with much of the literature on

performance, as the 'door' comes to imply a sense of movement as someone crosses its frame (McCormack, 2004). The 'door' becomes a space of (im)mobility as our body attempts to navigate the space of the 'door' and the other bodies around it. Yet this bodily interaction with doors has not remained the same, in recent years this has changed along with how we view our 'bodies'. The revolving door is a case in point, pioneered by Van Kannel in 1888, it offered a means to regulate both airflow and traffic in high rise buildings (Siegert, 2015). In turn the revolving door serves to control and regulate which 'bodies' could come inside or outside. Threshold architecture became embedded in notions of the 'dwelling' as a 'machine for living' (Teyssot, 2008), a politics of the 19th and 20th century which sought to regulate architecture as a means of structuring the user's activities. Its prolific use in metropolitan hotels and high-rise buildings created a bio-political device for managing humans in motion (Siegert, 2015). Its politics becomes more explicit when you consider the number of accidents recorded each year as a result of the revolving door, as Stalder (2009) notes that the victims were frequently elderly, or very young, therefore signaling those not meeting the requirements of the 'idealized male body'. This suggests that perceptions of what was perceived as 'able-bodied' changed with the 'modernisation' of threshold architecture. It also facilitated a change in perception of hygiene as it was heralded as a significant contribution in preventing the spread of disease and dirt, arguably producing notions of a more sterile human body that should be shielded from a world of germs (Kaghan, 1939). Sliding doors also embody this 'modernization' as Siegert, (2015) hails them as the signature of an era in which architecture is subject to the dictates of transit rather than the rules of dwelling. Opening and closing these new forms of architecture arguably serves to fragment the uniform body into individualized organs, each specific to a particular task, as a leg activates a light sensor whilst an iris is scanned in the name

of biometric control (Stalder, 2009). This individuation of experiences makes passage

through doors a fragmentary experience. The body becomes part of a cybernetic logic as

Lacan (1988) summarizes this relation as one of access and closure; as once the door is

open, it closes. When it is closed, it opens. This produces an experience where inside

and outside are blurred, emphasizing the liminal character of such threshold spaces as

defined borders are reduced to 'weak' potential margins.

Yet to discuss the 'door' as merely an object, metaphor or space that we inscribe

or inhabit with our bodies is to deny its power to act upon us as humans. Arguably the

'door's' own materiality and physical characteristics serve to produce its own agency

that in turn conditions our bodily engagement with it. Consider work by Latour (1992)

as he discusses the hinge. For him the hinge is a crucial invention as it provides a means

of opening and closing a door with ease, so you don't have to knock a hole through a

wall each time you want to exit and enter a room. He reflects upon how we have passed

down the work involved in providing an opening into a space, as without hinges the

effort required to move from room to room would be far greater. He takes this further

by highlighting that we have delegated human characteristics of forgetfulness onto the

non-human, as the mechanical door closer becomes a means of closing the door

automatically for those absent minded enough to leave a door open. This dissolves

boundaries between human and non-humans as humans are reduced to agents of

opening (Siegert, 2015). Linking with the notions around revolving and sliding doors it

is easy to see how technology and components of the door reflect what Latour (1992)

describes as an 'anthropomorphic' apparatus, as the revolving door or the mechanical

door closer, facilitate the replacement of human action as well as in turn shaping human

action in a prescriptive manner by restructuring how the human body physically

engages with the object (Stalder, 2009). This in turn transfers the responsibility for the

opening and the closing of 'doors' from human to machine. This gives the door its own agency, as the door and its associated technologies become equal actors with the human body. These ideas present how the door and the body are deeply interrelated. It creates an opportunity for us to think about how our bodies move in the world and the divisions we erect between human and non-human. It shows how through daily use the door comes to structure a distinct body politics which is inherently exclusive, where the door becomes a site of segregation and an extension of bodily difference, as it is the healthy male body that regulates who can access the door.

Concluding Remarks

What this article has tried to accomplish in positioning geographies of architecture to consider spaces such as the 'door' is threefold. Firstly, it has looked to add depth to existing notions of the door within geographic literature. Whilst this paper has focused on doors more generally, and perhaps with a greater focus upon the domestic setting, it has opened up a wider discussion around the role of the door in our everyday understanding of the built environment. The 'door' is presented as an ambiguous space, as it simultaneously becomes a border and a crossing point (Stalder, 2009). It is this state of being in-between two binaries (inside/outside) that the 'door' embodies the concept of liminality and the threshold (Shields, 1991). Thus the 'door' as liminal space encourages a variety of performances which serves to constitute how we know and define architecture. What emerges is how the 'door' is able to draw together numerous, seemingly disparate examples and use them to unpick the social and political structures of the everyday. It illustrates how the 'door' can be used to inform how we move and relate to our bodies in physical space, in turn reinforcing a distinct exclusionary politics which is strengthened through repeated acts of ritual performance and display. I have attempted to illustrate these ideas through my second line of argument, which was to

extend the understanding of the door by using examples from minor theory/architectures (Katz, 2017; Stoner, 2012). In particular it has explored a wide variety of perspectives that aim to broaden the discipline through various non-western, feminist and class-based standpoints. In doing so it positions the 'door' as a site of 'rupture' so that new subjectivities, spatialities, and temporalities might be marked and produced in spaces of betweenness that can then be used to reveal the limits of major theory/architectures as it is transformed along with the minor (Katz, 2017; Stoner, 2012). In the context of this article each example presents the door as a highly fluid and dynamic concept. For instance, the 'door' as a site of paradox is evident in the used of modern threshold technology such as the revolving 'door', as it holds together and simultaneously separates two binaries. This develops the 'door' as a site of (im)possibility, as it simultaneously embodies and holds together (however temporary) everything we come to know in and beyond the world in which we live. It is an assemblage of social relations, material and physical features, as well as symbolic and metaphorical meaning. The 'door' is the architectural form of 'impotentiality', it presents an impossible suture that is neither outside nor inside but, rather, a state of exception where such distinctions are rendered inoperable (Lewis, 2012). Yet crucially the paradox that the door comes to represent positions it at the forefront of exclusionary architecture that in turn facilitates and maintains categories of the 'other'. Its fundamental capacity to divide, exclude and define binary modes present it as the site through which politics is encountered, negotiated, reinforced and ritually performed (Teyssot, 2008). Of most concern is the inherently unequal power relations regarding who is in control or able to regulate the space of the door. As the recent 'red door' incident in Middlesbrough (Brewer, 2016) or the 'poor door' (Wall & Osborne, 2014) scenarios in major western cities highlight, the door is used to maintain class and racial divisions in the name of capital accumulation.

The historic and ongoing discrimination of female and non-male bodies in both artistic representation (Moore, 1981) and threshold architecture (Stalder, 2009) also present the unequal relationships of power associated with the door and how they are tied to notions of patriarchy and the idealised 'male body'. This prejudice is then regulated and built into threshold architecture and technology as sliding and revolving doors automatically respond to the movements of 'bodies' based on pre-set characteristics or programmed sensors (Latour, 1992; Siegert, 2015). Even the historic religious and sacrificial aspects (Essabal, 1961) of the door serve to define and maintain the order of the home and exclude that which does not align with the constructed politics of the household. Whilst the door may embody the notion of both inside and out, it is clear that for some it is more 'out' than 'in', as the logic of who controls the door is dictated by religion, ethnicity, class, wealth and gender politics. The freedom that supposedly comes from controlling a door and access to space (Vogler & Jorgensen, 2005) is undone by society, only truly applying to those who are in power, and predominantly those who are arguably white, wealthy, male and healthy. In this capacity the door comes to embody the prejudices of society, a political reflection of the world in which it is imbedded based on who or what is granted access. It presents how neoliberal and capitalist politics can co-opt elements of architecture and use them to maintain and regulate current systems of wealth, (im)mobility and discrimination.

It is from these discussions that my third line of argument emerges; that by focusing on the space of the 'door' through foregrounding minor subjects/subjectivities, I wish to attest the value of attending to 'intimate architectural spaces' as a complimentary way of undertaking architectural geography. That by attending to the 'intimate' features of architecture, as many have begun to do so already (Hurdley, 2010; Shortt, 2015), alternative theoretical understandings of architectural space can be

illuminated. Of particular import is how 'intimate architectural spaces' are well suited to engaging with a 'minor approach', in that as 'intimate features' they are able to provide 'lines of force' inside stable structures, locate weak points within them and then subvert and open space up across or between them (Bremner, 2013). This raises questions around how we can utilise minor theory as a particular approach, could we continue to use it in this way? Can it provide a framework or lens through which we can further explore the built environment? Already this paper has illustrated how attending to the door as an intimate architectural space is able to unsettle fixed notions of the building and unpick many of the complex political and exclusionary practices that gather there. Therefore, intimate architectures present how we can critique architectural space and its numerous subjectivities, spatialities and temporalities and acknowledge how they are embodied, situated, and fluid; that their productions of space and knowledge are inseparable from—if not completely absorbed in—the mess of everyday life. Hopefully what each of these lines of argument has illuminated is that there is a value in architectural geographers paying more attention to the door and other intimate architectural features. That by unsettling fixed notions of architecture and accounting for its 'intimate' features we can deconstruct and expose the social and political dynamics of architectural space that in turn can challenge the unequal power relations that are inherently built into the fabric of the lived environment.

Acknowledgements

References

Adey, P. (2008). Airports, mobility, and the calculative architecture of affective control. *Geoforum*, 39, 438–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2007.09.001

Bachelard, G. (1994). *The Poetics of Space.* Beacon Press: Boston.

Benjamin, W. (2002). *The Arcades Project*. (H. Elland, & K. McLaughlin, Trans.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Blunt, A. (2005). Cultural geography: cultural geographies of home. *Progress in Human Geography,* 29 (4), 505-515. https://doi.org/10.1191/0309132505ph564pr

Borden, I. (2001). Stairway Architecture: Transformative Cycles in the Golden Lane. In J. Hill (Ed.), *Architecture: The Subject is Matter* (pp.119-130). London: Routledge.

Bremner, L. (2013). Towards a minor global architecture at Lamu, Kenya. *Social Dynamics*, 39 (3), 397-413. https://doi.org/10.1080/02533952.2013.842340

Brewer, J. (2016, January 25th). Red doors and wristbands: Another day, another comparison to Nazi Germany, *The Telegraph Online.* Retrieved from https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/immigration/12120009/Red-doors-and-wristbands-Another-day-another-comparison-to-Nazi-Germany.html

Datta, A. (2008). Architecture of low-income widow housing: 'spatial opportunities' in Madipur, West Delhi. *Cultural Geographies*, 15 (2), 231–253. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474007087500

De Leeuw, S. and Hunt, S. (2018). Unsettling decolonizing geographies. *Geography Compass*, 12 (7), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12376

Dekeyser, T. (2016). The gaps of architectural life: the affective politics of Gordon Matta-Clark's Conical intersect. *Transaction of the Institute of British Geographers*, 42 (2), 179-191. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12166

Delanda, M. (2006). *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity.* London: Continuum.

Deleuze G. & Guattari F. (1986). *Kafka Toward a Minor Literature*. (Polan D Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G., Guattari, F. & Brinkley, R. (1983). What is a Minor Literature? *Mississippi Review,* 11 (3), 13-33. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20133921

Derkheim, E. (1957). *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals.* (C. Brookfield, Trans.). London: Routledge.

Duncan, J., Johnson, N. & Schein, R. (2004). '*A Companion to Cultural geography'.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Edensor, T. (2011). Entangled agencies, material networks and repair in a building assemblage: the mutable stone of St Ann's Church, Manchester. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* 36, 238–252. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2010.00421.x

Essabal, P. (1961). The Door and Threshold in Armenian Folklore. *Western Folklore,* 20 (4), 265-273. www.jstor.org/stable/1520711

Freud, S. (1959). *The Standard Edition of the Complete psychological Works. Vol. V*. Hogarth Press: London.

Gregson, N. & Rose, G. (2000). Taking Butler elsewhere: Performativities, spatialities and subjectivities. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 18, 433-452. https://doi.org/10.1068/d232

Hetherington, K. (2004). Secondhandedness: consumption, disposal and absent presence. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 22, 157-173. https://doi.org/10.1068/d315t

Hubert, H. & Mauss, M. (1964). *Sacrifice*. London: Cohen and West.

Hurdley, R. (2006). Dismantling Mantelpieces: Narrating Identities and Materializing Culture in the Home. *Sociology*, 40 (4), 717–733. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038506065157

Hurdley, R. (2010). The Power of Corridors: connecting doors, mobilising materials, plotting openness. *The Sociological Review*, 58 (1), 45-63. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01876.x

Imrie, R. (2003). 'Architects' Conceptions of the Human Body. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 21, 47-65. https://doi.org/10.1068/d271t

Irigary, L. (1993). *An Ethics of Sexual Difference.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Jacobs, J. (2006). A geography of big things. *Cultural Geographies*, 13, 1–27.
https://doi.org/10.1191/1474474006eu354oa

Jacobs, J., Cairns, S. & Strebel, I. (2008). Windows: Re-viewing Red Road. *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 124 (2-3), 165-184.
https://doi.org/10.1080/14702540802438488

Kaghan, T. (1939, February 12th). Humanity's Hall of Fame: Nominating the Man Who Made Doors Spin. *The Baltimore Sun.* Retrieved from
https://www.newspapers.com/clip/26868628/1939-theophilus-van-kannel-article-he/

Katz, C. (1996). Towards Minor Theory. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 14 (4), 487–499. https://doi.org/10.1068/d140487

Katz, C. (2017). Revisiting minor theory. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 35 (4), 596–599. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775817718012

Kraftl, P. & Adey, P. (2008). Architecture /affect /dwelling: geographies of being-in buildings. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 98, 213–231.
https://doi.org/10.1080/00045600701734687

Kraftl, P. (2010). Geographies of Architecture: The Multiple Lives of Buildings. *Geography Compass,* 4, 402-415. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-8198.2010.00332.x

Lacan, J. (1988). *The seminar of Jacques Lacan: Book II: The Ego in Freud Theory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis.* (S. Tomaselli, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge, University Press.

Latour, B. (1992). Where are the Missing Masses? The Sociology of a Few Mundane Artifacts. In W. Bijker & J. Law (Eds.), *Shaping Technology, Building Society, Studies in Socio-technical Change* (pp. 225-58). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Lawrence, R. (1984). Transition Spaces and Dwelling Design. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research,* 1, (4), 261-271. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43028706

Leach, N. (2006). *Camouflage*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Lees, L. & Baxter, R. (2011). A 'building event' of fear: thinking through the geography of architecture. *Social and Cultural Geography,* 12 (2), 107-122.
https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2011.545138

Lees, L. (2001). Towards a critical geography of architecture: the case of an ersatz colosseum. *Ecumene,* 8, (1), 51–86. https://doi.org/10.1177/096746080100800103

Lewis, T. (2012). The architecture of Potentiality: Weak Utopianism and Educational Space in the Work of Giorgio Agamben. *Utopian Studies,* 23 (2), 355-373. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/utopianstudies.23.2.0355

Li, X. & Smith, K. (2011). Time, Space and Construction: Starting with Auspicious Carpentry in the Vernacular Dong Dwelling. *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians,* 70 (1), 7-17. https://doi.org/10.1525/jsah.2011.70.1.07

Licea, M. (2016 January 17th). Poor door tenants of luxury tower reveal the financial apartheid within. *The New York Post.* Retrieved from https://nypost.com/2016/01/17/poor-door-tenants-reveal-luxury-towers-financial-apartheid/

Loo, Y. M (2017). Towards a decolonisation of architecture. *The Journal of Architecture,* 22 (4), 631-638. https://doi.org/10.1080/13602365.2017.1338412

McCormack, D. (2004). Cultural Geographies in Practice: Drawing out the lines of the event. *Cultural Geographies,* 11, 211-220. https://doi.org/10.1191/14744744004eu303xx

McFarlane, A. (2019). The properties of integration: Mixed-income housing as discrimination management. *UCLA Law Review,* 66 (5), 1140-1215. https://ssrn.com/abstract=3489272

Merriam Webster (2020). English Definition of Door. Retrieved from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/door

Moore, M. (1981). On the Signification of Doors and Gates in the Visual Arts. *Leonardo,* 14 (3), 202-205. muse.jhu.edu/article/599714.

Moran, D., Turner, J. & Jewkes, Y. (2016). Becoming big things: building events and the architectural geographies of incarceration in England and Wales. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 41, 416–428. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12140

Museum of London (MOL). (2011). Pocket Histories: London Plagues. Retrieved from http://www.museumoflondon.org.uk/explore-online/pocket-histories/london-plagues-13481665/black-death-13481350/

Naginski, E. (2010). Architecture at the Threshold. *Perspecta,* 43, 200-207.
https://www.jstor.org/stable/41680285

Neaher, N. (1981). Igbo Carved Doors. *African Arts,* 15 (1), 49-55.
https://doi.org/10.2307/3336006

Osborne, H. (2014). Poor doors; the segregation of London's inner-city flat dwellers.
The Guardian, Retrieved from
https://www.theguardian.com/society/2014/jul/25/poor-doors-segregation-london-flats

Paterson, M. (2011). More-than visual approaches to architecture. Vision, touch,
technique. *Social & Cultural Geography,* 12 (3), 263-281.
https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2011.564733

Pizzi, C. (2003). Doorways: A Visual Essay. *The American Scholar,* 72 (3), 77-83.
https://www.jstor.org/stable/41221155

Rendell, J. (2006). *Art and Architecture: A Place Between*. London: I.B Tauris & Co
Ltd.

Romano. G. (1999). The house as a place to share. *Leonardo*, 32 (2), 149-151.
https://doi.org/10.1162/002409499553037

Roosevelt, C. (2006). Symbolic Door Stelae and Graveside Monuments in Western
Anatolia. *American Journal of Archaeology,* 110 (1), 65-91.
https://doi.org/10.3764/aja.110.1.65

Rose, G., Degen, M. & Basdas, B. (2010). More on 'big things': building events and
feelings. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 35, 334–49.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2010.00388.x

Rosselin, C. (1999). The Ins and Outs of the Hall: A Parisian Example. In I. Cieraad
(Ed.), *An Anthropology of Domestic* Space (pp. 53-59). New York: Syracuse
University Press.

Rugoff, R. (2008). Psycho Buildings. In R., Rugoff, B. Dillon, & J. Rendell (Eds.),
Psycho Buildings (pp. 17-26). London: Hayward Publishing.

Shields, R. (1991). *Places on the Margin: Alternative Geographies of Modernity.*
London: Routledge.

Shortt, H. (2015). Liminality, space and the importance of 'transitory dwelling places'
at work. *Human relations,* 68 (4), 633-658.
https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726714536938

Siegert, B. (2015). *Cultural Techniques: Grids, Filters, Doors, and Other Articulations of the Real.* New York: Fordham University Press.

Simmel, G. (1994). Bridge and Door. *Theory, Culture and Society,* 11, 5-10. https://doi.org/10.1177/026327694011001002

Smitherham, J. (2011). Spatial Performativity/Spatial Performance. *Architectural Theory Review*, 16 (1), 55-69. https://doi.org/10.1080/13264826.2011.560387

Stalder, L. (2009). Turning Architecture Inside out: Revolving Doors and Other Threshold Devices. *Journal of Design History,* 22 (1), 69-77. https://doi.org/10.1093/jdh/epn047

Stoner, J. (2012). *Toward a minor architecture.* London: MIT Press.

Teyssot, G. (2008). A Theory of Design and Interface. *Architectural Association School of Architecture,* 57, 3-12. https://www.jstor.org/stable/29544683

Turner, T. (1977). Transformation, Hierarchy and Transcendence: A reformation of Van Gennep's Model of the Structure of Rites de Passage. In S. Moore, & B. Myerhoff (Eds.), *Secular Ritual* (pp. 61-62). Amsterdam: Van Gorcum Press.

Turner, V. (1969). *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure.* Chicago, Aldine Publishing.

Turner, V. (1982). *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play.* New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.

Vickery, A. (2008). An Englishman's Home is his Castle? Thresholds, Boundaries and Privacies in the Eighteenth-Century London House. *Past and Present,* 199, 147-173. https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtn006

Vogler, A. & Jorgensen, J. (2005). Windows to the World, Doors to Space: The Psychology of Space Architecture. *Leonardo,* 38 (5), 390-399. https://doi.org/10.1162/leon.2005.38.5.390

Wall. T & Osborne, H. (2018 November 25th). Poor doors are still creating wealth divide in new housing. *The Guardian.* Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/society/2018/nov/25/poor-doors-developers-segregate-rich-from-poor-london-housing-blocks

Walsh, D. (1983). Doors of the Greek and Roman World. *Archaeology,* 36 (1), 44-50. www.jstor.org/stable/41729039

Wilbur, M. (2013). *At the Threshold: liminality, Architecture and the Hidden Language of Space* (Unpublished MA thesis). University of Austin, Texas.

Wood, D. & Beck, R. (1990). Do's and Don'ts: Family Rules, Rooms, and Their

Relationships. *Children's Environments Quarterly,* 7 (1), 2-14.

https://www.jstor.org/stable/41514713