



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/218714/>

Version: Published Version

---

**Article:**

Beech, N., Bentancour, A., Fisher, H. et al. (2023) Still, but without a fix. *Charrette*, 9 (2). pp. 183-196. ISSN: 2054-6718

---

© 2023 The Author(s). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**Reuse**

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

# ***Still, but without a fix***

## Unsettled Subjects

### ABSTRACT

*'Still, without a fix...'* represents a sample of an ongoing debate within an interdisciplinary reading group, *Unsettled Subjects/Confronting Questions*. The purpose of the reading group is to enable a transformation of knowledge and practice, recognising the deep structures of colonialism, capitalism, and patriarchy that are operative within existing knowledges and practices. The text was generated from a series of dialogues over a period of about six months. It does not provide a solution to any problems within architectural history. Rather, it provides some provocations.

### KEYWORDS

*Architectural education, architectural history, coloniality, decoloniality, epistemology*

## Unsettled Subjects/Confronting Questions<sup>1</sup>

We begin by acknowledging all those who live in present danger to their lives, their livelihoods and their loved ones: surviving and resisting the exploitation, subordination and marginalisation exacted in that system of racialised practices, structures and knowledges that we know of as colonialism. We acknowledge them in solidarity and recognise their struggle, offering as they do, not just resistance but histories and practices of life. We will continue to seek counter-hegemonic socialist, feminist and decolonial knowledges, practices and affects in our work with one another as grounded beings in and of this only Earth.

Unsettled Subjects/Confronting Questions is a reading group. It was set up online in the summer of 2020, following the murder of George Floyd and the subsequent resurgence of the Black Lives Matter movement and affiliated protests and demands for recognition and justice from racialised and marginalised communities across the world. Originating in the School of Architecture and Cities at the University of Westminster, the reading group consists of unsettled subjects from a wide array of institutions (and none), mainly architectural (but other disciplines, the ill-disciplined, and none), and many locations. Anyone can join. Many have.

The reading group is grounded in the recognition that we need ‘some terms—some languages—to talk about the things we need to talk about, but find ourselves not talking about, because we find them too difficult: identity, race, ethnicity, gender, sex, sexuality, class, power’.<sup>2</sup> This is recognition that we haven’t found the languages necessary to talk about these things within our discipline, instead we have turned to a diverse range of literatures, that speak across all kinds of ‘domains’ and ‘fields’. Invariably, in our spoken conversations, we have pulled these books into relation with our understandings, our practices, and our experiences, beginning to forge a new ‘curriculum’.<sup>3</sup>

Some of us within the reading group are professors, some are practitioners, some are lecturers, some are students. Some of us write for a living, some of us teach for a living, some of us design for a living, some of us do all those, and most of us do care work. We have only just begun to write together.<sup>4</sup> This has proved difficult. Unsettled subjects have different things to say, and different ways to say them, and the result is no fixed solution.

What we hope *this* text might offer is insight into the tension immanent in any project to transform the discipline of ‘architectural history’. On the one hand, a yearning for acknowledgement of all that is outside the circumscribed borders of the field—and all that has been systematically erased, twisted, and reordered to sustain the operations of ploughing that field. The subjects, practices, knowledge, forms, cultures, modes of production, carings, ecologies that remain excluded from design and excluded from history. What would

architectural history become if we could let the ‘non-architectural’ in and centred that, in different narratives, and different meaning-making practices, than ‘history’? On the other hand, the recognition, the painful recognition, that ‘architectural history’ is only a fraction of a wider project of colonial enlightenment and we are inside (here, now, as we address you in this journal) the field, born of it, or conscripts to it.<sup>5</sup> It is a tension that runs through the work completed by our peers, colleagues, brothers and sisters in developing shared resources for curricula reform.<sup>6</sup> The tension results from the different locations of the anti-, post-, and de-colonial projects, and that tension is reproduced in what follows.

A note on the composition. This is an assemblage of quotations, comments, statements, and drafts, written or chosen by members of the reading group to intervene in the debate initiated by Alan Chandler and Neal Shasore, the special issue editors of *Charrette*. They form a dialogue, rather than synthesis. We suspect that the arguments, reflections, and propositions will be all too familiar to many people working to transform ‘architectural history’ within their school or practice. We make no apologies for repetition.

---

I would like us to start with a brief quotation from Aimé Césaire’s work of 1939, ‘Return to My Native Land’. It might give us an opportunity to pause. It made me pause, and I started to see something ‘outside’, something more.

Listen to the white world  
its horrible exhaustion from its  
immense labours  
its rebellious joints cracking under  
the pitiless stars<sup>7</sup>

But also, the following, from Stuart Hall, which comes from a transcript of ‘Race, the Floating Signifier’, in which Hall shows why ‘race’—as the final ‘natural’ guarantee, the base on which a politics might be founded—is evident in even apparently emancipatory projects, which have inherited the epistemologies of race, and so have been re-bound within the very politics they were trying to extricate themselves from.

...begin again in another space, begin again from a different set of presuppositions to try to ask ourselves what might it be in human identification, in human practice, in the building of human alliances, which without the guarantee, without the certainty of religion or science or anthropology or genetics or biology or the appearance of your eyes, without any guarantees at all, might enable us to conduct an ethically responsible human discourse and practice about race in our society.<sup>8</sup>

I think, if we start with these two perspectives—Aimé Césaire on the one hand, Stuart Hall on the other—we will convey the tensions we are all in, in architecture, in history, and in our conversations.

---

But we should also acknowledge that this Call for Papers is already a sort of disturbance. An academic association (the Association of Architectural Educators) which has historically (again that word) defined the questions worthy of ‘architectural history’, how those questions should be answered, and by whom, temporarily opens the gate and asks for contributions, temporarily asks how the questions, the answers, and the subjects can be broadened and, maybe, challenged. That which holds articulation of what architectural history is, issues a call which asks others to question what is at the core of what the institution defines. I would like to remind everyone that a Call for Papers is an instrument, one that assumes an ‘even playing field’, a public sphere in which it is possible to bracket differences and as equals debate issues of societal importance. Nancy Fraser is there to remind us that this bracketing is predicated on a public sphere that is bourgeois—that bracketing is possible only if those in the sphere are already equal.<sup>9</sup> And while it is not hard to argue that architectural history has been a bourgeois formation, we are writing this because we know that matters of knowing space, historically, are not.

A Call for Papers, in the context of the academy, assumes that what comes as a response is academic, that is, bound by certain academic standards, one of which is still ‘neutrality’. But what if the response comes from a position of infidelity, infidelity to the academy and to neutrality? A response from those who have already taken a side, a side that is excluded by ‘neutrality’? Those willing to unsettle even their own position in the academy because they understand that the academy is, well, disciplinary. I would quote Župančič

In any social conflict, a “neutral” position is always and necessarily the position of the ruling class: it seems “neutral” because it has achieved the status of the dominant ideology, which always strikes us as self-evident. The criterion of objectivity in such a case is thus not neutrality, but the capacity of theory to occupy a singular, specific point of view within the situation.<sup>10</sup>

Some of you might say, ‘but this is just architectural history, it is hardly a field of social conflict’. But, I would say that, in the long now of racial capitalism, space has always been the primary site of social conflict. Matters of space, of either the built or unbuilt environment, across all scales—from decisions on which fabrics interiors are furnished in (and which interiors are to be furnished) to which land is ‘empty’ and therefore capable of becoming the property...—I could go on, you know where I am going... Repeat after me, deserts are not empty!<sup>11</sup>

Anyway, Donna Haraway reminds us:

It matters what we use to think other matters with; it matters what stories we tell to tell other stories with; it matters what knots knot knots, what thoughts think thoughts, what descriptions describe descriptions, what ties tie ties. It matters what stories make worlds, what worlds make stories.<sup>12</sup>

Let us follow Haraway and add to her sequence: it matters what questions we ask questions with. After all, the fate of a study—if it would be radically transformative, or power affirmative—is predicated on this understanding. What happens if we ask the evergreen architectural question of a home not from the common-sense position of it being a shelter, but following Gil Scott-Heron's dictum that 'home is where the hatred is?'<sup>13</sup>

However, here we are, responding to the Call by trying to transform it into a call—a way to recognize each other, stranded across institutions, ready to maybe not just try to fix the History into history, but to abandon the canon and canonical once and for all, and again. Here we are, treating a call as what Stefano Harney and Fred Moten call a 'prop', that which enables entering 'into some new thinking and into a new set of relations, a new way of being together, thinking together'.<sup>14</sup> Not because we care about Architectural History, but because we know that our duty is to dig where we stand.<sup>15</sup> That's where I think we could begin.

---

OK. Well I have a different starting point, I think. But maybe it follows from the Donna Haraway quote you shared. Because I want to say that my aim is to write and make a genuine impact and contribution to knowledge. I recognise now that, having been in architectural practice for several years, my understanding of scholars and theorists that impact my writing and scholarship has been superficial. However, I have struggled, engaging with those writings and I did my literature review, I became more engrossed and at the same time more convinced of my initial goals. But in scholarly engagements, how things are said fit a certain social status. Terms of engagement in a scholarly context define how we articulate ideas. Words and ideas must be substantiated, and referenced, and cited, and packaged, in a particular manner, defining the scholarly terms of engagement. At times the ideas that could help civilians is packaged in an inaccessible manner, and yet again, those civilians that inspire new ideas and whose lives these ideas are meant to transform, are hidden. This is significant to young scholars as well, who may have a difficult time articulating great ideas without a freedom of speech that is not policed and edited to its content's loss.

The people who consume knowledge, who are here for academic accolades, and for quotas on their academic papers that are published. It seems to me, therefore, that inevitably and unquestionably the right person may *never*

access rightful ideas meant to transform their lives. The undergraduate student who needs the agency to self-actualise beyond their degree in architecture may never read the papers by scholars that could help them accomplish that. It is interesting that as I write I am also at a loss as to how to better articulate the ideas—as a black first-generation woman in South Africa—how politicised crime and corruption, that paints a reality on the ground of how jobs are accessed, and agency is built goes beyond a university degree. I am cognisant of the fact that a thesis or a paper produced in an academic institution must meet rules of engagement. But I hope to speak a ‘truth’ that will help transform lives without diluting the content and knowledge of being a scholar. So I don’t think I come from the same place at all, as where you began: I want to uphold standards of excellence and not discredit works done by scholars for centuries. In the same light I want to contribute significantly and not hold back.

As a scholar if you stoop too low in articulating your ideas and start talking like the men on the street, you are considered to be disregarding the rules of engagement. I couldn’t say it better than Professor Bongani Mayosi when he says, ‘lift as you rise’. The idea is that you don’t forget the people who are inspiring you to write from their case studies (collected from their struggles of life on the ground as civilians) and the people you are writing to. I always use a crude example to scholars that when you visit the zoo you engage from the standpoint of an ‘observer’. We need to engage as young scholars beyond ‘observers’ and make a difference in our scholarly contributions to society and curriculum being embedded in the actual context.

---

OK, I think you express the tension we all find ourselves in very clearly there. But as scholars we need to be aware that no matter the position we occupy inside academia, as researchers, students or lecturers, we are always educators. And, as such, we can differentiate pedagogy as a mechanism to reproduce oppression from pedagogy as a means to liberate historically oppressed subjects: that’s what we discussed when we read bell hooks together.<sup>16</sup> And that means we don’t have to treat education as neutral, and we can instead understand that different pedagogical methods need to be seen within the political contexts they serve.<sup>17</sup> So, a positive, effective change would benefit from the ideas of Paulo Freire in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. The Marxist educator, based on his experience with education in underprivileged communities in Brazil, highlights the faults of the traditional educational system to demonstrate how the ‘banking style’ of educational narrative and anti-dialogical actions are fundamental tools for the maintenance of unequal relations between the oppressed and their oppressors. To liberate the oppressed, education must make use of dialogical actions and find ways to relate with students through choice of words and openness to their contributions and different narrative constructions and not only curricular changes. I think that’s a slightly different way of looking at things from what

you have just proposed. Because in this perspective, consciousness raising is paramount to this pedagogical methodology and puts the oppressed at the centre of the educational process. Educators, therefore, are merely facilitators of a knowledge production process, with a special eye to identify potentialities in each student and provide them with tools to apply in their own development.

We cannot aim at a pedagogical change in history without mentioning that the inclusion of historically oppressed narratives is crucial to its success. However, the inclusion of racialised, historically oppressed histories needs to be followed by the inclusion of the racialised, historically oppressed *subjects*. Nonetheless, the inclusion of these subjects in these spaces is not enough. In my experience as a mixed-race black-indigenous gay scholar from the so-called Global South, I have noticed how much academia needs to adapt itself not only to receive the historically oppressed subjects without de-legitimising our points of view (producing an epistemicide), but also to embrace our struggles and prepare for the debates, confrontations, and resistances that our presence alone triggers in subjects who are part of historically privileged groups. Curricular changes will not succeed in legitimating the presence of different forms of knowledge production and epistemic inclusion, if not led by the inclusion of these historically oppressed intellectuals and the preparation of the institutions to truly promote this change. It isn't *us* who need to change (though we will), it is academia, its institutions, its languages, and its practices. Institutional preparation to receive the wide diversity of peoples and knowledges would require training of every worker in it—from scholars and lecturers to secretaries and administration staff—helping to develop a special kind of sensibility that empathises with group struggles, and able to identify how they reverberate in a person's response to day-to-day issues. Patriarchy, racism, xenophobia, ableism, and class oppression profoundly impact how we perceive the world and build our responses to it. Understanding that different perceptions of the world and completely different experiences can emerge from the same one fact is a powerful tool to make more inclusive and humane spaces for a knowledge construction that can, in fact, positively impact the world.

---

These are really useful points—both the comments that I think everyone can relate to, on the need to engage with scholarship, 'rise up to' and meet the challenges of the academy, and also the point that we can't escape our political task. What I have to add doesn't contradict either, or resolve them, but I want to get a bit specific about my own discipline—architecture. In schools of architecture in university, the teaching of history is often viewed as something which supplies a grounding for architectural design: 'Here, you students, here are the great (and not-so-great) works of the past: know them, copy them even, and you will do good work!' Architectural history (what came before) is a servant of architectural design (what comes next). If there is a fault

in history (it is too male, too white, too European—which of course it is), then our job is to make better, more diverse, and more inclusive histories, which will lead to better, more diverse, and more inclusive designs.

As unsettled subjects, I get the sense that we find the idea of architectural history as a servant of architectural design incredibly limiting. Architectural history is not really about learning a set of references, but rather about instilling or programming in a set of values and concerns that map out a disciplinary space within which architects should and can act: the course tells you what architects do, and so what you should care about, your space of operation, and more importantly therefore it also programmes in a vast zone of exclusion of things not to care about, not to involve yourselves in. By doing this, it maintains the status quo not just in form but in structure: allowing (by ignoring) the continuation of violent practices that are ‘outside’ architectural practice. Beyond this, it maintains a division between the production of history and the production of architecture: if architectural history is only a resource for practice, then if you are engaged in the production of one, you are excluded from the other.

We read together as unsettled subjects not only to unsettle histories, but to unsettle the relationship between history and practice. The idea of rewriting the canon to generate better architectures assumes an unchanged relationship between histories (as taught) and design (as practised). I have found Michel-Rolph Trouillot really useful on this. Following Trouillot, I want us to recognise that our discursive process of reading and relating (to each other and to our pedagogic practices) is not only about the unearthing of silences and their introduction into new and better historical narratives, but a questioning of the usefulness of such narrative-making *at all*.<sup>18</sup> We cannot merely make better history: we must eliminate the idea of history as a form of narrative.

We said at the beginning that we want to ‘abandon the canon and the canonical once and for all’. Our reading group is a place of conversation, frustration, mutual support, and (to some extent) escape from the limits of the canonical process. What begins as a conversation about a text very often ends up in a discussion about the institutions and institutional challenges we are working in. Perhaps because of this, we do not replicate the form of a history course with better books, but try and take seriously the moments in texts which demand that we consider the limits of history as a process of understanding. Remember when we read *Policing the Crisis*, and the part which described how historical images often only reproduce the author’s solution to a problem rather than help to understand its causes?<sup>19</sup> Well, maybe we need to pay attention to that. Can the reading group be a new model for our pedagogical practice?

---

Yes! Let's go back to hooks again:

The classroom remains the most radical space of possibility in the academy.<sup>20</sup>

Collaborative reading: could this act as a model to be expanded into a further set of practices?

Our readings developed as a response and critique of existing educational models, exploring how to outline alternative models of pedagogical engagement. In our dialogue and discussions, different fields of knowledge, perspectives, and experiences got intertwined. The book has been the framework, and the process has been the act of reading together from multiple perspectives. This inter-dialogue is a reflective approach, a ground for critical thinking, the making of an environment for a collaborative culture and practice, where ideas and thoughts take place through exchange across disciplines and geographies.

The text becomes the site of exploration, enabling the projection of different thoughts and ideas that can grow and oscillate, embracing multiple perspectives in the process and the formation of a common base for socially engaged pedagogy and situated mode of knowledge production. bell hooks, in *Teaching to Transgress* (1994), defines the classroom as a location of possibilities and urges us to collectively imagine ways to move beyond boundaries, to transgress, in the labour for freedom. hooks's open call for education as the practice of freedom and to create communities of resistance opens a framework for action in the construction of spaces of commons and alternative modes of production and dissemination of knowledge in the struggle for a just society. Remember that passage:

When education is the practice of freedom, students are not the only ones who are asked to share, to confess. Engaged pedagogy does not seek simply to empower students. Any classroom that employs a holistic model of learning will also be a place where teachers grow, and are empowered by the process. That empowerment cannot happen if we refuse to be vulnerable while encouraging students to take risks.<sup>21</sup>

To resonate with hooks's open call for education as the practice of freedom and to create communities of resistance, our collaborative reading, the making of a common space, a community, a process of sharing, constructing a language of a multitude of languages, a creole identity, explores modes for a situated practice to be expanded in the labour for freedom. That's always only ever an ambition, but even if we're always falling short, we're doing so consciously—it's not an 'end' result, it's always in process.

---

I'm going to interrupt. Am I the only student here? I'm worried that what I have to say is one of those infidelities to the academy you mentioned. What knots knot knots, I recall you, recalling. Maybe I'm too concerned with the strands of twine of those knots. What I'm writing is paranoid, worrisome, crying. I'm writing as stranded in an institution, trying to respond, to recognize you all. As you just said, it could all be wrong. It often is. By no means am I meeting the 'terms of engagement' either, and the institution I'm in, just isn't a humane one, like you proposed it could be (following Freire). No, it is far away from the kinds of proposals you have all made. The work of the 'vast zone of exclusion' that you have noted is in *my* institution, muffling, redacting. But there is still a voice heard, a word under. You note we have made 'common space' in our collaborative reading. Might we find here, might we hold the space of, an anti-university, an analogue to Achille Mbembe's 'anti-museum' from a text of his that we collectively read, *Necropolitics* (2016):

A place of refuge, [it is] a place of unconditional rest and asylum from all the rejects of humanity and the "wretched of the earth," the ones who attest to the sacrificial system that will have been the history of our modernity – a history that the concept of archive struggles to contain.<sup>22</sup>

'There's not really a problem, right?' asks Sheena Ringo in her hit song 'Yattsuke Shigoto', as the track spins out uncontrollably into an indignant harpsichord solo. The fast-paced delirium of the song brings on the question, a question not unfamiliar to us.

Why is the onus on us? When I say us I mean the architectural historians who chose to leave design, through denouncement or painful breakup. Or who never studied it in the first place. One order of architectural history against architects, please: 'Would you like that done Ionic or Corinthian? Foucauldian or Lefebvrian?' Screw it, I'll just make some rice at home.

I begin my term at an [architecture school] one hour late. The lifts are too small, a lot of people take it only one or two floors. I am stuck in the lift. It ate me for an hour. I was absolutely not sleeping in after saying a long goodbye to an old friend. The architects look confused outside our room. As the speaker talks about the church in her country surrounded by land mines the architects parade models, themselves, and their industrial cutting equipment. The architects later look hungrily at the lunch for the architectural history conference. Not many of them smoke so their appetites are not suppressed like ours are. The [architecture school] forgot to send us the all-student emails. Our lecturer was notably saddened by this. The [university] was involved in eugenics, says another of our lecturers. Nobody has resigned in shame. They actually leave with pride in their abusive eyes. And I thought the [art school] was bad. The creep was fired but hasn't been removed from the board of the [journal]. The coffee shop at the [architecture school] doesn't

tell people the colonial history of the drink. But then it's just a drink. You can't criticise everything. Oh, but we will. You'll see. Eyal Weizman says no architects have been tried at the Hague yet. Just you wait. You're gonna wish you never picked up a pencil.

'Who made the reading list?' us students of the [architecture school]'s history programme debate. I don't know entirely. There are some voices behind those lists of texts we cannot see. They are on sabbatical perhaps. Maybe they left architectural history entirely because it didn't deal with issues they knew it needed to deal with. The footprints lead towards that path, but when nearer there appear to be lots of smaller tracks leading into deep grass before the path. Fourteen percent of the students don't become architects, our lecturer said. The room we are in holds little trace of them. But we found cuttings from programmes for an event on 'holding space' they put on by the guillotine. Did they leave these for us to find? We tried to market ourselves. And afterwards we argued over why we tried to market ourselves, or whether we did at all. None of us got the research job opportunity. Maybe the architecture students are designing their own guillotines to chop us up. I asked if they were making a catapult and they laughed. Did they mean to stage a siege on the rooms and offices of the architectural history department? No. There is already the Trojan horse of the architect in the architectural history class. Or is it the other way around. I can't remember. We wrote some of our history projects on a whiteboard but when we came back the next day it was rubbed off. The building plan that had been in the corner had not been rubbed off, though. Maybe that's what happened to the voices behind the reading list. Our friend dropped out of the course. He was always so happy, we didn't know why he quit. If there was more therapy provided by the university would he be okay? Why do designers dress so forcefully, I thought as we sat in our jumpers. We could hear distant music in one seminar, a long drone in another. Where is our harmony in the piece? We had thought we had sung it loudly but in the recording we could only hear our muffled voices behind reading lists.

## Acknowledgements

Unsettled Subjects/Confronting Questions is the title of a reading group, and the name adopted by members of that group when writing together. 'Still, without a fix...' is one product of a collective reading and writing practice that has been ongoing since 2020, and though the following—Nick Beech (University of Birmingham), Anna Betancour (Malmö University; University of Strathclyde), Harry Fisher (University College London), Emily Mann (University College London), Buhle Mathole (University of Cape Town, SA), Gabriel Marques Camargo (University of Manchester), Anthony Powis (University of Sheffield), Dubravka Sekulić (Royal College of Art)—take responsibility for the contents of 'Still, without a fix...' they acknowledge all those other Unsettled Subjects who have contributed to this collective reading and writing practice. Unsettled Subjects thank the editors of Charrette for their patience, guidance, and contributions to the work.

## REFERENCES

1 Unsettled Subjects/Confronting Questions is the title of a reading group, and the name adopted by members of that group when writing together. 'Still, without a fix...' is one product of a collective reading and writing practice that has been ongoing since 2020, and though the following—Nick Beech (University of Birmingham), Anna Betancour (Malmö University; University of Strathclyde), Harry Fisher (University College London), Emily Mann (University College London), Buhle Mathole (University of Cape Town, SA), Gabriel Marques Camargo (University of Manchester), Anthony Powis (University of Sheffield), Dubravka Sekulić (Royal College of Art)—take responsibility for the contents of 'Still, without a fix...' they acknowledge all those other Unsettled Subjects who have contributed to this collective reading and writing practice.

2 From the first Unsettled Subjects/Confronting Questions reading group invitation. If you would like to join the reading group, visit here: 'Unsettled Subjects/Confronting Questions' <[https://docs.google.com/document/d/12DLbxtFfLE1fpjIMbDksA2-4E0TavmawdWsvx\\_RkcHU/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/12DLbxtFfLE1fpjIMbDksA2-4E0TavmawdWsvx_RkcHU/edit)>

3 To date, this new 'curriculum' includes Angela Y. Davis, *Women, Race and Class (collected essays)* (London: Penguin, 2019); Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. by Richard Philcox (London: Penguin, 2021); Paul Gilroy, *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack: The cultural politics of race and nation, Classics Edition with new Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2002); Stuart Hall, *The Fateful Triangle: Race, ethnicity, nation*, ed. by Kobena Mercer, Foreword by Henry Louis Gates Jr. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017); Stuart Hall, Chas Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke, Brian Roberts, *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State and Law and Order*, 2nd Edition (London: Palgrave, 2013); bell hooks, *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the practice of freedom* (London: Routledge, 1994); C. L. R. James, *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo revolution, with introduction and notes by James Walvin* (London: Penguin, 2001); Achille Mbembe, *Necropolitics* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2019)

4 The first text written by Unsettled Subjects/Confronting Questions is 'Unsettled Subjects/Unsettling Landscapes: Confronting Questions of Architecture in C. L. R. James's *The Black Jacobins*', in *Embodying an Anti-racist Architecture*, special issue of *field: a free journal of architecture*, ed. by Emma Cheatle, Luis Hernan, Carolyn Butterworth, Victoria Ogoegbunam Okoye and Catalina Mejia Moreno, 8.1 (2022), 145–68.

5 David Scott, *Conscripts of Modernity: The Tragedy of Colonial Enlightenment* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004)

6 Space/Race Reading List, ed. by Brian Goldstein, Marta Gutman, Ana María León, Dubravka Sekulić and Amber Wiley (2020) <<https://bit.ly/spaceraceplace>> [accessed 22 March 2023]; Race, Space and Architecture: An Open Access Curriculum, ed. by Huda Tayob, Suzi Hall and Thandi Loewenson (2020) <<http://racespacearchitecture.org/index.html>> [accessed 22 March 2023]; 'Race' and Space: What Is 'Race' Doing in a Nice Field Like the Built Environment?, ed. by Solomon Zewolde, Adam Walls, Tania Sengupta, Catalina Ortiz, Yasminah Beebeejaun, George Burrige and Kamna Patel (London: Bartlett, UCL, 2020) <<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/bartlett/about-us/our-values/equality-diversity-and-inclusion/race-and-space>> [accessed 22 March 2023].

7 Aimé Césaire, *Notebook of a Return to My Native Land*, as cited in James, *The Black Jacobins*, p. 312.

8 Stuart Hall, 'Race, the Floating Signifier: What More Is There to Say About "Race"? [1997]', in *Stuart Hall, Selected Writings on Race and Difference*, ed. by Paul Gilroy and Ruth Wilson Gilmore (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2021), pp. 359–73 (p. 372).

9 Nancy Fraser, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy', *Social Text*, 25/26 (1990), 56–80.

10 Alenka Župančič, *What Is Sex?* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2017), p. 4.

11 Samia Henni, *Deserts Are Not Empty* (New York: Columbia Books on Architecture and the City, 2022).

12 Donna J. Haraway, *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books, 2016), p. 12.

13 Gil Scott-Heron, *Pieces of a Man* (Flying Dutchman Records, 1971)

14 Stefano Harney and Fred Moten, *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning and Black Study* (Wivenhoe: Minor Compositions, 2013), p. 104.

15 Sven Lindqvist, *Dig Where You Stand: How to Research a Job*, ed. by Andrew Flinn and Astrid von Rosen, new edition (London: Repeater Books, 2023)

16 bell hooks, *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1994)

17 André Donoso Romo, *Education in Revolutionary Struggles: Iván Illich, Paulo Freire, Ernesto Guevara, and Latin American Thought* (London: Routledge, 2020)

18 Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1995), p. 58.

19 Stuart Hall, Chas Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke and Brian Roberts, *Policing the Crisis*, second edition (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), p. 115.

20 hooks, *Teaching to Transgress*, p. 12.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 21.

22 Achille Mbembe, *Necropolitics*, p. 172.