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Introduction

2019 was the year of the declaration – from Culture Declares to Architects Declare to Architecture Education Declares – a landmark moment when built environment practitioners pledged to confront climate emergency. In this paper I step back to reflect on the ethical dimensions of public declarations in architecture, from the institutional to individual, to consider their role in negotiating ethical concerns.

This is explored through three paths: reviewing the ethical know-what of contemporary codes of conduct of built environment professional bodies, examining resources that develop the ethical know-how required to deal with everyday ethical dilemmas in practice, and reconsidering the history of architectural manifestoes that explicate an ethical why-now.

Across this survey I question whether debating and drafting declarations is an act of ethical reflection. I shift the focus from proclamation to process, considering how authors act on the situations of past declarations, present concerns and future visions. I propose this reflexive and relational process of working towards and working through operates between and beyond the principlist ethics of professional codes and the situated ethics of everyday actions.

At a time of climate breakdown and biodiversity loss, systemic social injustices and inequalities, I argue architects must practice collectivity and intersectionality to unsettle conventions and complacencies. To illustrate this, I draw inspiration from Sumayya Vally and Huda Tayob et al.’s An Inventory of Feminist Upheaval and draw upon three strands of my teaching and research as part of the Bartlett Ethics Commission led by Jane Rendell which seeks to expand understanding, raise awareness and collectively develop approaches of ethical practice targeted to the methodologies chosen by built environment researchers and practitioners and their relation to disciplinary specificities and institutional settings.¹
Codes of conduct

*Be honest and act with integrity*

*Consider the wider impact of your work*

*Have respect for others.*

(Architects Registration Board, 2017)

Codes of conduct are a component of what creative arts research theorists Barbara Bolt, Estelle Barrett, Pia Ednie-Brown, Kate MacNeill, Megan McPherson, Carole Wilson, Sarah Miller and Marie Sierra define as *ethical know-what*, the deliberative rules and procedures of institutional ethics and compliance. A key strand of my work for the Bartlett Ethics Commission has involved examining the codes of built environment professional bodies to question how effectively these institutional declarations articulate ethical values and empower practitioners to navigate dilemmas with confidence and creativity.

Architecture bodies have faced stringent and sustained criticism from established practitioners both for failing to define the specific ethical challenges raised by the profession and for failing to set high standards to meet them. In reference to the Architects Registration Board (ARB) and Royal Institute of British Architecture (RIBA) codes of conduct, architect Jeremy Till identifies few ethical values or standards of behaviour beyond “the short-term protection and the duty of care to the client” and contractual relationships with other professionals. This “self-defining circle”, Till continues, “turns its back on something rather important, which is architecture’s outside”, which he summarises as the consequences rather than the object of architecture.

This frustration is echoed in the critical reflections of Part 3 Architecture students. These emerging professionals are equally excoriating of the weak position of the ARB and RIBA in empowering individual or collective responsibility to identify and take action on ethical issues. They argue their codes are not robust enough to support practitioners who choose to act in the interests of the public against the client. Jennifer Pirie states “It is clear that the profession acknowledges its role in a wider social and public context, but to what extent is often a cause for debate. The codes of the ARB and the RIBA appear prescriptive in the definition of professional conduct, but vague on the application of a set of moral or ethical principles or a
commitment to a wider public.” This lack of guidance on application is of critical concern in times of national and global uncertainty. To Thomas Trudeau:

The Codes, then, leave the architect in a confusing position. By virtue of architecture’s engagement in shaping social environments, and its associated environmental impacts, the profession involves inherently ethical questions; the Codes of Conduct indeed suggests these issues should be considered, but give little guidance as to the manner or extent of that engagement. Until such time as the Codes of Conduct are modified, the architect is left to make their own ethical choices. In this context, the codes provide little support for ethical behaviour in the face of decreasing fees and reduced agency.

*
Seek to enhance the diversity of the natural environment\textsuperscript{10}  
(Landscape Institute, 2012)

Seek social justice by working to expand choice and opportunity for all persons\textsuperscript{11}  
(American Planning Association, 2016)

If something does not feel right, you need to do something about it, for example, speak up\textsuperscript{12}  
(Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, 2014)

My research took the form of a constructive critique principally oriented to architectural professional bodies, examining the codes of the ARB and RIBA against sixty-four UK and international built environment professions ranging from construction, design, energy, engineering, heritage, planning, surveying, sustainability and transport.\textsuperscript{13} Reading across the ethical know-what of these professional bodies reveals standards of integrity, objectivity, competence and confidentiality are commonplace, but some choose to elevate conduct beyond this base level.\textsuperscript{14} I identify five common ethical duties in the codes of other bodies which set a benchmark, not the baseline, for ethical practitioners to work towards: “empower practitioners to reflect critically and act fearlessly,” “prioritise the public over the client,” “enhance ecological diversity,” “seek social justice,” and “enrich cultural heritage.”\textsuperscript{15}

This survey led to a set of recommendations shared with the ARB and RIBA as they undertook widespread reappraisals.\textsuperscript{16} However, before revising codes, I advised architectural professional bodies to prioritise the development of ethical guidance. Perhaps more than other professions, the process of conceiving, making, using and transforming the built environment is aligned to ecological, social and material conditions. Built environment practice therefore demands an ethical standpoint. But the decisions practitioners take will always have a cost personally, professionally or publicly. Design ethicist Jeffrey Chan Kok Hui claims codes:

cannot substitute for the architect’s ethical judgment of prioritising values. After all, the architect is hired because he or she alone has the overview and capacity to make difficult choices among competing constituencies – the clients, the building’s users, the neighbours and the general public, as well as “voiceless others” that include the poor and marginalised, as well as the environment, both natural and man-made – all of which will make different claims on this architect’s sense of duty. Which of these constituencies should the architect prioritise and which should the architect de-
prioritise, and at whose expense? And how justifiable is the architect’s decision? These important questions are not ones that can be answered by appealing to the professional codes of conduct or to the technical expertise of the architect, but to ethics alone.¹⁷

Professional bodies have a vital role to play in rewriting codes of conduct that expand ethical awareness and aspiration. But even more important than raising the standards of ethical know-how, they have a responsibility to support practitioners to approach and act on the knotty dilemmas that arise in practice from an informed and empowered position.

*
Everyday practice

Am I able to see things from another person’s perspective?

Have my actions impacted negatively on others, even if unintentional?

Do I lead by example?²¹⁸

(Chartered Institute of Housing, 2015)

Declarative principles are only the starting point for conducting an ethical practice as it is through the specific that ethical judgments come to be made. Architectural theorist Pia Ednie-Brown introduces us to Francisco Varela’s notion of ethical know-how as a framework for considering how best to equip creative practitioners for the ethical dilemmas they will face.¹⁹ Varela addresses the situated nature of ethics in practice, “in harmony with the texture of the situation at hand, not in accordance with a set of rules or procedures.”²⁰ Drawing from Confucian philosopher Mèng Kē, Varela proposes that rules and procedures “will always remain external to the agent, for they will always differ at least in some ways from the agent’s internal inclination.”²¹ Ethical know-how, by contrast, involves spontaneous, compassionate moral action sensitive to the particularities and immediacies of lived situations. To develop this disposition where immediacy precedes deliberation requires expertise gathered through a sustained journey of experience and learning:

And because truly ethical behavior takes the middle way between spontaneity and rational calculation, the truly ethical person can, like any other kind of expert, after acting spontaneously, reconstruct the intelligent awareness that justifies the action. And, like any other kind of expert, the truly ethical person can use such a posteriori justification as a stepping-stone for continued learning. Indeed, even the beginner can use this sort of deliberate analysis to acquire sufficient intelligent awareness to bypass deliberateness altogether and become an expert.²²

To paraphrase the words of Bolt et al., this raises the question of how we might foster the conditions for emerging and established built environment practitioners to develop ethical know-how. The Bartlett Ethics Commission is devising a set of research protocols which aim to present both guiding principles to work towards and generative questions to work through the situated and contextual ethical issues that arise in built environment research.²³ A number of
professional bodies, architectural theorists and ethicists provide further resources for practitioners. The Chartered Institute of Housing offers self-reflexive questions as tools to force practitioners to confront uncomfortable truths, from “Do I own up to mistakes and learn from them?” to “Do I try to leave others better off?” To answer them calls for setting aside dedicated time for reflection. Terry Williamson, Antony Radford and Helen Bennetts describe the process of making and managing the built environment as an active negotiation between “ethical theory, the environmental, social and building contexts, and personal and stakeholder evaluations.” This process of going backwards and forwards between an ethical theory and personal action is described by philosopher John Rawls as “reflective equilibrium”, seeking to reach an acceptable balance, and by Donald Schön as “reflective practice”, seeking to gain insight into the underlying assumptions and priorities which inform everyday actions.

For practitioners to develop the expertise required to identify, analyse and respond effectively to specific ethical dilemmas, guidance must emerge from real ethical challenges reported by practitioners and the public, provide access to rigorous evidence and analysis, and combine applied and theoretical knowledge. In Ethics for Architects, architect Thomas Fisher grapples with case studies based on real-life situations that involve personal risk, organised according to the American Institute for Architects’ codes and drawing upon approaches to Western ethics to work through the most appropriate response. This connects with Lynn Gillam, Marily Guillemin, Annie Bolitho and Doreen Rosenthal’s strategy of “imaginative identification” to guide ethical judgement by putting yourself in the shoes of another to empathise or imagine. Bolt et al. build on this with their creative pedagogical model of “the hypothetical” as a way for institutional know-what to be brought into play with ethical know-how through scenarios which ask participants to put themselves in the position of an ethical committee to deliberate on actual projects.

*
Manifestoes

Less is more.\textsuperscript{30}  
(van der Rohe, 1947)

Less is a bore.\textsuperscript{31}  
(Venturi, 1966)

Mess is the law.\textsuperscript{32}  
(Till, 2013)

Alongside my work for the Bartlett Ethics Commission, I teach on accredited architectural and alternative spatial master’s programmes in London and Denmark. I run workshops on debating and drafting manifestoes as a means to introduce students to the depth and range of issues and positions that inform architectural inquiry and practice.\textsuperscript{33} I witness how emerging and established practitioners respond to the challenge of negotiating and articulating the practitioners they seek to become.\textsuperscript{34} I propose the act of drafting a manifesto involves both working through and working towards principle and situation, providing practitioners with the space to explicate and exclaim an urgent ethical why-now. To set this out I shift how architectural manifestoes have been analysed from proclamation to process.

Rather than “a simple command or a definition”, art historian Mary Ann Caws describes manifestoes as “an exhortation to a whole way of thinking and being.”\textsuperscript{35} “The manifesto moment,” she distinguishes, “positions itself between what has been done and what will be done, between the accomplished and the potential, in a radical and energising division.”\textsuperscript{36} In the edited anthologies of architectural manifestoes, theorists are particularly attuned to this positioning. In terms of the what has been done, Mark Wigley suggests “Manifestos are layered on top of each other, and each of these layers has its own precise history.”\textsuperscript{37} Beatriz Colomina adds “Every manifesto is a re-working of previous manifestos... That is what architectural discourse is all about – an exchange of manifestos.”\textsuperscript{38} Writing a manifesto is a relational act of working through, a personal accounting as authors respond to the principles and practices set out by others in relation to contemporary forces.

In terms of what will be done, “The manifesto precedes the work.” posits Colomina, “It is a blueprint of the future.”\textsuperscript{39} Craig Buckley defines this as “a special type of relay, one that transmits such urgent signals forward in time, but which also encapsulates the past’s claims on
the future, in words and forms that aim to be the barometer against which some future present will take its measure.” Writing a manifesto is also a working towards, a reflexive relay which not only reflects but projects as a directive for future acts.

These relational and reflexive acts correspond to approaches of ethical deliberation and imaginative identification. Working between principle and situation, the accomplished and the potential propels manifesto authors to explicate why this practice is necessary to address the challenges of the now. In doing so, Wigley characterises “Manifestos conjure whole worlds. A manifesto never simply appears in our world. It is a polemical document thrown into and against our world. There is always a violence to the throw. One world hits another.” To manifesto is a political and embodied act, but as with all things politics embodies it can too easily lead to war: Colomina claims “A manifesto requires destruction of history.” Wigley bangs the table in agreement “A manifesto is a weapon.” Charles Jencks shouts “The genre demands blood.”

*
I am an architect, a constructor of worlds, a silhouette against the darkening sky.\textsuperscript{45}  
(Woods, 1993)

I combat and despise perpendicular and horizontal lines.\textsuperscript{46}  
(Sant’Elia, 1914)

Architecture must blaze.\textsuperscript{47}  
(Coop Himmelblau, 1980)

Bolt et al.’s work into creative arts practice acknowledges that the “ethos of risk taking and rule breaking” in a creative tradition that aims to “worry boundaries” is not one that sits comfortably with the idea of ethical practice.\textsuperscript{48}  Indeed, looking across the array of manifesto compilations, architectural theorists can become so swept up in the selective histories, forceful enumerations and epigrammatic style of canonical examples, they repeat these self-referential rhetorical traits when examining the genre.

Felicity Scott singles out Jencks as characterising manifestoes in terms of “an emotionally charged, even biblical crusade bent at once on destruction of an enemy or outsider, the exclusion of difference, and the establishment of new orthodoxies.”\textsuperscript{49}  She condemns his belief that it is “The irresistible display of violence and strength which makes the manifesto memorable and psychologically impressive” as foreclosing critical potentialities.\textsuperscript{50}

The authors of two recent global manifesto anthologies challenge these limited conceptions. In \textit{World Art Manifestoes}, critic Jessica Lack describes “a delusion in the West” that the manifesto has “long outlived its finest hour.”\textsuperscript{51}  For Lack, the manifesto is a reminder of the privilege of who has been able to speak in spheres of public exchange and who has been excluded. Indeed, a recent survey of 110 architectural declarations in as many years includes only five examples from the Global South.\textsuperscript{52}  The manifesto also “opens up the space through which marginalised voices and experiences can attempt to make the voice of their diversity heard.”\textsuperscript{53}  To read from political scientist Penny Weiss’ \textit{Feminist Manifestoes Global Reader}, is to listen to previously silenced stories in myriad political contexts, learn tactics to undermine colonialism and censorship, forge solidarity and collective identity.\textsuperscript{54}  It is to confront positionality which, as anthropologist Soyini Madison summarises, “forces us to acknowledge our own power, privilege, and biases... When we turn back on ourselves, we examine our intentions, our methods, and our possible effects.”\textsuperscript{55}  There is an ethical imperative to moving beyond architecture’s Western-centric bias, the narratives and theories we perpetuate.\textsuperscript{56}
The task of our generation is to accelerate the decolonisation of our curriculum and discipline, and use our privilege to ensure the voices that were previously suppressed now have the possibility to act.\textsuperscript{57}

(Architecture Education Declares, 2019)

This year 400 arts organisations and individuals, 600 UK architecture practices and 1700 UK architecture academics and students declared a climate and ecological emergency. These landmark declarations urge a “paradigm shift in behaviour” to transform an industry that accounts for “nearly 40% of energy-related carbon dioxide emissions”; insist we “recognise ecological breakdown and global inequality are intimately linked”; and call on practitioners “to give voice to those at the heart of the flames”.\textsuperscript{58}

[Figure 1. Manifesto workshop for Fast-Forward Feminism. Miranda Critchley and David Roberts, 2019.]

Rather than simply sign up, they call on architecture practices and schools to collectively evaluate approaches and negotiate regenerative principles. This requires as much working through as working towards. To shift behaviour, they advocate a dialogue of collaboration working across practices and disciplines. To recognise how threats of ecological breakdown vary in intensity depending on class, race, gender and geography, they call for an intersectional analysis of climate change. To give voice, they demand “multiple, plural, and diverse responses.”\textsuperscript{59}

Grassroots collective Wretched of The Earth go further to insist on the inextricable interrelatedness of decolonisation and decarbonisation. In an open letter written collaboratively with 48 aligned groups including architecture network Concrete Action, they critically reflect on a phrase invoked by climate campaigners: “If we continue on our current path, the future for our species is bleak.”\textsuperscript{60} The letter reads:

\begin{quote}
in order to construct a different future, or even to imagine it, we have to understand what this “path” is, and how we arrived at the world as we know it now. “The Truth” of
\end{quote}
the ecological crisis is that we did not get here by a sequence of small missteps, but were thrust here by powerful forces that drove the distribution of resources of the entire planet and the structure of our societies. The economic structures that dominate us were brought about by colonial projects whose sole purpose is the pursuit of domination and profit. For centuries, racism, sexism and classism have been necessary for this system to be upheld, and have shaped the conditions we find ourselves in.

Another truth is that for many, the bleakness is not something of “the future”. For those of us who are indigenous, working class, black, brown, queer, trans or disabled, the experience of structural violence became part of our birthright. Greta Thunberg calls world leaders to act by reminding them that “Our house is on fire”. For many of us, the house has been on fire for a long time: whenever the tide of ecological violence rises, our communities, especially in the Global South are always first hit. We are the first to face poor air quality, hunger, public health crises, drought, floods and displacement...

And you look past the vast intergenerational knowledge of unity with nature that our peoples have. Indigenous communities remind us that we are not separate from nature, and that protecting the environment is also protecting ourselves. In order to survive, communities in the Global South continue to lead the visioning and building of new worlds free of the violence of capitalism. We must both centre those experiences and recognise those knowledges here.

Our communities have been on fire for a long time and these flames are fanned by our exclusion and silencing.61

I wish to conclude with a manifesto which centres the experiences and recognises the knowledges of communities of the Global South, practicing collectivity and intersectionality in process and proclamation.62

*
An *Inventory of Feminist Upheaval* is a manifesto convened by Sumayya Vally and Huda Tayob with Lesley Lokko, Yolisa Nqonqoza, Kgaugelo Lekalakala, Cornel Hugo, Olasumbo Olaniyi, Heidi Lu, Terrence Mxolisi Mkhwanazi, Tonia Nicole Murray, Sibonelelo Gugulethu Mthembu, Karuni Naidoo, Amina Kaskar, Althea Peacock, Iketleng Mankwe Meladi Montjane, Tanzeem Razak, Kate Otten, Sarah de Villiers and Tarika Pather. The text forms a script curated in response to a call for films that celebrate female architects, taking the prefix *trans* — as the means to expand binary definitions of discipline, gender, time and place. This process of collective deliberation and writing, as Weiss identifies, has an important history in feminism: “collective authorship means that feminist manifestos not only *inspire* political action but also are the *outcome* of, or *reflect* feminist action—a diversity of voices, informed by experience and reflection and dialogue, together confronting enormous practical and theoretical problems.” Collectively written manifestos help create feminist space and actors cognisant, as designer Thandi Loewenson reminds us, of the labour already enacted by excluded bodies and bodies of knowledge.

*An Inventory of Feminist Upheaval,* 2019.

There is collectivity in its proclamation too. The manifesto begins with a stark inventory of spaces of the margins, acting as an urgent portal to put ourselves in relation to different histories and stratifications of racial segregation. Tayob has written elsewhere, with Suzi Hall, of the frustrations “of being educated in a discipline of architecture in which constitutions of ‘race’ are largely omitted, despite its omnipresence.” In this intersectional act, we are forced to confront the discipline’s relationship to systemic and overlapping oppressions of women of colour.
The manifesto supplements the inventory of marginal spaces listed by cultural historian Saidiya Hartman and situates them in Johannesburg. On film, it is read by female architects and students at the Rand Club, transgressing spaces traditionally reserved for men in a site central to Cecil John Rhodes’ imperial vision for a “greater” South Africa. On the page, each stanza convenes spaces designed to subjugate, enclose, exclude and restrict women, themselves segregated by slashes on the page, creating a collective consciousness of legacies of slavery and servitude. It speaks, as Hartman urges, “outside of the fiction of an individual voice” and “from the space of being inside the assemblage.” In making the marginalised more central and visible, the inventory begins to recover possibility in them. “Dance halls, streets, and spiritual interiors,” Tayob and Hall continue, “are counter architectures in which different circuits of connection, processes of validation and alternative ways of inhabiting the world are established.”

Rather than defining themselves against, or in reference to the canon, An Inventory of Feminist Upheaval is defined with and through other writings, sayings and phrases from women of colour outside of what is conventionally regarded as architectural practice. This inclusive gesture redefines both discipline and genre, reframing the manifesto from the individual to collective and opening the page as a collaborative site to an equal multiplicity of other voices. In so doing, it acknowledges the space and possibility of writing. It creates what writer Alexis Pauline Gumbs identifies as “an ancestrally cowritten text,” in which “transnational feminist accountability” is consolidated. These are words, Gumbs says elsewhere, that make worlds and invite affect: “They [bring] to mind nameless women in unknown places who were laughing and looking sideways at each other and a world that couldn’t understand them.”

*
Conclusion

In this paper I unpack the ethical dimensions of architectural declarations at three aspects of codes of conduct, everyday practice and the manifesto. At a time of climate breakdown and biodiversity loss, systemic social injustices and inequalities, I argue for principles that set the benchmark for ethical built environment practice, resources that equip creative practitioners to negotiate ethical challenges from an informed and empowered position, and visions that address the interrelatedness and urgency of decolonisation and decarbonisation.

Through this paper I highlight the importance of ethics as a practice. Moving from proclamation to process, I make steps towards an alternative conception and possibility for the architectural declaration from codes of conduct to manifestoes. An alternative conception in how declarations already employ relational and reflexive processes of ethical reflection, presenting an opportunity for us to question our position and expound what practitioners we want to be. An alternative possibility in collective and intersectional approaches, exemplified by An Inventory of Feminist Upheaval, that unsettle conventions and complacencies and embody inclusive and regenerative ethical practice.
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