

# Kitchen Politics

Julia Wieger

Eight members of the Spaces of Commoning research group sit around a large office table. They are organizing a summer school called “Commoning the City” and it is one of their last meetings before the event.<sup>1</sup> They are still undecided on how to organize the provision of food:

**A:** So, I spoke to the organic food store and they said they could deliver a meal each day, including salad, for quite a reasonable price.

**B:** I still like the idea that summer school participants prepare food together. It’s a way of getting to know one another and it could become part of our knowledge production.

**C:** On paper this sounds great, but if you think about it there would always be a group spending the whole morning organizing and preparing food. When you think of our dense program, we just don’t have enough time ...

**D:** Have you ever organized collective cooking as part of an event? It eats up all the time and attention and pretty much dominates the entire setting. Do we really want this? We have so many interesting guests coming!

**C:** And cooking is one thing, but afterward, washing the dishes?

**E:** Still, I think it would be great if everyone is involved in the reproductive parts of the summer school—it’s part of the issue at stake. If each person attends one shift during the week it could really work. It’s half of a day you would miss.

**F:** I think C is right, I didn’t think about washing dishes. That’s a hassle. It really puts me off.

**A:** I can ask if the organic food store can take care of the dishes as well.

I wrote the above dialogue based on my recollections of the numerous meetings of the Spaces of Commoning research group. In June 2014 we organized a summer school and discussed, sometimes at great length, how we would provide food for our fifty guests during those nine days of workshops, discussions, tours, and talks. It’s no surprise that the actual exchanges (in contrast to our many other discussions) were not recorded—usually these issues do not take center stage. We, too, couldn’t help distinguishing between the work of discussing issues and developing ideas on commoning and the city, and the work of meeting the participants’ everyday needs. We understood that practices of commoning and reproductive labor—such as the provision of food—are closely related, but we struggled in tying the immediate and practical

<sup>1</sup> The summer school “Commoning the City” took place from June 22–29, 2014, at the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna, and was organized by the Spaces of Commoning research group.

questions of the group's physical needs with our academic and artistic formats of workshops, tours, and talks. Doubtless, unrecorded discussions like this one point to the difficulties we face when trying to overcome an existing order, one that ascribes less value to reproductive tasks than those one can list in a résumé. So what are the relations between the spaces of commoning and reproductive labor? How do such relations manifest themselves in designs or built spaces? How can one oppose established, spatial orders of productive/reproductive labor? What kinds of spaces are able to support such struggles? And what other power relations are involved in the organization of reproductive labor and commoning?

Our struggle to reevaluate and restructure tasks like cooking and cleaning isn't new. In the 1970s feminist Marxist thinkers and activists like Mariarosa Dalla Costa, Selma James, and Silvia Federici introduced the term "reproductive labor" to describe the unpaid domestic labor typically carried out by women in private homes. In their Wages for Housework campaign, they criticized traditional Marxist concepts for ignoring the significance of domestic labor, and therefore papering over a gendered division of the working class between those who get paid for their work and those who do not. This was possible, they argued, because women's labor in the private home had been made invisible by the ideology of the family, which framed domestic labor as being in the nature of women.<sup>2</sup> Feminist economists like J. K. Gibson-Graham later showed that such argumentation still adhered to a rather capital-centric imaginary (as well as epistemology), and missed out on alternative forms within a diverse range of economies not covered by the dichotomies of waged/unwaged, productive/reproductive labor.<sup>3</sup> Still, the campaign powerfully revealed and helped to understand the mechanisms of capitalism's devaluation of reproductive labor—which is still worth keeping in mind today.<sup>4</sup>

As a reaction to the social and economic restructuring that globalization brought about in the 1980s and '90s, Federici abandoned her stance in the Wages for Housework campaign and called for the organization of reproductive commons. The re-territorialization of the international work divide, new enclosures of resources in former colonized countries, destruction of the institutions of the workers' movement, and the crumbling of countermovements from the '60s had broken established forms of resistance to capitalist exploitation and made it necessary to rethink a feminist stance on reproductive labor.<sup>5</sup> Expanding her notion of reproductive labor to include subsistence economies and the means of (re)production, she argues that collective forms of reproduction and practices of commoning can enable our independence from wage labor and subordination to capitalist relations.<sup>6</sup> This does not mean, however, that practices of care, maintenance, or mutual aid disappear. On the contrary, Federici's notion of the commons is tightly linked to reproductive labor. In contrast to many other discussions on the commons, which

avoid questions of everyday reproduction,<sup>7</sup> she insists (referring to Maria Mies) that "the production of commons requires first a profound transformation in our everyday life, in order to recombine what the social division of labor in capitalism has separated."<sup>8</sup> As one of our guests at the "Commoning the City" summer school, Federici concluded our discussion with a related remark reminding us that social movements are only sustainable if they include cooperation and reproduction; only self-reproducing movements are able to establish continuity and thus also agency. This involves taking care of each other and taking responsibility for each other's lives.

## Functionalist Architecture, Kitchens, and Collectivity

Architect Margarete Schütte-Lihotzky, who set the standard of modernist planning in the late 1920s through her work in the New Frankfurt social-housing program, urban researcher Günther Uhlig, and radio journalist Bea Füsser-Novy sit at a garden table. Uhlig and Füsser-Novy interview Schütte-Lihotzky for their documentary film, *Das Bauen ist ja nicht das Primäre ...*<sup>9</sup>

**Margarete Schütte-Lihotzky:** Today people think that the functionalist architects believed that once a function is solved, everything is fine. But that's not how it was. That's a false impression that I would like to correct. I have known no one who believed that things are automatically beautiful when they function well. One could put it like this: functionalism developed at a break—a break between crafts and a rather advanced industrialization. This brought up tremendous problems and functionalism approached these problems rather bravely. This is what I wanted to say to conclude Frankfurt.

- 2 Nicole Cox and Silvia Federici, *Counter-Planning from the Kitchen: Wages for Housework; A Perspective on Capital and the Left* (Brooklyn: New York Wages for Housework Committee, 1976).
- 3 J. K. Gibson-Graham, Esra Erdem, and Ceren Özselçuk, "Thinking with Marx towards a Feminist Postcapitalist Politics," in *Karl Marx: Perspektiven der Gesellschaftskritik*, ed. Rahel Jaeggi and Daniel Loick (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2013), 275–85.
- 4 For more information on the Wages for Housework campaign, see <http://caringlabor.wordpress.com/category/housework>.
- 5 Silvia Federici, introduction to *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction,*

- and Feminist Struggle*, ed. Silvia Federici (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2012), 5–14.
- 6 Silvia Federici, "Feminism and the Politics of the Common in an Era of Primitive Accumulation," in *ibid.*
- 7 See, for example, Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt's trilogy of books that emphasis on knowledge production and information: *Empire* (2000), *Multitude* (2004), and *Commonwealth* (2009).
- 8 Federici, "Feminism and the Politics of the Common," 144.
- 9 *Das Bauen ist ja nicht das Primäre ...: Erinnerungen der Architektin Margarete Schütte-Lihotzky*, directed by Bea Füsser-Novy, Gerd Haag, and Günther Uhlig (Cologne: Westdeutscher Rundfunk, 1980).

**Günther Uhlig:** There are some questions—you described it very well, the question is ...

**MSL:** (*Knocking on the table*) I forgot something—something rather important. We were aware that functionalism—if you need to use such a catchword—we were absolutely aware that this was a transitional stage ...

**GU:** That's important.

**MSL:** At best it was, let's say, the very first beginning of an architecture of the twentieth and twenty-first century. The very beginning.<sup>10</sup>

The title of the film translates as “Building is not the primary thing ...” and the transcript is part of its concluding conversation. There Schütte-Lihotzky tells Uhlig and Füsser-Novy about how she had learned over the course of her career that she and many of her colleagues in the functionalist movement had been wrong to think that architecture could change people. “It is rather the opposite,” she says.

Schütte-Lihotzky is most famous for her 1926 design of the Frankfurt kitchen. A paradigmatic example of functionalist design, it is the standard model for the work kitchen in tenement buildings in Europe for the rest of the twentieth century. The narrow layout of the Frankfurt kitchen was a reaction to constraints in space and cost in the late 1920s New Frankfurt social-housing program. The kitchen, planned as a separate space within the apartment, was not only determined by the dire interwar economics. Schütte-Lihotzky also supported the idea that the household, like the factory or the modern office, should be rationalized. In her opinion, women of all class backgrounds had to be relieved of the heavy burden of domestic labor, and her kitchen design, inspired by the rationalization of industrial production, helped to free them.<sup>11</sup>

Back then, critique of Schütte-Lihotzky's design focused on the particular workflows it forced on its users. It was only in the 1970s and '80s that feminists questioned its implications on women's emancipation. Susan Henderson, for example, argues that Schütte-Lihotzky's work kitchen tapped into the general feminist backlash that took hold of 1920s Germany and sought to re-domesticate women.<sup>12</sup> Under the aegis of progress and modernization, a largely conservative women's movement promised emancipation through the professionalization of the housewife. As Henderson explains, their pre-emption was that “the best social purpose of managerial and technical expertise was to bolster the existing model of the family and woman's role within it.”<sup>13</sup> The dream of a kitchen machine went well with many architects' functionalist ideas and their obsessions with mass production and industrialization. For women though, it meant the kitchen machine would bind them once again to the household.

Uhlig, who coconducted the interview with Schütte-Lihotzky, found another 1920s kitchen concept baring the potential for emancipation and alternative forms of living: the *Einküchenhaus*, which means “one-kitchen building.” The one-kitchen building was a multistory apartment building featuring living units without (or very minimal) cooking facilities. Instead, meals were served to the tenants out of a central kitchen. The housing model was discussed and tested throughout Europe for different reasons: for bourgeois city dwellers, it was a way to save on costs for servants while keeping up their lifestyles, but also to realize reformist ideas of living; for parts of the socialist feminist movement, the model promised independence for women.<sup>14</sup>

Uhlig looks at the rise and fall of the one-kitchen building from the perspective of the late 1970s. Criticizing housing and planning policies of his own time,<sup>15</sup> he argues that standardized mass housing for the nuclear family—inherited from functionalist planning ideas—dominated building practices and left no room for alternative approaches to the production of living environments. While the idea of the one-kitchen building also emerged out of the desire for rationalizing living arrangements, it still held the potential for alternatives, Uhlig argues. This potential lay in its collectivity, and opened the doors to a much wider range in modes of living. Its urban typology also further invited heterogeneity into the building.<sup>16</sup>

The demise of the one-kitchen building came about for different reasons: not enough middle-class families were attracted to the idea to make it economically feasible on a large scale. Among feminist socialists, discussions on the one-kitchen building remained stuck in conflict between micro-political reformist ideas and more sweeping demands for a wholesale revolution. Schütte-Lihotzky herself came to the conclusion that for the masses of the working class, the one-kitchen building was not affordable and that architects would do better to improve individual kitchens. For her as well as for Uhlig, the pos-

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own.

<sup>11</sup> Margarete Schütte-Lihotzky, “Rationalisierung im Haushalt,” in *Wien und der Wiener Kreis*, ed. Volker Thurm and Elisabeth Nemeth (Vienna: Facultas, 2003), 283–85.

<sup>12</sup> Susan Henderson, “A Revolution in the Woman's Sphere: Grete Lihotzky and the Frankfurt Kitchen,” in *Architecture and Feminism*, ed. Debra Coleman, Elizabeth Danze, and Carol Henderson (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996), 221–48.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 229.

<sup>14</sup> Günther Uhlig, *Kollektivmodell “Einküchenhaus”: Wohnreform und Architekturdebatte Zwischen Frauenbewegung und Funktionalismus, 1900–1933* (Gießen: Anabas-Verlag, 1981).

<sup>15</sup> A prominent example for Uhlig's critique of mass housing is the housing estate Märkisches Viertel in West Berlin, built between 1963–74, providing apartments for fifty thousand inhabitants.

<sup>16</sup> Günther Uhlig, “Kollektivmodell Einküchenhaus: Wirtschaftsgenossenschaften (auch) als kulturelle alternative zum Massenwohnungsbau,” *Arch+ 45* (1979): 26–34.

sibilities of habitating differently and influencing gender relations through the design of a building are connected to multiple other struggles,<sup>17</sup> such as who can actually afford organizing reproductive labor differently, or arranging life collectively, and how such efforts relate to greater economical and political systems.

In her queer reading of the only one-kitchen building ever realized in Vienna—the Heimhof Einküchenhaus built between 1922 and 1926—Heidrun Aigner observes that for the purpose of women’s liberation, the building was not especially useful.<sup>18</sup> Initiated by one of Vienna’s leading feminist activists of the time, Auguste Fickert, the building was realized to support single or working women. With its central kitchen, laundry facilities, and employees who managed many household tasks, the building had the character of a hotel. Still, the Heimhof Einküchenhaus was not able to subvert the gender relations of housework. Even though they were employed and paid, it was still women in the kitchen, cleaning the apartments, doing laundry. Here, too, housework remained the women’s domain. Nor was the building able to transcend oppressive class relations. Only well-off middle-class women and men could afford to live there; meanwhile, their domestic needs were fulfilled by less affluent women.

Nonetheless, drawing on interviews with witnesses from the project’s early years, Aigner discerns a hint of resistance amid the different co-living constellations the building allowed for. Reports include a great diversity of living models that diverge from the heteronormative model of the nuclear family. They tell about inhabitants appropriating the communal spaces of the building and creating a public situation within the private building that supported and fostered alternative modes of living.<sup>19</sup>

## Political Work, Queer Households, Reproductive Commons

Cordula Thym, Dani Baumgartner, Florian Anrather, Jasmin Rilke, all inhabitants of a shared apartment in the Türkis Rosa Lila Villa, and my colleague Mara Verlič and I sit at a round kitchen table. Mara and I have come to ask them about their everyday lives (with a focus on reproductive labor) in the villa. Cordula has prepared homemade dumplings but everyone ensures us that they don’t eat together every day. Türkis Rosa Lila Villa is a self-administered queer cohousing project and community center for gay, lesbian, and trans people. It was founded in 1982 and is still an important address for queer Vienna today:

**JW:** You are part of the Wohnverein [an association for co-living in the villa]. What kinds of things do you do together? You organize the annual

party, you go to the assemblies, and you manage the house together. But what else do you do together as a house collective or a shared apartment that includes political work? Or do you do these things individually?

**DB:** Well, for example the refugee project—today it is called Queer Base—was initiated by the Wohnverein. Sure, it wasn’t run for long by the Wohnverein—it quickly became too large—but it is cool if projects can grow from here.

**FA:** If you don’t know about the project—it is about organizing living space for LGBTIQ refugees and asylum seekers. Additionally, many people contribute to Tips (an information and counseling center) and through this work, interpersonal alliances can emerge that are project based. There are always different things happening, and different groups of people work together on different projects.

**MV:** So the project is not only organized by people living in the villa but also by people from outside?

**DB:** Exactly. By many other people!

**MV:** And today, the project is not at all connected to the villa?

**FA:** They founded an independent association, if I remember it right.

**CT:** But this association is still based at the villa! We often do things as a reaction to an event or a situation. If something is happening, we organize something together, as a living association, or as people from the house.

Türkis Rosa Lila Villa started out as a gay and lesbian activist and cohousing project.<sup>20</sup> Its beginnings were embedded in an emerging gay and lesbian movement, as well as in Vienna’s squatting scene that opposed rising rents and real estate speculation in the city.<sup>21</sup> Activists squatted in an abandoned apartment building owned by the city that was about to be razed. Later they renovated the building and adopted its spaces to house several gay and lesbian shared apartments, a community cafe and a counseling center. At present these are the three core elements of the project.

17 See Schütte-Lihotzky, “Rationalisierung im Haushalt”; and Uhlig, “Kollektivmodell Einküchenhaus.”

18 Heidrun Aigner, “Das Einküchenhaus Heimhof auf der Schmelz zum Potential queer/feministischer Zwischenräume,” in *Orts-Erkundungen: Der Stadt auf der Spur*, ed. Alexandra Schwell and Jens Wietschorke (Vienna: Verlag des Instituts für Europäische Ethnologie, 2012), 135–52.

19 *Ibid.*, 149.

20 The word *Türkis* was added to the project’s original name, Rosa Lila Villa, in reflection of discussions and the political activism of the villa community that, since its founding, expanded to include trans\* activism. See “Geschichte,” *Die Villa* website, accessed January 15, 2016, <http://dievilla.at/geschichte>.

21 Marty Huber, “DO IT! 30 JAHRE ROSA LILA VILLA: UND SIE BEWEGT SICH IMMER NOCH,” in *Besetzt!*, ed. Martina Nußbaumer and Werner Michael Schwarz (Vienna: Czernin Verlag, 2012), 208–10.

While the founders of Türkis Rosa Lila Villa hoped that theirs would be the first of many gay and lesbian cohousing projects, the villa has remained the only such effort in Vienna for years.<sup>22</sup> This may be one of the reasons the villa is a famous house in Vienna—well known beyond the queer, lesbian, and gay scene. Compared to other cohousing projects, even those based in alternative contexts, the combination of political work and the everyday is unique. While being an important space for LGBTIQ activism in Vienna, translating ideas of alternative ways of living and emancipatory strategies into practices of everyday life has been an important objective in the villa. From its beginning, the project “was not only a living space, but also a matter of radical, emancipatory politics.”<sup>23</sup> For the villa, overcoming the heteronormative model of living in the nuclear family is closely connected to political work reaching beyond the domestic realm.

In terms of domestic reproductive labor, members of the shared apartment said they just recently agreed on a new plan to structure the cleaning of the shared areas in their apartment: the kitchen, bathroom, toilet, living room, and hallway. The work is distributed in such a way that each member of the household oversees the area they are most finicky about, but one may also swap tasks such as walking a dog.<sup>24</sup> I detail this because such agreements, common to co-living situations, do something that more conventional arrangements often don't: put up the reproductive tasks of the household for negotiation. While conflicts are likely unavoidable, defining and distributing a range of tasks and making written lists ultimately renders them more visible and concrete.

While infinitely rewarding, one should not underestimate the demands and challenges of such a living situation. Conflicts are inevitable between the different activist groups in the villa, the inhabitants or those who run the café. Then there are mundane disputes over the yearly celebration. Recalling Federici's ideas of sustainability and reproduction of social movements though, I would say that part of what the residents and activists of the villa provide to a larger community is exactly that—a place of support, a backbone maintaining the community's activism and contributing to its agency. As such, it is experimental ground for establishing reproductive commons, showing that questions of reproduction can go well beyond the designated realm of the kitchen.

## Architecture, Performativity, and Exclusion

Mady Schutzman and I sit across from each other at a small kitchen table in Schutzman's house in Los Angeles. I am meeting her to speak about the Llano del Rio Co-operative Colony, a utopian, socialist experiment between 1914 to 1917 northeast of Los Angeles in the Mojave Desert. Schutzman just finished her film *Dear Comrade*,<sup>25</sup> which is partly about the experiment in Llano del Rio, and I am starting an interview project on the experiment, being especially interested in the role of feminist architect Alice Constance Austin:

**Julia Wieger:** I first read about Llano del Rio in Dolores Hayden's book *The Grand Domestic Revolution*.<sup>26</sup> She writes about Llano as an example of early feminist planning. So when I started my research, here in LA, I was a little disappointed that this feminist element wasn't so obvious.

**Mady Schutzman:** If Alice Constance Austin, the architect, actually had built her designs, and if people had actually lived in it, it may have changed the gender dynamic. My understanding was that she was really trying to minimize the domestic labor demands of the women. And that the units [she proposed in her plans] didn't even have kitchens. Did they?

**JW:** No. No kitchens.

**MS:** Yeah. But it never got built, and people were still just struggling in their little nuclear family huts. So there was really no intervention in the gender politics or the division of labor that her design was hoping to effect.

**JW:** But there must have been some sort of affinity to feminism, otherwise they wouldn't have employed an architect who had these ideas?

**MS:** It came from Harriman.<sup>27</sup> He was very much a supporter of feminist ideas. I know he wrote quite a bit about it. So ideologically there was support. They were just struggling so much for money that they ended up not exactly facilitating a feminist way of living.<sup>28</sup>

22 Currently, the queer cohousing project Queerbau is realized at the outskirts of Vienna in Seestadt Aspern. See <https://queerbaudotat.wordpress.com>.

23 “Popolitik,” *Die Villa* website, accessed January 15, 2016, <http://dievilla.at/popolitik>.

24 Florian Anrather, Dani Baumgartner, Jasmin Rilke, and Cordula Thym, interview by Julia Wieger and Mara Verlič, Rosa Lila Villa, Vienna, January 14, 2016.

25 *Dear Comrade*, directed by Mady Schutzman (Los Angeles, 2013).

26 Dolores Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1981).

27 Job Harriman was a Marxist lawyer who unsuccessfully ran for mayor of Los Angeles and was one of the founding members of Llano del Rio.

28 Julia Wieger, *MOVEMENTS ARCHIVES WAVES GARDENS CITIES PERMACULTURES COSMIC DESIGN AGENCY ORGANIZING PUBLIC BICYCLES* (Los Angeles: MAK Center for Art and Architecture, 2012).

For her film, Schutzman delved into the archives of Llano del Rio, and she was well aware of the hardships the people of Llano faced when their dreams collapsed in the desert dust. I, on the other hand, coming from the field of planning and looking for early feminist architecture, kept wondering how important it was whether the plans of the architect were actually built. Did the architect's feminist ideas of houses without kitchens provoke discussions and maybe even new practices aiming to redistribute collective labor through the town's co-operative structures?

Llano del Rio was initiated in 1914 by a group of leftist Californian activists and supported by a broad, enthusiastic socialist movement. The group envisioned a city that would defy individual property and capitalist competition, a city that would take care of its inhabitants rather than exploit them. But their ideas of an autonomous life in the desert were harder to realize than they had thought. They had to give up Llano del Rio by the end of 1917. Nevertheless, during those four years, the experiment offered the possibility to try out a co-operative form of living, to test its social and political structures, as well as to think about its built environment, its infrastructures and architectures.

The cooperative colony hired Austin, who developed a rough scheme for future Llano del Rio. Inspired by the European garden city movement, her design organized cooperative life in a strict radial layout, detailing the housing units without kitchens. Intending to free women from domestic labor, Austin proposed to the people of Llano building a city where the tasks of cleaning, cooking, buying food, and childcare would be organized in cooperative, centralized infrastructures. Austin's Llano del Rio featured bucolic, low-density suburban housing developments between plenty of green space. In her book *The Next Step*, where she published some of her ideas for Llano del Rio, Austin draws suburban, almost rural houses for families that lack kitchens in a strangely inconspicuous way, as if she was trying to play down her radical proposal.<sup>29</sup> Austin's ambitious plans for Llano del Rio accommodated up to ten thousand inhabitants. Only fragments were ever realized.

Of the few buildings ever realized, only stone ruins remain. But documents chronicling life in Llano del Rio can be found in several LA archives.<sup>30</sup> For long periods, people lived in tents and huts, and it is safe to assume that their lives were shaped by improvisation. One can find traces pointing to ideas of gender equality. To become a member of the colony, every inhabitant had to state their skills and preferred field of occupation, irrespective of gender. A caption in the town's official magazine, *The Western Comrade*, describes a group of children led by a girl: "Lots of willing workers in the industrial school. Note the teamster, showing equality of sexes, as well as equal suffrage at Llano."<sup>31</sup> It is unclear though, whether the tasks of domestic labor were also distributed evenly between men and women. I found two photographs that

point to a possible shift in the gendered distribution of labor: the first shows five women in overalls standing in front of a construction site. One holds a hammer and all look rather satisfied, as if they had just finished the job of building a house.<sup>32</sup> In the second image, Austin stands in the middle of a group of Llano inhabitants around a model of the above housing unit.<sup>33</sup> In both pictures, I would say we see women transgressing existing norms of gendered professional roles. Architecture is involved in both. I would like to think that Austin's proposals were part of everyday negotiations of gender roles and the redistribution and valuation of labor.

But while the plans and drawings were tools for imagining a radically different everyday, they were also part of processes of exclusion and occupation. A crucial question for establishing a cooperative city, especially on this scale: who can be part of the community? While Llano del Rio allowed women to get a step closer to emancipation, it also actively excluded many other groups who sought to participate. In the *Western Comrade's* April 1916 issue, a detailed call for members entitled "A Gateway to Freedom through Co-operative Action" states at the bottom: "Only Caucasians are admitted. We have had applications from Negroes, Hindus, Mongolians, and Malays. The rejection of these applications are not due to race prejudice, but because it is not deemed expedient to mix the races in these communities."<sup>34</sup> I would like to add Karl Hardy's reminder that "all the various expressions of utopianism—from intentional communities to radicalized politics—which emerge from [...] settler societies ought to be recognized and being predicated upon and therefore implicated in the ongoing naturalization of settler colonization."<sup>35</sup>

When we seek out ideas of reproductive commons today, looking to escape the exploitative orders of reproduction of our everyday lives, when we look to historic examples of feminist reformist projects of the past, as Federici recommends us to do, we can learn from their radical aspirations, but also from their blind spots, limitations, and complicities in other people's oppression that we surely still have today. While efforts to collectively transform our

29 Alice Constance Austin, *The Next Step: How to Plan for Beauty, Comfort, and Peace with Great Savings Effected by the Reduction of Waste* (Los Angeles: Institute Press, 1935).

30 For example, the Huntington Library and the Special Collections & University Archives at UC Riverside.

31 Kate Sennert, "Llano del Rio: A Utopian Dream That Flowered and Wilted in the California Desert," *Kate Sennert* (blog), October 27, 2013, [http://katesennert.com/858/#\\_ftn3](http://katesennert.com/858/#_ftn3).

32 UC Riverside Special Collections & Archives, Walter Millsap papers (collection 157), box 9, folder 2.

33 Hayden, *Grand Domestic Revolution*, 244.

34 "A Gateway to Freedom through Co-operative Action," advertisement in *The Western Comrade*, April 1916.

35 Karl Hardy, "Unsettling Hope: Settler Colonialism and Utopianism," *Spaces of Utopia: An Electronic Journal* 2, no. 1 (2012): 123–36.

everyday lives and the spaces we inhabit can be extremely rewarding, contemporary and historical examples show how much resistance such endeavors can face. They demand a considerable amount of time and energy on the part of the people pursuing them, not least in order to cope with the contradictions that run through them.

## Literature

Aigner, Heidrun. "Das Einküchenhaus Heimhof auf der Schmelz zum Potential queer/feministischer Zwischenräume." In *Orts-Erkundungen*, edited by Alexandra Schwell and Jens Wietschorke, 135–54. Vienna: Verlag des Instituts für Europäische Ethnologie, 2012.

Anrather, Florian, Dani Baumgartner, Jasmin Rilke, and Cordula Thym, interview by Julia Wieger and Mara Verlič, Rosa Lila Villa, Vienna, January 14, 2016.

Austin, Alice Constance. *The Next Step: How to Plan for Beauty Comfort and Peace with Great Savings Effected by the Reduction of Waste*. Los Angeles: Institute Press, 1935.

Cox, Nicole, and Silvia Federici. *Counter-Planning from the Kitchen: Wages for Housework; A Perspective on Capital and the Left*. Brooklyn: New York Wages for Housework Committee, 1976.

Federici, Silvia. Introduction to *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*, edited by Silvia Federici, 5–14. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2012.

Gibson-Graham, J. K., Esra Erdem, and Ceren Özselçuk. "Thinking with Marx towards a Feminist Postcapitalist Politics." In *Karl Marx: Perspektiven der Gesellschaftskritik*, edited by Rahel Jaeggi and Daniel Loick, 275–85. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2013.

Hardy, Karl. "Unsettling Hope: Settler Colonialism and Utopianism." In *Spaces of Utopia: An Electronic Journal* 2, no. 1 (2012): 123–36.

Hayden, Dolores. *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1981.

Henderson, Susan. "A Revolution in the Woman's Sphere: Grete Lihotzky and the Frankfurt Kitchen." In *Architecture and Feminism*, edited by Debra Coleman Elizabeth Danze, and Carol Henderson, 221–48. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996.

Huber, Marty. "DO IT! 30 JAHRE ROSA LILA VILLA: UND SIE BEWEGT SICH IMMER NOCH." In *Besetzt!*, edited by Martina Nußbaumer and Werner Michael Schwarz, 208–10. Vienna: Czernin Verlag, 2012.

Schütte-Lihotzky, Margarete. "Rationalisierung im Haushalt." In *Wien und der Wiener Kreis*, edited by Volker Thurm and Elisabeth Nemeth, 283. Vienna: Facultas, 2003.

Uhlig, Günther. *Kollektivmodell "Einküchenhaus" Wohnreform und Architekturdebatte zwischen Frauenbewegung und Funktionalismus 1900–1933*. Gießen: Anabas-Verlag, 1981.

———. "Kollektivmodell Einküchenhaus: Wirtschaftsgenossenschaften (auch) als kulturelle alternative zum Massenwohnungsbau." *Arch+* 45 (1979): 26–34.

Wieger, Julia. *MOVEMENTS ARCHIVES WAVES GARDENS CITIES PERMACULTURES COSMIC DESIGN AGENCY ORGANIZING PUBLIC BICYCLES*. Los Angeles: MAK Center for Art and Architecture, 2012.