

Cinematic Views: John Lautner's Architecture and Masculine Spatial Types.

Michael J. Ostwald and Michael Chapman

The architecture of John Lautner has had a particular affiliation with male heterosexuality in the 50 years since his buildings first entered the American consciousness. This paper examines the representation of Lautner's architecture in the popular media (particularly film and magazine) as the dominion of stereotypical heterosexual masculinity. The paper considers Lautner's architecture as an example of the bachelor pad type; a peculiar model for architecture that elevates intimate domestic settings (such as the kitchen, bathroom and bedroom) into extroverted platforms for recreation. By transcending the presumed banality of domestic life Lautner's houses unconsciously embody, and even celebrate, male fantasy projecting an architectural model that continues to be promoted by the popular media. However, the paper also notes that there exists a curiously negative and occasionally violent undercurrent in the cinematic representation of Lautner's houses which provides an important alternative means of interpreting mediated depictions of the "bachelor pad".

Space, Architecture and the Bachelor Pad

A series of representations extracted from popular culture provide the basis for a potential re-examination of the architecture of John Lautner (1911-1994). In the last decade Lautner's architecture has once again become fashionable in American discourse taking its place alongside the works of other classic American modernists including Richard Neutra and Frank Lloyd Wright. This resurgence has seen the publication of a number of lavish monographs which have made Lautner's designs widely accessible for the first time. Despite this, theoretical explorations of Lautner's work are noticeably absent. This paper examines the way in which Lautner's architecture, which is typically seen as representing the optimistic ideals of modernism, has taken on a profoundly different role in its depiction within the popular media. Specifically Lautner's architecture has become associated with an overt and ostensibly stereotypical form of masculine behaviour associated with libertine bachelorhood. If the machinery of cultural production is to be believed, then there is something about Lautner's architecture which makes it an ideal setting for erotic, violent or criminal acts.

Over the last two decades, the Feminist concern with rewriting architectural history (herstory) has resulted in several classic interpretations of gendered spaces. The preoccupation with many of these spatial histories is the correction of what is seen as a male bias, confounded by the systems of patriarchy, and embodied in the etymology of the word his-story. The determination among many feminist scholars has been to galvanise the considerable achievements of women in the discipline of architecture and also in a broader vernacular context. One of the most meticulous reconstructions of a Feminist spatial history is Dolores Hayden's analysis of the evolution of the domestic home entitled *The Grand Domestic Revolution*.¹ Hayden demonstrates the subtle but paradigmatic changes that occurred in domestic housing as the first and second waves of feminism impacted on the lives of predominantly middle-class women across America. More recently Alice Friedman's *Women and the Making of the Modern House* demonstrates the influence of female clients on the evolution of Twentieth Century architecture.² Friedman provides an extensive list of houses where women in various roles were central to the architectural process and design. Fundamental to Friedman's argument is an understanding that a relationship exists between the free-form, open-planned, spaces of Modernism and female emancipation. For Friedman such architectural landmarks are made possible because of the determination of female clients to resist cultural typecasting and challenge the dominant patriarchal orthodoxy.

What is not so well acknowledged within feminist discourse is the emergence of a chauvinist, or predominantly masculine, spatial paradigm which mirrors the path of feminism within the popular imagination. While works such as George Chauncey's *Gay New York*³ chart the emergence of homosexual male spaces within the city the study of masculine heterosexual spaces, and in particular residential spaces, is in its infancy. Joel Sanders' edited volume *Stud: Architectures of Masculinity*,⁴ and George Wagner's "The Lair

of the Bachelor"⁵ represent possibly the first forays into this area. What emerges from such research is an architectural type associated with the "bachelor pad" which celebrates the cultural freedom and libidinous urges of unattached masculinity. Such research into the evolution of the bachelor pad suggests that it has two related characteristics. The domestic evolution detected by Hayden is largely absent because it is consumed, somewhat ambiguously, by the Modernist obsession with open planning and the indeterminate spatial definition; an advance which Friedman ironically cites as emancipatory for women.⁶ These architectural characteristics are central to the media depiction of the quintessential bachelor pad; a space which refutes any notions of domestic life and celebrates sexual and social interaction.

This mythologising of the bachelor pad found its vehicle in *Playboy* magazine which, throughout the 1960s and early 1970s provided an evolving spatial description of the idealised male realm. The bachelor pad, as portrayed by the editors of *Playboy*, celebrated the seamless flow of spaces, the integration of technology (in particular stereo equipment) within walls, the prevalence of entertaining areas (such as lounges, billiard rooms, swimming pools and patios) and the seemingly endless adaptability of furniture which could invariably transform to accommodate a range of sexual pastimes. Domestic spaces, like the kitchen, were secondary to more traditionally male rooms such as the bar. The bedroom, rather than being an isolated and segregated compartment (as it was in the traditional family house), in many instances became the central space, occupying the most important view and the centre from which all other spaces unfolded. George Wagner describes the importance of architecture within this construction, writing that

Playboy was always dependent on the spatialisation of the lifestyle imagined in its pages, and in its heyday it spawned, besides its own designs for various bachelor pads, publications of built pads, Playboy Clubs, Playboy Hotels and Resorts and the Playboy Jet called the Big Bunny.⁷

These manifestations of Playboy culture, like the models that adorned its pages, provided a convenient model of male fantasy which quickly became inseparable from the aspirations of its predominantly male readers.

As well as providing conceptual representations of the bachelor house, *Playboy* also published architectural examples, attaching to the work of certain architects a strong masculine-heterosexual association. One such architect was John Lautner who had a series of designs published by the magazine. Where the 1960s saw the domestic kitchen and bedroom become an increasing target of female animosity, the masculine house had merged the kitchen, bedroom and entertainment areas into one vast heterosexual space. The quotidian realities of domestic life, such as housework, are conspicuously absent in the depictions of male life from the 1960s. More recently Lautner's houses have been featured in mainstream

male-oriented magazines such as *Gentleman's Quarterly*, subtly reinforcing the principles of a predominantly masculine domain.⁸ The same stylistic qualities of Lautner's work that attracted the editors of *Playboy* magazine were also widely exploited by the film industry. From the 1960s through to the present Lautner's architecture has provided a backdrop for masculine activity; either as a sexual stage, evil lair or domain of aggression or violence. Movies such as *Diamonds are Forever* (1971), *Body Double* (1984), *Less than Zero* (1987), *Lethal Weapon II* (1989), *The Big Lebowski* (1998), *The Fast and the Furious* (2003) and *Charlie's Angels* (2001) all position Lautner's architecture as an ideal context for masculine, heterosexual activity.⁹ In such films Lautner's architecture is a space that is detached from the mundane realities of life, a space for archetypal heroes, sexually active women, richly textured materials and sublime views.

This paper considers several themes that have emerged in Lautner's architecture and the sexual mythology surrounding it. Of particular concern is the way in which latent themes and practices implicit in Lautner's work have rendered it central to the production of a masculine popular culture. In particular the paper concentrates on two houses: The Elrod House, the stylish Palm Springs residence built for an interior designer; and the famous Chemosphere House—the UFO styled building which hovers above the rocky cliffs of LA. The research, which builds upon the ideas of Sanders and Wagner, examines the two Lautner houses in the context of a number of theories concerned with gendering architectural types. Specifically the paper draws on Andrea Kahn's essay on the relationship between the site, "overlooking" and the expression of patriarchal spatial orders and Catherine Ingraham's depiction of the surface as a site of sexual potency in architecture. In the case of both houses, the paper examines the way that these themes have been transformed or manipulated in the service of a popular (predominantly masculine) culture.

All research into sexuality and architecture relies, to a certain extent, on either generalisation¹⁰ or careful abstraction.¹¹ Such strategies are essential because, as Lacan observes, space is ostensibly without gender.¹² Both of these methodological approaches also rely on the criticism of authorised representations (usually canonical texts, legal documents or professional journals) which are presumed to embody legitimate or accepted values. More often though, the source of the gender representation is the media (trade catalogues, films and books). In this latter case there is no reliable authorising body and the scholar cannot assume that there is any accuracy in the representation or that the findings of the research may be extrapolated to other cases. At best the media representation might be seen to embody cultural stereotypes and common fantasies. Nevertheless, the study of media depictions of gendered space is still useful because the mainstream media shapes and is in turn influenced by, community values. The present paper is about cinematic and media representation; it deals with the way in which Hollywood films and the *Playboy* magazine depict gendered behaviour in the architecture of John Lautner. The paper accepts that

such depictions are necessarily artificial but maintains that these media stereotypes, in some limited way, shape and reflect popular culture.

The Malin (Chemosphere) House

The Chemosphere House (1961) remains Lautner's most famous work, achieving an iconic status within the architectural culture of Los Angeles.¹³ The Chemosphere House, despite a long association with bachelor lifestyles, was originally designed as a family house for up to five inhabitants. The client Leonard Malin was an aeronautical engineer who, like Lautner, had a fascination with technology and the future. The completed Malin House consists of a singular concrete support from which the major spaces of the house are cantilevered. Alan Hess describes the layout of the space as follows:

the main living area faces the view and, in a way typical of modern architecture of the time, incorporates kitchen, dining and living room in one comfortably continuous space, open but well defined. Built in sofas line the windows, and a fireplace, set in a semicircular brick inglenook at the centre of the house varies the space. The master bedroom and bath are off the living room, and the children's rooms are a large space intended to be divided by a movable partition.¹⁴

A recurring theme within Lautner's architecture is the suggestion of a continual flow of space and, at a certain level, the absorption of pragmatic spaces (like the kitchen) into other more spacious entertainment areas. It is this spatial bias (which privileges the social at the expense of the domestic) that renders his architecture susceptible to masculine readings because the stereotypical "feminine" spaces of the house are marginalised.¹⁵

Another common characteristic of Lautner's designs is that many of his buildings occupy spectacular sites, on steeply sloping cliffs or rocky outcrops, which enjoy extensive views over the surrounding landscape. A number of Lautner residences are sited on Mulholland Drive and its associated arteries in the Hollywood hills with commanding panoramic views over the sprawling city below. The Chemosphere House represents the most spectacular example of this. While the central structural support of the Chemosphere House left the sensitive (symbolically virgin) cliff face relatively untouched, it served to exercise a far greater power over the site, that of surveillance. Although Lautner's design preserved the land beneath it, its height and configuration dominated all of the land surrounding it. The power relationships implicit in this kind of architectural gesture are explored by Andrea Kahn in her essay "Overlooking: A Look at How We Look at Site."¹⁶ Kahn demonstrates the way in which overlooking is, in the manner of Bentham's panopticon, a means of establishing spatial control and disempowering the surrounding landscape. As a result, for Kahn the science of analysing the site should not be restricted to the site itself, but the inevitable consequences that result beyond it. Cat-

egorising the various modes of viewing, she arrives at “overlooking as ‘looking down upon’ in the sense of ‘supervising’ or ‘supra-intending’—suggesting the presence of possible mechanisms of control.”¹⁷ Kahn considers that buildings that hover over sites not only offer an “aestheticised point of view” but serve to homogenise the landscape and frame it within a singular perspective. For Kahn this perspective is necessarily masculine; because “the operations of overlooking are aspects of gendered production, structured and reinforcing a dominant patriarchal order.”¹⁸

The complicity that exists between surveillance and patriarchy is also acknowledged by Joel Sanders as one of his four strategies for “[enhancing] male performance”. As Sanders writes,

[a]rchitecture regulates subjectivity not only through the arrangement of objects in particular spatial structures but also through the organization of spectatorship within those same spaces. From panoptic prisons to pornographic theaters, numerous building types endow men with visual authority while relegating disempowered subjects—especially women—to the position of scopophilic objects.¹⁹

These panoptic qualities, already profoundly inherent in the circular, glazed Chemosphere house are exaggerated throughout the movie *Body Double* by Brian de Palma. Significantly *Body Double* takes the techniques of spatial voyeurism as its primary theme. In this instance Lautner’s house becomes a site from where its single male inhabitant surveys Hollywood as it unfolds before the house. More sinister however is its capacity for voyeurism wherein the male inhabitant secretly watches his female neighbour through a telescope. The vantage point offered by the house structures the inhabitant’s gaze over neighbouring houses and directly invades their privacy and spatial independence. It is from this vantage point that the central character observes the murder of his female neighbour.

Such themes of panopticism are further attenuated in the movie because aspects of the original house are restructured to exaggerate this panoptic capacity. This becomes most evident in the reconfigured bedroom in the Chemosphere House where a mechanically rotating bed dominates the space of the film. A scene from the movie shows the central character, positioned under the sheets of the bed taking in a range of views as the bed slowly rotates; first the view of the expanding city beyond, then the large television screen inside the house (on which adult films are being played) and then back to the city below once more. The bed has also become round, mimicking the bed in Hugh Hefner’s own infamous house²⁰ and simultaneously stressing the centralised location of a new visual power. The gently rotating bed provides a total perspective, no longer inhibited by the restrictions implicit in a singular viewpoint and exercising a continuous and unobstructed gaze over the room and the surroundings. The viewer is forced to continually change his point of reference so that, as in the panopticon, no part of the landscape can escape his (or her) gaze.

Throughout de Palma’s film, the Malin house is presented as a bastion of male supremacy which, in its siting, execution and program of surveillance, exerts a controlling influence over the landscape and, in particular, the female “other”.²¹ The atmospheric “darkness” that pervades the house throughout the movie also subverts the “homely” qualities of Lautner’s original design and recasts it as a space of indolence, sporadically punctuated with perverse sexual exploits and excessive drinking. Significantly, throughout the movie the bar, replaces the kitchen as the central and dominant space of the house. In de Palma’s *Body Double* Lautner’s house is stripped of other meanings and is presented, in its purest form, as the natural habitat of the voyeuristic male recluse.

Lautner’s Malin house again underwent profound changes when it became the lair for the arch-villain at the centre of the recent *Charlie’s Angels* revival. The house, significantly in this case rebuilt in a studio and substantially redesigned, is the backdrop for a number of key exchanges in the movie, including a scene where the character played by Drew Barrymore is thrown violently through one of its full-height windows and falls to the rocky undergrowth below. Perhaps more importantly, earlier in the film the house was the setting for the formation of a relationship between Barrymore and the villain; a plot arc situated in the house and which involves flirtation, the performance of various domestic tasks (such as cooking) and a climactic scene of sexual congress. Just as in *Body Double*, so too in *Charlie’s Angels* the Malin house is transformed by the director, altering its original mood and intent. The house was rebuilt for the movie at almost twice the original size and many of the interior spaces were considerably altered to exaggerate their materiality and spatial disposition. This process of reconstruction serves to celebrate the sensual materialism of Lautner’s original design, doubling the surface area and, as a result, the capacity of these surfaces for interpretation. Catherine Ingraham, in her essay “Sexuality and the Line”, argues that the line (as drawn on a page) pretends to harbour an impartiality but, when materialised as a wall, becomes the manifestation of profoundly materialistic themes. Importantly Ingraham conducted a series of experiments that involved doubling the size of lines and observing them through magnification.²² This led Ingraham to argue that the wall should be read as a textural, rather than visual architectural element which is sometimes sexual and occasionally erotic.²³ Ingraham writes that within such architecture,

the mythology of “touch,” for example, might come into play, as well as the very well-developed discourse of materials (steel, stone, glass, wood, brick, cloth, brass, aluminum, slate, lead, and so on). This vocabulary is sensual without being explicitly sexual but, ironically, it is here that the geometric line first clarifies itself as not only not being in opposition to this order of the sensual but, in fact, extending this sensuality to the sphere of the sexual by giving a vital structure—a body—to this surface erotica. (And, it turns out, this surface erotica tells us a good deal about the aspirations of that body.) The cool geometric line in architecture, in fact, harbors a hot materiality.²⁴

In the context of the sensually burdened Chemosphere House, the doubling of the scale of the surface detail in Charlie's Angels results in an overbearing sensuality; manifest in the luscious fabric curtains, slickly polished floors, selected designer furniture and thinly supported glazing. In this way the house becomes a sanguine, engorged and priapic simulacra; like Ingraham's enlarged line. When Barrymore's character breaks through the glass façade of the building she not only terminates her relationship with the enemy, but simultaneously deflates the manifest sexuality of the reconstructed building and its bestial lines.²⁵

The Elrod House

A number of themes related to sexuality and masculinity that are explored in the Chemosphere House are also implicit within Lautner's 1968 Elrod House. The sensual curvilinear plan, like that of the Chemosphere House, proscribes a free flowing, profoundly Modernist space with little differentiation between functional zones. The Elrod House was commissioned by the well-known interior designer Arthur Elrod, who was to use the structure both as a workplace and a home.²⁶ In this instance the typology of the "bachelor pad" is apparent when the bedroom extends directly into the vast living space. Extroverted outdoor spaces line the periphery of the plan and provide seamless places where social (public) and domestic (private) interaction merge; another characteristic of the "bachelor pad". All of these aspects of the house were superbly captured when it appeared in *Playboy* as "The Playboy Pad: Pleasure on the Rocks". The editors described the work as a "masculine home-office where Elrod can entertain, work or relax within the same dramatically designed premises."²⁷ The photographs that accompany the article present the work as the quintessential bachelor pad, peopled with swimsuit-clad models, stylish furniture and well-dressed male figures. Space here has become laced with sexual promise at the expense of the representation of any other aspect of daily life. Even Elrod's own office is presented as a site of sexual encounter rather than a more mundane place of work. While *Playboy's* misogynist and onanistic leanings no doubt coloured the way in which Lautner's work was presented in such articles, the editors of *Playboy* were drawn to identify the Elrod House as the ultimate residence for the libertine male for the range of spatial and functional reasons outlined above.

One of the most interesting dimensions of the design of the Elrod House is the means by which it was created. The site rests within a gated community but, in a number of ways, directly challenges the uniform suburban lifestyles implied by this. When Lautner visited the site he immediately sought to undermine the orthodoxy it prescribed. As Hess records, when Lautner first visited the site it had been flattened by developers. "Noticing an outcropping of boulders, [Lautner] had Elrod scrape another ten feet of dirt off the pad to reveal the natural boulders he would feature in the living room."²⁸ Such an intervention could be seen as representing Lautner's urge to shape the landscape, in this case returning it to a more natural state and challenging the homogenous landscaping that had previously been imposed upon it.²⁹ This

approach, like that used in the Chemosphere House, partially conforms to the kind of masculine/patriarchal paradigm articulated by Andrea Kahn where the attitude to the site is one of conquest and control rather than of negotiation and mutual cooperation.³⁰

In 1971 the Elrod House, then only a few years old, became the site for the most single-mindedly heterosexual-masculine film series ever created; it became a set for a James Bond movie. As in the case of Lautner's house in *Charlie's Angels*, the Elrod House in *Diamonds are Forever* is the villain's lair, used to imprison the displaced business man Willard Whyte. Unlike the space described in *Playboy*, the villain's house is a fortress and, as Hess notes, it is depicted on film in all of

its sybaritic modernity [which] gives it a decadent edge, reflecting the danger of living at the edge. Its modern art and furniture, along with the go-go girl/guards Bambi and Thumper, mark it as the complete space age bachelor pad; [...] showing off the swinging sixties colors and mod furnishings that, in many original furnishings of Lautner houses, perfectly matched the fashionable cutting-edge lifestyle of the architecture.³¹

Architectural historians have noted that the association with James Bond forms a large part of the Lautner mystique. For example, Hess describes the personal affiliation with fast cars that Lautner harboured.³² More pertinent was the array of gadgets and innovations which were incorporated in many of his houses. In his obituary to Lautner in *Progressive Architecture*, Hess saw in the plush Silvertop residence "walls of glass that silently disappeared at the touch of a button, high-tech toilets that flushed without a whisper, solid walls that pivoted to become windows."³³

Faulting the Bachelor Pad?

A possible postscript to the forces of cinematic masculinity that have become inseparable from Lautner's architecture are those which, through similar mechanisms, have sought to tear it apart. For example, in *Lethal Weapon II* Lautner's 1962 Garcia House becomes the fortress for yet another evil villain and it is ultimately violently destroyed by Mel Gibson's character. Gibson, using his four-wheel drive, attaches a chain to one of the monumental V-shaped structural supports of the house tearing it (however improbably) from its foundation and causing the entire house to crash to the ground. In the aftermath Gibson is depicted, not unlike Howard Roark in *The Fountainhead*, standing in front of the flaming ruins, grunting and screaming with delight at his revenge over the villain. In this cinematic sequence the culture of masculinity, collides with the architecture, rather than becoming the latent manifestation of it, that is implied in Lautner's other houses.

Yet, the destruction of the evil bachelor pad at the hands of a heroic bachelor, complete with its animalistic undertones (including Gibson's primitive reaction), is not without further interest. In contrast to the

Garcia House Gibson's bachelor lives in a stranded and decrepit caravan, his spaces merge into one for practical, not architectural reasons, and his domestic life-style is haphazard, inward-looking and defiantly at odds with Lautner's bachelor pad. This realisation is particularly important because Lautner's houses have indeed been depicted in films more often as lairs, than as homes; the inhabitants are typically decadent, predatory and aloof males. Furthermore, in such films Lautner's houses are frequently the site of violent events (in the short scene in *Diamonds are Forever*, for instance, the house becomes the scene for a martial arts style sequence as well as a later gun battle). While it cannot be suggested that a cinematic depiction has any innate validity for architectural speculations about gender, it may still be significant that the archetypal bachelor pad is as much a site of misery as it is of pleasure. This is most apparent in the film version of Bret Easton Ellis's *Less than Zero* where Lautner's Silvertop house (1963) provides the *mise en scene* for a tale that follows the self-destructive path of a wealthy, young man whose bachelor ways (drugs, parties and sex) eventually lead to his downfall.

While a small number of previous scholars have suggested that Lautner's architecture is complicit in the formation of overtly masculine spaces (and the present paper provides a deeper reading of this argument) the latter realisation that it is also appears to be the site *par excellence* of a kind of fictional or symbolic violence has not previously been noted. The bachelor pad, at least in filmic depictions of Lautner's architecture, is as much a scene of tragedy as it is of dominance. This suggests a previously unforseen characteristic of the bachelor pad type of gendered space that is worthy of future investigation.

¹ Dolores Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighbourhoods and Cities*, Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1981. See also: Dolores Hayden, *Redesigning the American Dream: The Future of Housing, Work and Family Life*, New York: W. W Norton, 2002.

² Alice T. Friedman, *Women and the Making of the Modern House: A Social and Architectural History*, New York: Abrams, 1998.

³ George Chauncey, *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture and the Makings of the Gay Male World, 1890-1940*, New York: Basic Books, 1994.

⁴ Joel Sanders, *Stud: Architectures of Masculinity*, New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996.

⁵ George Wagner, 'The Lair of the Bachelor' in Debra Coleman, Elizabeth Danze and Carol Henderson, eds. *Architecture and Feminism*, New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996, pp. 183-221.

⁶ Curiously Lautner's houses have also served as the backdrop for many fashion shoots (memorably including one in Italian Vogue, No 595, in 2000) which have been intended to depict the glamorous lifestyle of the single woman. The resulting fashion photos have a paradoxically strong resemblance to those in the *Playboy* magazines despite being for completely different readerships. This realisation resonates with Friedman's analysis of modern architecture and the type of spaces found in Lautner's designs. See: Maria Luisa Frisa, Mario Lupano and Stefano Tonchi eds. *Total Living*, Rome: Charta, 2003, pp. 46-50.

⁷ Wagner, 'The Lair of the Bachelor', p. 95.

⁸ See, for example: Jonathan Colman, 'The Wright Stuff,' GQ: Gentlemen's Quarterly 70, 3 (March 2000) p. 122.

⁹ Curiously, the television cartoon series *The Simpsons*, once featured (c1994) an animated version of the Malin House as the abode of a failed, male actor.

¹⁰ For example, see Paglia's argument connecting female anatomy to spatial influence. See: Camille Paglia, *Sexual Personae: Art and*

Decadence From Nefertiti to Emily Dickinson, New York: Vintage Books, 1990.

¹¹ Agrest's research into the relationship between bodies and gender in architectural production is a well known example that traces the gendering of architecture through abstraction. See: Diana I. Agrest, *Architecture From Without: Theoretical Framings for a Critical Practice*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1991.

¹² See the discussion in: Catherine Ingraham, 'Initial proprieties: Architecture and the space of the line,' in Beatriz Colomina (ed.) *Sexuality and Space*, New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1992, pp 261-267.

¹³ In recent years the Chemosphere House has been owned by Angelika and Benedikt Taschen; famous publishers of books that cover the spectrum of art, architecture and erotica. See: Maria Luisa Frisa, et.al. *Total Living*, pp.50-51.

¹⁴ Alan Hess, *The Architecture of John Lautner*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1999, p. 109.

¹⁵ The same architectural strategy can also be read as being complicit in the emancipation of women; perhaps explaining the curious dual role of Lautner's houses simplistically used as sets in fashion magazines (for women) and action films (for men).

¹⁶ Andrea Kahn, 'Overlooking: A Look at How We Look at Site or...Site as "Discreet Object" of Desire' in Katerina Rüedi, Sarah Wigglesworth and Duncan McCorquodale (eds), *Desiring Practices: Architecture, Gender and the Interdisciplinary*, London: Black Dog Publishing, 1996, pp. 174-185.

¹⁷ Kahn, 'Overlooking,' p. 178.

¹⁸ Kahn, "Overlooking," p. 178.

¹⁹ Source: Joel Sanders, "Introduction", in Joel Sanders (ed.) *Stud: Architectures of Masculinity*, New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996, p. 12.

²⁰ Wagner, "The Lair of the Bachelor" pp. 184.

²¹ The American director and writer Brian de Palma, often described stylistically as a follower of Alfred Hitchcock, has been responsible for a number of films which explore covert surveillance, masculine identity, vision, power and memory. De Palma's *Sisters* (1973) *Dressed To Kill* (1980), *Blow Out* (1981), *Snake Eyes* (1998) and *Femme Fatale* (2002), like *Body Double* (1984), are all sexually laden films that involve covert surveillance and/or the female "other". Significantly *Blow Out* is inspired by Michelangelo Antonioni's famous *Blow Up* (1967); the quintessential tale of sexual politics, the power of the technologically framed gaze and masculine fascination. De Palma's female "others" are admittedly a more complex set of characters than the stereotypical form depicted in *Body Double*; heterosexual female and lesbian voyeurs, male cross-dressers and exhibitionists (of both genders) contradict a simple reading of the "other" as necessarily female in de Palma's work.

²² Catherine T. Ingraham, "Lines and Linearity: Problems in Architectural Theory", in Andrea Kahn (ed), *Drawing Building Text*, New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1991, pp. 63-84;

²³ See: Michael J. Ostwald and R. John Moore, "The Mapping of Architectural and Cartographic Faults: Troping the Proper and the Significance of (Coast) Lines." *Architectural Theory Review*, Vol 3, No 1 (1998), pp. 4-45

²⁴ Catherine T. Ingraham, "Initial proprieties: Architecture and the space of the line," in Beatriz Colomina (ed.) *Sexuality and Space* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1992), p. 267.

²⁵ See also: Catherine T. Ingraham, "The Burdens of Linearity", in John Whiteman, Jeffrey Kipnis, Richard Burdett (eds), *Strategies of Architectural Thinking*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1992, pp. 130-147.

²⁶ See: Barbara-Ann Campbell-Lange, *John Lautner*, London: Taschen, 1999, pp. 104-111.

²⁷ Anon, "The Playboy Pad: Pleasure on the Rocks", *Playboy*, (November 1971,) p. 151.

²⁸ Hess, *The Architecture of John Lautner*, p. 115.

²⁹ While this argument could be countered, in that it could be proposed that Lautner is reconstructing the original landscape, the new landscape is neither original, nor as it was before he arrived on site.

³⁰ Kahn, "Overlooking," 184.

³¹ Hess, *The Architecture of John Lautner*, p. 18.

³² Hess, *The Architecture of John Lautner*, p. 12.

³³ Hess, *The Architecture of John Lautner*, p. 16.