



Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane Australia

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted/accepted for publication in the following source:

Brott, Simone & Kwinter, Sanford (2003) *The Deleuze Spray, New York 1977 : an Interview with Sanford Kwinter, Professor of Architectural Theory and Criticism at the Harvard Graduate School of Design, on the Architectural Reception of Gilles Deleuze in America*. Subjectivizations : Deleuze and Architecture (Masters Thesis).

This file was downloaded from: <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/67947/>

© Copyright 2003 The Author(s)

Notice: *Changes introduced as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing and formatting may not be reflected in this document. For a definitive version of this work, please refer to the published source:*

Sanford Kwinter, Interview
The Deleuze Spray, New York 1977-
Jerry's, NY, January 15, 2003
Simone Brott

So what do you want to know? I was in Paris between '75 and '78. But about half way through, Sylvère published the *Anti-Oedipus* issue of *Semiotext(e)* and, actually, that was for me one of the deciding events that made me decide to come to the United States, to come study at Columbia University. There appeared to be this little group working at Columbia working around these issues. In 1970, in Paris even, Deleuze was a cult – there was an incredibly small number of people following Deleuze.

Who were those people?

A lot of the guys from the sixties, around May 1968, etc. I knew a handful of them, two or three brits, two or three Japanese guys and how many americans?...I can tell you this: the only one that I met in my time was Brian Massumi. I met Brian in the Foucault seminar. He hadn't gotten interested in Deleuze yet. That was in Paris 1976/7. I was primarily interested in Foucault at that time. I had started going to the Deleuze seminar because I was taken there by an interesting friend Jacques Sotrol [?] Jacques Sotrol was the director of research for the architectural department in the Ministry of Culture. The reason I think this is interesting is he was an ardent follower of Deleuze, right since '68 and I was not in the architectural field but he was just a good buddy of mine; he took me to the seminar. The appeal of Deleuze to the architectural field, I realise now, goes way back. That's where I started.

Why did you go to Paris?

I was studying philosophy in Canada and I was escaping the logical positivist tradition of philosophy in Canada. I had gone to France because I heard about structuralism. I had gotten a whiff of Foucault and went there to see what it was all about and became totally obsessed, in a way, by Foucault and there was so much going on...

Did you talk with Foucault?

Sure I talked to Foucault. He wrote me my letter of recommendation to get into Columbia – which, by the way, fell flat. They had no idea who he was and those who knew said: 'we don't want any of that here...'

When is this?

1978. I'll tell you what happened in 1978 which is fascinating. Sylvère Lotringer in the french department has already published this wild shit based on the most important politics of metaphysics from France, whereas the English department, where I applied to—comparative literature—had only at that point – the closest they had gotten to this stuff is Edward Said's book *Beginnings*—Have you ever heard of *Beginnings*?—in which

Said had published a large chapter on Foucault, but the rest of the English department was fairly hostile. I thought I was going to walk in like a cake walk to Columbia because, you know, I had an incredible background at the time in linguistics—all the stuff that seemed to matter so much for English studies. That Foucault letter did not go in my favour, let me tell you. Of course I got in.

This is just off the record. I never received an admittance from Columbia and so I went to Said. We met in Paris. Said said: 'Don't worry, you're in.' I flew to New York to find out what was going on and when I got there they couldn't find my application; it was sitting on someone's desk. And I was there in late May; I had already missed the ordinary admittance procedures. They told me, in order to get admitted I had to take my envelope and to go to each persons office and get them to sign a paper and say it was ok. They said: 'don't look inside the envelope' and I did—I looked inside and what I noticed were the comments they made on my application. I was amazed to see what I took to be incredible provincialism on their part. These are big English professors. I thought I had a killer application whereas these guys were expressing deep reservations. That anecdote is just to point out to you this strange scene in the US as its happening at the time.

Did you apply to study Foucault and Deleuze?

I was still Foucault at the time. In America if you wanted to study that kind of stuff, philosophy in what they called the continental tradition, you had to do it under the auspices of a comparative literature department which was the most radical, free, curricularly free department in America. In the 1970s and early 80s the intellectual scene was far, *far* from having accepted the influence of these trends in, you know, thinking and method. The haven for them was in the french departments. I, personally, could not go into a french department—for my own personal reasons I would not go into a french department...

But Massumi said his PhD thesis—the translation of *Mille Plateaux*—was almost failed by the french department at Yale.

It was unorthodox to accept a translation. On the other hand, Massumi's translation is worth two PhDs. The ground work he did, it is a masterpiece. He read almost all the source material. When you look at the footnotes, the foundations of *A Thousand Plateaus*...I was aware of Massumi's problems, he used to call me up.

I can tell you the people that were reading Deleuze in those years. I didn't really start getting seriously interested in Deleuze until 1980. Until then it was just Foucault. I was trying to put together a foucauldian history of space for my PhD – from the Egyptians to Einstein. I'm still doing it. Said turned on me. I went originally to study with him. Edward Said was my first advisor. The relationship soured after a year.

There was a cult thing that happened. Sylvère Lotringer had a seminar in 1978. It was a deleuzo and post-Deleuzian seminar. It was very deleuzian and very post Deleuzian even though most of us weren't even at the point of being proto-deleuzian.

What about Guattari? How do they come together? Was it all Deleuze?

It was all Deleuze. We met Guattari, we hung out with him at his parties, we met his daughter. We had dinner with him. Eventually with Sylvère it just became a big old fucking party. A bunch of old post 60s hippies hanging out. For Sylvère the whole thing has always been a big intellectual party, he never separated the two. I just want to point out, it was so unColumbia, the seminar of Sylvère. Remember in the 1978-seminar-Sylvère-thing he would bring in pimps, hoars, dominatrix's and schizophrenics—to Columbia.

What would the pimps and hoars do?

They were culturally and politically schizophrenic. Inherent radicalised human beings and they were brought to us. They were interesting people. I mean he didn't just bring in any pimps and hoars. He was hanging out in some nasty places. Those things he was fucking around with. Those days he was polysexual. New York city was a deleuzian plane of immanence. It was being exploited for that. The point is that in that seminar there were a lot of film makers including Kathryn Bigelow. If you want to see a crypto deleuzian in Hollywood...

What was the point of the seminar?

It was in the french department. All I can remember is that I always took all of Sylvère's seminars. It was about literature and desire. Ostensibly.

Was it serious or just a party?

No no. He would give these totally incoherent lectures but it was completely structured in the columbian manner. You know it was a Columbia seminar. Everybody sat around a table. They would talk incomprehensibly for an hour and a quarter then there would be this and that. Some of them are still deleuzians. There was Michael Oblowitz, a film maker. They are Crypto-deleuzians. We all worked on *Semiotext(e)* Everyone worked on it when they had to get an issue out, copy editing, proof reading, etc. Look at the names of the people who helped out. You will see people like Oblowitz and Kathryn. These people were here before I got here in '78. Rajchman was here. Now Rajchman wasn't taking seminars with us because he was much older and he was already gone. He had already graduated before I got there

What is Rajchman's role in the scene?

Rajchman started a foucauldian working closely with Sylvère and he helped out a lot with *Semiotext(e)*. There was a whole generation of them. Rajchman, Moshenberg...[also gone by the time you got here?] But when I got there they were working on an issue on Schizoculture. [I thought they had left?] The *Schizoculture* conference, I missed. It was '77, before I got there.

You should talk to Sylvère. He's an incredible guy. His parents were french jews. They had to change his name in the 40's. Sylvère is a very interesting character. It was said of him the minute he got tenure he started turning up to class in jeans and leather jackets and never taught another academic 18th century seminar again – Marquis de Sade, Blanchot, everything that was sort of fashionable. Still in the late 70s, the atmosphere—the literary establishment, from these ivy league universities—was still formally hostile and unaccepting of this stuff, including Foucault who is the least wild. Said, of course, who was the first to bring it into the English department – he himself – it was a totally Marxist reading of Foucault.

It was a post '68 kind of a place. Out of that seminar, at one point as well, came *Zone*. That's where I met the people.

Michel Feher?

Yeah, he was from Belgium

And Hal Foster?

Hal could never handle any of that stuff. To this day he still doesn't know how to read Deleuze. His name is only on the early issues.

How did the group come together?

I had this idea. I was writing for the Art Journals. American Art of the 60s and 70s was equal in brilliance to European philosophy of the 60s and 70s and extraordinarily similar in many ways in terms of the new kinds of spaces and modalities that they were opening up.

Who were you writing for?

Art in America. In NYC in the 50s 60s and absolutely in the 70s right in to the 80s you could not be an intellectual in the city without engaging art. It's hard to imagine from today's perspective but art was radical, profound and serious. It was also extremely organised and coherent in the sense you could discuss historical movements in a scientific way. Art was a form of political, historical research, up until the 80s. I don't want to argue anything positivistic, but in the sense that it was historically coherent. It wasn't just like doing anything. Today you do whatever you want, who cares? It's amusing, you can put it in a gallery, someone will try and sell it for you. Art then was linked to historical development. Since 1948 you can compare it to developments in cinema, what's going on...Everyone dealt with art. Public intellectuals. Most of us interested and engaged would write about art. I taught art history for the New School. I didn't know any intellectuals who were not engaged with art.

It was one of the best ways also, for me, for taking this philosophy that I had learned in France, and finding an incredibly adequate venue for developing the concepts. I didn't want to be part of a sort of arcane literary avant-garde. Nobody in America had read the new ideas, yet the European ideas of the late 50s through the 70s and the new art in America—minimalism, post-minimalism and all the stuff that ensued from that—in my mind, can only be understood from using the new body of concepts.

Zone was born from a different generation. Sylvère was still from the war generation, the equivalent of a concentration camp survivor, [Sanford, what does this mean? I want to be accurate about this if it's true. Was he born after the war, did his parents in fact survive concentration camps or somehow hide in France the whole time?] still working through 68. [Sanford, it sounds strange. Working through '68 is v. different from working through the holocaust with your parents...] Whereas for us without a doubt, I was Canadian—[the rest of this sentence was obscured by the sound track]

So when you say we, who were the people in this new generation?

In Zone, it was Jonathan Crary, an art historian, Feher who was doing sort of philosophy and literature, and myself. I invited Rajchman to the first meeting. He called me up an hour after the meeting and said: 'Sanford, I don't think I can do this.' I think he just saw Semiotext(e) rising up in front of his eyes again. He couldn't deal with it. He backed out. But it was good. We would never have been able to do it with Rajchman. So we went ahead.

Another important person was John Johnston. John was part of our group, informally. He moved to LA to teach so was never included in our editorial board.

Was he in the seminar?

Yes.

John had worked on many Semiotext(e)s too; he was older than us and had been there in earlier years. He wrote a fairly notorious article which is in the first three issues of *October* [magazine] on the *Spiral Jetty* of Smithson and *Gravity's Rainbow*, a monumental piece of gibberish. It was the most exciting thing, in a weird way, that had happened in literary studies. Why? Because it was a combination of french philosophy, American literary aesthetics and american art. And these are the two most brilliant works of art produced in America since the second world war. Gravity's rainbow is the greatest novel written in the last 30, 40 years in America and Spiral Jetty is the greatest post war american work of art. I still believe that. I believed it 25 years ago And it was an incredibly ambitious attempt to sort of run it through the structuralist mill and give it a whole new kind of intellectual existence.

But at first it didn't make a lot of sense and they hadn't really mastered all of the french ideas, etc. And it was very early. We're looking at 76/77. It was totally cutting edge. Exciting as hell. I was totally psyched. This is the environment I came to. I left Paris to come to here in New York. OK there's Sylvère and there's Said and the work he's doing in the English department and there's October magazine and especially what John Johnston did. This essentially turned into the great deleuzian cauldron, when I got here, and it was absolutely focused at Columbia and that's thanks to Sylvère. There is no doubt about it, the Deleuze thing was focused at Columbia in New York.

Now the conference that you asked me about—this is going to take us nine years to complete—I had only heard rumours about. Sylvère, this was the year in which New York turned all of their schizzos and all of their mental patients into the streets, deciding no longer to confine them. Foucault got spat on when he was here in New York. He got roughed up too.

And the stories of fist fights at the symposium?

We all know the stories but you want to hear it from Sylvère. Sylvère invited all the schizzos living in the streets to the conference. The *Village Voice* published something totally erroneous saying Foucault is a KGB agent. People came, it was a madhouse from what I understand. Get the story from Sylvère.

And what about the Ontologico Hysterical Theater that were rumored to have hidden in the audience?

Every conference at Columbia has a back person that disrupts it but this sounded pretty heavy. It was already a legend a year and a half later when I got to New York. It was, like, '76.

What about Derrida, also at the Schizoculture symposium. He's not visible in this scene, is he?

I'm biased. The answer is no. Derrida was just starting to teach at Yale but the Yale department started to become very derridean, which is essentially why Massumi had such a rough time.

Derrida wrote one essay in Semiotext(e) called "Becoming-Woman" and it seems to predate Deleuze's essay Becoming-woman. It's about style.

It's about Nietzsche.

Everything was wild and exciting in those days. But Derrida was of no interest, no importance – nothing but academic and philosophy criticism. It was important. As I used to see it, Columbia was the foucauldian/deleuzian school, Yale was derridean and John Hopkins was basically derridean too. But because I was at Columbia I started to identify it. I wasn't sure about any of it before I came. I just happened to land at the right place.

That's the late 70s basically. There was still a bit of resistance and nobody knew the work.

Rhizome came out in French around 1977, published by Minuit, the normal publisher of Deleuze. I had the book. I was reading it, I was meditating on it. I didn't know what to make of it but I got to New York around 1978 and by 1979 [check date] the *Nouveau Philosophe*—Henri Levi, Andre Glucksman, Jean-Marie Bounoit [?]
—they are a complete break with the [_____break with what?] When I got to New York, sometime around 79/80, on the art scene something new emerges called *Postmodernism*. No one knows what it is.

It seems late.

Yeah, that's when it started. I can tell you the precise day it was inaugurated.

At the institution for Urban Design and Architecture they hold a seminar and they invite Julian Schnabel, David Sally and Sherry Levine – and it's moderated by Christian Hubert, a friend of mine used to teach at Yale. Something new emerged in the art world. Sherry Levine is taking photos of other peoples photographs and presenting it as her own. Schnabel is throwing broken plates at his canvas so it's a return to heroic painting in the era when painting is dead – meaning it's a slap in the face to the philosophical historically driven, research based aesthetic practice. It's a panel discussion. I'm just a young kid that knows the french stuff. Christian Hubert comes uptown. I've been in Columbia for a year and a half. I've been sucker punched into studying 19th century literature just because I have to do my requirements and its Columbia's strength. Christian comes, takes me out to dinner and he wants to pick my brain. He says he has to moderate this conference and he wants to know: WHAT IS POSTMODERNISM? He wants to bone up and have something to say. At that point I had a crisis. I said, this is what *I'm* supposed to do, this is *my* thing. Why am I fucking myself in the 19th century reading Dickens, Marx?—it's very good in part—but suddenly I realise I'm giving him answers to what it is. I say, all the shit you're reading about postmodernism it's all bullshit.

Postmodernism is one thing and one thing only. I don't say I agree with this now. I'm telling you what I said in 1979 or 1980. I said, Postmodernism doesn't exist all, all it is post-humanism. I said get it straight in your head. It's not always been against modernism. [this was hard to hear, is this what you said?] In the first issue of *Zone*, there wasn't a single mention of the word [Postmodernism] except once in my own article where I'm sort of denouncing it. That's when it occurs to me that Rhizome is the most succinct existing vision of what is important today because this is a description of the new space. Not the bullshit that you're reading about all these people who are still reading their Barthes and their Derrida. I suddenly realised it's fucking Rhizome. At which point that was it for me. I started harassing all these critics.

Who were these critics?

The critics who were championing this were Craig Owens, Hal Foster – to a smaller degree Rosslyn Krauss. They were theorising this whole new thing, bringing in Warhol; they were interested in media, simulation—all this bullshit I couldn't stand. Basically it was not clear and it was not fundamental philosophical thinking. That's when I suddenly realise, 1980, Rhizome takes on this whole new importance for me.

What is intriguing in this is while Postmodernism is being articulated, there is this entire Deleuze scene in the background.

I suddenly changed my perspective. Abandoning the 19th century.

Why Rhizome?

It was the only thing that had come out. We'd all read *Anti-Oedipus*. But *Anti-Oedipus* is not the same thing. *Anti-Oedipus* is a Hegelian, Freudian Marxist interpretation of history. He's developing the production model of desire but it hasn't turned into a whole reflection on historical space, as it gets developed in the second volume. *Rhizome* is an incredible departure in thinking. And they brought it out as a separate book and it wasn't until 1981 that the full book of *A Thousand Plateaus* comes out. And I was one of the only people who could read it in French when it first came out. *Rhizome* was published by Minuit as a tiny book and then four years later my friend John Johnston translated it. It was an incredible little book. No one knew what to make of it. It hit me like a brick. Christian Hubert came uptown to ask me about postmodernism...and I had an epiphany.

But the context – it was only by chance. I wasn't in architecture. I was interested in it, but I was doing literature, linguistics, philosophy, art – and it was an architect that came and asked me the question and it played an amazing role. It's essentially been driven by architects. Even the fact that I was dragged into the Deleuze seminar. The architects were always the ones who brought the issues to my attention. Jacques Sortreau in Paris. Never was Deleuze mentioned that day at the Institute. I was in the audience. I was prepared to attack the critics. It was sponsored by the institute, David Sally, Julian Schnabel, Shelly Levine and Craig Owens. Craig was defending Levine's baudrillardian simulation practice against the painters – against Sally and Schnabel.

There was nobody who was reading Deleuze that I didn't know about in those days. They would have found me, or they would have been circulating around Sylvère or Columbia. We knew them all. John Rajchman had read *Anti-Oedipus* and had even written about it.

He wrote the introduction to the *Anti-Oedipus* issue of *Semiotext(e)*.

Right. I remember a particular conversation with him John Johnston and I had. It was like a mugging. We met John Rajchman in 1980 at a conference. So we said to Rajchman because Rajchman was really interested in Paul de Man. So we said to Rajchman: 'How do you go from reading Deleuze to reading Paul de Man – and find it more interesting?' At which point John and I look at each other then we look back at Rajchman and say: 'you know what? You're a stupid fuck and you're lost.' We were arrogant arseholes.

Fifteen years later Rajchman wrote a nice enough book on Deleuze. Rajchman completely dropped the Deleuze thing.

But he keeps publishing new books on Deleuze, even now.

Now—that’s ten years later, 15 years no, actually, 25 years later. He’s started looking at it again. At this point John and I are completely foaming at the mouth because we realise Gravity’s Rainbow and Spiral Jetty—Smithson—is essentially foucault/deleuzianism and were going to rewrite all of american culture based on this stuff. So by the time Sylvère’s little book comes out we can begin teaching it – to teach Rhizome to students. When Sylvère publishes it in English, it means I can start teaching it in New York. And I taught an entire course on that text at the new school of visual arts and was teaching two classes: a deleuzian reading of american art, 20th century art. [S, what was the second class?]

Who were the students?

Nobody really interesting came out of the class. I got fired eventually from the school. The head of the school brought me in right before my seminar and she said: ‘No more Deleuze! No more Deleuze!’ She was Gene S[?] Anyway, at that point I was ready to get out. Somewhere between ‘81 and ‘83. I also started teaching at Parson School Of Design. I taught theory seminars at that school. I taught a class on Deleuze. “Nomadology” came out [“Nomadology” only appears as part of Mille Plateaux. I am not aware of a separate earlier publication. Do you mean “Nomad Art,” which was published in ‘85 in Art and Text?] and I taught an entire course on Mille Plateaux around ‘84.

But Mille Plateaux was not yet in English. [ATP 1987] Did you work from the french?

Yes. And I used Sylvère’s translations. I taught Rhizome and The smooth and the striated. Massumi was sending me chapters of his translations so I could make suggestions and I was probably using his translations and teaching that to the students. They were all architects. Half the class went on to Columbia to do masters degrees at Columbia. I can’t tell you the year; it couldn’t have been later than 85. No one else would have taught a class on Deleuze – and to architects. I was the only one. Massumi hadn’t graduated yet plus the French department wouldn’t have let him do it.

A few people started coming to the seminar I was giving, like editors of *assemblage*. It’s also true that everybody knew I was working on *Zone* the year it came out, 1986. It was largely thanks to Bob McAnulty editor of *Assemblage*, totally anti-Deleuze but at the same time knew it was important and helped change the attitude at *Assemblage*. How did Deleuze get picked up by architecture? It is absolutely the “Smooth and the Striated” that won its interest and popularity in architecture. Not Rhizome. Rhizome remains an obscure text that requires much too much imagination, interpretative imagination. Not many people can teach Rhizome. Massumi, who doesn’t teach architects, Manuel Delanda who in the last six years has been very important because he teaches seminars at

Columbia in the architecture school. By the way, Delanda was in the seminar – that's how I met him.

--

Delanda gives huge primacy to Deleuze and so he's sustaining the Deleuze tradition in architecture school at Columbia. He doesn't teach Deleuze directly but everything he does is so deeply deleuzian. He teaches a little course on complexity theory and the history of technology...totally saturated with deleuzian method and even using the terms totally liberally. Students will be aware of it.

The next guy to get in to Deleuze is [Bob] Somol around 1990. Somol starts reading and talking about Deleuze, but not doing it well because he starts talking about it before he's mastered it. *A Thousand Plateaus* would take a minimum of three years to master in the 1980s, a minimum of two years to master in the '90s and now maybe a minimum of one year. But Somol was the next guy and in my opinion Somol's reading of Deleuze should have put to death the particular reading of Venturi that he is currently still subscribing too. On the other hand, Somol's readings of everything are really very creative and personal at this point. Most of them. Almost all of them.

Somol is part of a group in Chicago which includes Greg Lynn and at this time Somol and I aren't talking to each other because he's offended at my comments about his reading of Deleuze. He's teaching at the University of Illinois Chicago, UIC, architecture school and doing a doctorate at the University of Chicago – and in 1990/1 he's reading Deleuze, and he's presenting papers and writing a bit about Deleuze in an architecture context and teaching Deleuze at UIC. At UIC there's Doug Garaofolo [?] and Greg Lynn – by 1990. Greg Lynn has finished his masters and is working in Eisenman's office and teaching at UIC.

Here's the way I see it. In the 90s, literally reading and teaching Deleuze meant overcoming my foucauldianism. By 1988, James Gleick's *Chaos: Making a New Science* comes out and I have another massive revolution. I realise it's no longer American Art – it's contemporary Science that's the real realm of the deleuzian universe where it all takes place. I have totally assimilated Deleuze so I don't teach Deleuze specifically anymore. The deleuzian project, I feel, is to teach science. In 1990 I am teaching a complexity course at Harvard, January 1991. The class starts with a lecture on Deleuze.

So do you see this as the moment of the depoliticisation of Deleuze—the new developments in contemporary science/mathematics?

A lot happens. One thing you have to realise is *A Thousand Plateaus* makes it hard, especially for America, makes it hard to be political. ATP, It's a deeply political book but it's so fucking imaginative that people no longer see, you know, the hard core revolutionary Marxist foundations anymore here. It's just so full of imagination—I have to say, this is a very sad thing—it's too full of imagination to be seen as political practice. Then again, [if you're going to quote me on this] I want to say this, reading Foucault's

introduction to ATP, I know for me it was a liberatory little essay. As far as I was concerned, everything I was doing was politics after that. Meaning, having a good time was politics. Having a joyous time in the classroom was politics after Foucault's contextualising the deleuzian project.

But for me, the moment of Gleick, that's the point I dropped the explicit Deleuze. I thought doing Deleuze was examining this whole new theory of nature. I spent the '80s teaching Deleuze. Interiorising Deleuze. At Parson's, Toronto and the School of Visual Arts. I stopped doing explicit Deleuze in 1991 feeling like I was obviously a deleuzian at which point Somol picks it up in 1990. Somol gave a lecture in 1990 that infuriated people like Kurt Forster. I teach at UIC in 1992. I think Lynn got his Deleuze from Somol not from me.

What is the connection with your dropping the 'explicit' Deleuze and Somol picking it up at the same time?

Somol didn't keep with it. You couldn't say now that Somol was a deleuzian. But it was definitely creative work that Bob was doing with it. He was five years younger than me and coming to it rather late from a different context and on to that stuff at a very rudimentary level. There were people who were much more advanced than Bob. But, essentially, Greg got it from him. I gave a lecture at UIC called Soft Systems in 1992 and I wrote an article for Eisenman for his biennale show in 1990 or '91 when Greg was working in the office and that's where Greg began to sort of see where the chaos theory connects up to this kind of work.

Greg picked up chaos theory from your article?

Yeah, especially the thing on Eisenman, it's on *oscillation*. The point is that the Chicago scene, UIC 1990/1991, becomes a place out of which Somol and Greg Lynn's deleuzianisms, let's say, begin to get developed. At that point, in most peoples minds, my role in the Deleuze thing probably passes into oblivion. It was earlier, before anyone was paying attention. In the '80s no one was paying attention except for the few people at Assemblage and the few people in non-architectural circles, or the few people I taught in small architectural contexts in various seminars etc. On the other hand, the first class at Harvard—the first lecture, on Deleuze—the syllabus got circulated among many schools. Some of the first people went and did their doctoral theses on Deleuze, Ila Berman. A Few others. For Ila that introduction to Deleuze is what turned her into a rabid rabid deleuzian. Totally out of control.

The '90s, Greg picks it up. Somol picks it up but leaves it behind. Greg unfortunately passes it on to Eisenman who flirts with it briefly and to my incredible anguish because I think he's going to fucking ruin it. Sometime around '93 he gets it from Greg. Eisenman feels that he should, so he does a few things on it. But he doesn't get into it, he doesn't fully understand it. You know what he did to me? You know what he said to me the other day? As recently as the Krier/Eisenman symposium, in the middle of the symposium he

calls over to me and says: 'What does a flow look like?' I looked at him and said: 'Peter, if you don't know by now...' [laughs]

And what did he say?

He just laughed. Because if there's anything anybody knows, it's what a flow looks like. But anyway, if he still doesn't get it, fine – who cares? The point is he'd rather we stopped talking about than he get into it because he's not that into it, because he feels obliged to get into stuff that me and Kipnis are into. Eisenman's becoming very conservative now. In the '90s Eisenman and Cynthia discover Bernard Cache. They go to Paris and visit him in his studio. Cynthia decides to publish his book, and he's extremely deleuzian. Peter never quite gets it, but Cache was an important deleuzian. Greg makes his use of it but he's doing a very eisenmanian use of it. Greg doesn't use it in itself but as a series of justifications and arguments – but he does a pretty interesting job developing his whole Animate Form thing.

If you even mention to Greg Lynn that Deleuze is a social philosopher, he would go blank. Greg just can't see the social, the political-social. The social realm. He's not really a deleuzian. You should ask him: 'Have you ever read Anti-Oedipus and if not why not?' 'Have you ever been interested in the social revolutionary aspects of Deleuze?' 'Have you ever read his book on Spinoza?' You certainly do not have to accept wrong interpretations of extremely important work because ultimately what they do is they censure you and tell you this is what you're reading the book for. They close down the sphere of interpretation. Just look at Deleuze's book. Every sentence is dripping with a systematic world view about the relationships of force and matter and it's totally missing in these little architectural expedient readings to sort of justify a particular move or a particular project or a particular formalism. Would Deleuze ever accept the formalisms? Essentially Greg Lynn is an architect and he uses stuff he picks up in order to help give stories to his forms but we cannot ...

I have had students who wanted to work with me on deleuzian subjects. They all go in different directions. They drop out and their discourse is lost, they never publish it...She [who, again?] became a goalie. Ila got lost in New Orleans. This stuff goes on and on. Their work goes on but it's not getting published. But Deleuze has gotten short shrift. If you're interested in Deleuze, read Deleuze and read Delanda. Delanda is the only thing I tell people in architecture to read. Its fascinating what Greg Lynn and Bernard Cache do but it's not Deleuze; it's not the deleuzian theory of nature.

Deleuze would have written about architecture both equally negatively and positively if he had lived another five years. Because architecture became really central around 1997. In the last five years architecture has experienced incredible centrality in culture that it never had before and this is probably short lived. Architecture's been more important than Art lately.

To speculate about this, in the '90s everyone did a little bit of Deleuze. Every student in Europe. Everybody, even the English have gotten deeply into Deleuze – the Australians:

Megan Morris, Paul Patton, Massumi's years in Australia. We have a sort of deleuzian underground now, but in the '90s you can tell where deleuzianism is happening whenever you see the word *diagram*, between 1997 and 2000. Jessie Reiser, in many ways, is much more deleuzian than Greg Lynn. Even though Jesse Reiser doesn't have adequate reading of Deleuze, he is much more deleuzian.

Bernard was made by Deleuze's comments on his book but Cache doesn't actually merit it. It really went to his head. He thinks of himself as aristocracy of architectural theory but I think he's completely negligible.

--

What about the Japanese Deleuze proponent?

A bunch of them in Japan. I met them all: Akira Asada who wrote a book in Japanese on Deleuze that turned him in to what many people say the most famous person in Japan. Now that's unthinkable! How could that have happened? Apparently it's a very light book. And every person under the age of 35 in Japan knows Akira Asada – he's like John Lennon. Asada was brilliant. He goes to all the ANY conferences. He comes as Isozaki's side-kick. But he's a brilliant guy, a fantastic creative brilliant guy. Shin Takamatsu and Shinohara. They're all in connection with Asada. I find it all fascinating that they like him.

The "Smooth and the Striated" is probably the most theoretical text that came out in the '90s in architecture and there is nothing else in its category. It dominated architectural theory in the 1990s in a way that nothing since Colin Rowe's Transparency text may have done ever before. The Smooth and the Striated is of foundational significance. What is sad is that it is still not completely accepted, it is still resisted and Delanda, Massumi, me and certain others who are interested in it—all who come from other disciplines.

And whereas the philosophers don't want to talk about a deleuzian architecture, somehow the architects who claim their work to be deleuzian fall short of the deleuzian project.

A building that claims to be deleuzian is certainly the most pathetic thing in the world.

What might be an interesting parallel between Deleuze and Greg Lynn's work is the way in which Lynn's buildings are all peculiar animals or becoming-subjects and Deleuze's own project as a kind of animation of concepts that also take on their own subjectivity.

Subjectivisation. You are absolutely right. You can summarise Deleuze's philosophy, on the one hand, and can also summarise everything that is impoverished with contemporary deleuzianism in architecture around this one particular subject—that all of Deleuze is research into matter becoming subject. All of Deleuze, Deleuze's entire enterprise is

describing the ways in which matter becomes subject and multiplying the possibilities for matter to become subject. That is what Deleuze is about and nothing else.

And this is the site for the whole problematic with Deleuze's translation into architecture.

Don't let people think it is about anthropomorphism. It is not about becoming a person. It's becoming a subject.

Right.

The second thing wrong with all of architectural deleuzianism is it misses the most central foundational aspect of Deleuze. And that is, that you have to be a joint reader of Foucault and Deleuze in order to understand either one of them. I happen to be writing about this in a little afterward to Michael Bell's book.

They're forces. Subject, is a coherent organisation of forces which is essentially organised itself toward an end or toward the production of something. When matter is seized by complete forces in order to produce something you have the process of subjectivisation taking place. Singularization is the most important concept in Guattari.

[fragments: we might have to fill in the blanks here]

Greg is not trying to be deleuzian anymore.

Lars Spuybroek and Kas Oosterhuis. They're nine parts hustlers.

You should include in architecture, design, urbanism, material organization of the material world. Material organization is what architecture is. That allows you to understand all the processes of social organisation and their impacts on matter and the organisation of our material world as essentially problems for architecture. Somehow capital or the forces of social organization will manifest themselves in matter through design. So think less about buildings/designer but about what has happened. Big infrastructures for example. Massive transformations in communications and transportations which have totally transformed the landscape...mp3 player.

Deleuze is doing two things. He's doing a description of emerging realities, trying to formulate a diagram about what is about to appear. For Deleuze, Nature and History is about the unforeseen but he knows that the unforeseen is always an actualisation about what is already virtual. What are the conditions under which the new appears, emerges? For Deleuze he feels that politics is keeping yourself vigilant to what is emerging, to what is new – because in the new is the possibility for transformation. It is the opening of a world view that is so important to Deleuze's philosophy so when you talk about a building it is sometimes the spirit of Deleuze which has to be understood.

You could show a rhizomatic building, but would that be a sufficient argument for deleuzism? No. You could show a building structured around an intense interplay of actualisation of the virtual, would someone say there was proof that deleuzism is happening? [what buildings do you have in mind here?] Deleuze is about description about the real world and about real anonymous processes, organizational and compositional processes so in one sense it's a critique of existing history and reality. And it could also be a manual for how to construct a building. And I want to say, *that's dangerous*. And that's where Greg Lynn and some of the others are a bit naïve. Because they're not deleuzian, they can't do deleuzianism because Deleuze is not just a manual for how to construct a building, it's a way of being. Once you've adopted that way of being your work is going to be deleuzian. Are there any architects who are at that stage yet? I have often argued that [_____did you say Koolhaas's?] work is deleuzian because it manifests a particular deleuzian concept.

Look at how Deleuze applies his own ideas. In the Smooth and the Striated he's not trying to prove that anything is totally deleuzian. He zeros in on examples, if you look at the music of Boulez if you look at...one thing, is our world is deleuzian, so relax. Everywhere you look is deleuzian if you're smart. See there's two ways of looking at the world. You can look at it through Deleuze's eyes or you can look at it through Capital's eyes. If you look at it through capitals eyes you're essentially just giving the official interpretations of reality, accepting what capital says is real as real. If you're looking at it through Deleuze's lines [an interesting slip, did you mean eyes or lines?] you'll see it as essentially comprised of subjectivizational processes which can be made apparent. You can descriptively show that what we're looking at is not a building but a subjectivization process. But we have failed to see that it is that. As Nietzsche says, all truth is but a metaphor of which we have forgotten that that is what it is. There's no such thing as truth, it's all metaphor and that's essentially what Deleuze is saying too and that's what subjectivization is all about.

Nietzsche says all truth is metaphor, metonym and anthropomorphism.

Use that.

The only architect with a social perspective of deleuzism is Koolhaas. Koolhaas is totally committed to social subjectivization. His work is the most deeply deleuzian that exists for that reason and that reason only.

But, the deleuzian project hasn't started in architecture It hasn't started yet.