

philosophy @ LISBON

International eJournal
Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa

n. 5 | 2016

Special Number *Philosophy & Architecture*



edited by
Tomás N. Castro
with
Maribel Mendes Sobreira

ISSN 2182-4371



www.cful.lettras.ulisboa.pt

Changing the Architectonic of Philosophy. John Rajchman's Interest in Folded Architecture

Frederike Lausch

Goethe-University Frankfurt am Main /
DFG-Research Group Media and Mimesis
lausch@kunst.uni-frankfurt.de

Abstract

Based on the assumption that in the 1990s certain figures and institutions conducted the rise of Gilles Deleuze in US-American architecture, the paper examines the actions and intentions of John Rajchman as one intercessor for a working together of architecture and philosophy. It is necessary to find out why he is interested in folded architecture and how he wants to use architecture for his philosophical work. To answer these questions the paper addresses the introduction of Deleuze into the US-American academic discourse in the 1970s and the shift in reception from predominant political and social issues to art and architecture related topics in the 1980s. This is followed by further investigations of Rajchman's actions in the scope of the Anyone Corporation and the implementation of a 'Deleuze-after-Derrida' narrative in the 1990s. Of interest are especially Rajchman's contributions to discussions about 'folding' in architecture and his relation to Peter Eisenman. Finally via a close reading of Rajchman's essays, it is argued that he intends an enhancement of philosophy through a "new" folded and flexible architecture, as if both disciplines working together the rigid architectonic of our thinking might lighten up and thereby philosophical working and writing can acquire "new" forms.

Keywords

Fold; Gilles Deleuze; John Rajchman; Peter Eisenman; Anyone

In an interview with Simone Brott, the US-American philosopher John Rajchman explains his contribution to the intensive connection of architecture and Gilles Deleuze's philosophy in the 1990s: "I was really interested in Deleuze as a philosopher and also as an interesting way of doing philosophy in an academic context and so I wanted to extract for my own purposes a model and architecture happened to provide an opportunity to do this"¹. Rajchman emphasises that he belongs to the field of philosophy. Meanwhile he contributes with articles to almost all the major architectural publications about the concept of 'folding', where Deleuze's *The Fold* gets translated into the realm of architecture. Therefore Rajchman appears to be a kind of facilitator accelerating the relationship between US-American architecture and French philosophy. He himself draws the line to Deleuze's term 'intercesseurs'². It gets often translated as 'mediators' and is used to define figures, events and mobile connections producing different resonances of Deleuze's work.³ In this regard Brott states, that the "affiliation between Deleuze and architecture arose neither by his direct interest in architecture nor by architecture's immediate affection for him", but it evolved through mediators, as she formulates it: a "cult-assemblage of various characters who pursued their own activities around Deleuze"⁴. The 'mediator' Rajchman explains that architecture serves him to obtain a model for his very own purpose, which is doing philosophy in an academic context similar to the way Deleuze is doing it. But what does it mean then, that architecture provides an opportunity to extract a model for his philosophical work? How is he in fact using architecture?

Semiotext(e) and Zone

Before looking at Rajchman's interest in folded architecture, one has to go back to the 1970s and the introduction of Deleuze and Félix Guattari into the US-American academic discourse. It is at Columbia University, where in 1973 the collective Semiotext(e) is founded by Sylvère Lotringer, who is associate professor in the French Department and hired to teach semiotics.⁵ From the initial semiotics reading group, where Rajchman, being a graduate student in Philosophy, takes part, the cultural/theoretical jour-

1. Rajchman 2003, 3.

2. Ibid., 2. See Deleuze 1985.

3. Besides Rajchman other theoreticians like Elizabeth Grosz, Anthony Vidler, Sanford Kwinter, Brian Massumi and Manuel De Landa are as well presented as the "major secondary commentators [on Deleuze] operating at the threshold of the architectural discipline" Frichot and Loo 2013, 6.

4. Brott 2011, 16.

5. Schwarz and Balsamo 1996, 206.

nal *Semiotext(e)* emerged with Lotringer as general editor and Rajchman as secretary. The first three issues appear in 1974 and 1975 “devoted to ‘traditional’ semiotic texts and commentary”⁶. Then the journals content shifts from semiotics to introducing French radical thought, for instance in 1977 the 6th issue is entirely devoted to Deleuze and Guattari’s *L’Anti-Œdipe: Capitalisme et Schizophrénie*. From the beginning, *Semiotext(e)* is conceived as “an intervention into cultural politics, not merely as an academic exercise in theoretical reproduction”⁷. In November 1975 they organise the legendary schizo-culture colloquium at Columbia University. Lotringer and Rajchman give the introduction together, followed by presentations from Jean-François Lyotard, Michel Foucault, Guattari and Deleuze, who then become regular contributors of *Semiotext(e)*. Retrospectively it is summarized as a fusion of “the radical writing of key figures of post-1968 French philosophy with the chaotic creativity of an emerging New York downtown art scene”⁸. *Semiotext(e)* serves Rajchman to publish some of his first critical articles, mainly on Foucault, Lacan, Nietzsche and Deleuze.⁹ Around 1980, the collective disperses and Lotringer starts the Foreign Agents series, a succession of little black books from French theorists such as Deleuze and Guattari, whose *On the Line* appears as the second book in 1983 and *Nomodology. The War Machine* gets distributed in 1986. With this series *Semiotext(e)* – and Rajchman as being an active member – publishes some of the earliest English translations of Deleuze and Guattari, that is why Schwarz and Balsamo call *Semiotext(e)* “an agent of infection”¹⁰ – infecting the US-American audience with French theory. In an interview Lotringer says that they “were intercessors in the sense that there were no texts [of Deleuze] available in English [...] we were intercessors because we just allowed something to happen”¹¹.

The End of the 1980s marks a turning point in the reception of Deleuze in the United States: from a radical, interdisciplinary ethos as well as an interest in questions of subjectivity towards the situation that Deleuze is being directly taught in architectural schools by theorists, such as Sanford Kwinter.¹² He and other seminar students of Lotringer, namely Michel Feher, Jonathan Crary and Hal Foster, form the younger generation and possess a stronger affinity to art, architecture or space and the techno-

6. Ibid., 207.

7. Ibid., 208.

8. Artistspace Web Page.

9. See “Semiotics, Epistemology and Materialism.” *Semiotext(e)* 1 (1974): 11-28. “Analysis in Power: A Few Foucauldian Theses.” *Semiotext(e)* 6 (1977): 45-58. And “Nietzsche, Foucault and the Anarchism of Power.” *Semiotext(e)* 7 (1978): 96-107.

10. Schwarz and Balsamo 1996, 218.

11. Lotringer 2013, 256.

12. Brott 2011, 26.

-scientific dimension of Deleuze.¹³ Together they create the magazine *Zone* with its first issue “The Contemporary City” appearing in 1986 and with essays from Paul Virilio, Christopher Alexander, Manuel De Landa and of course Deleuze and Guattari.¹⁴ The back of the issue features statements about the city by architects and architectural theorists such as Kenneth Frampton, Peter Eisenman, Daniel Libeskind and Rem Koolhaas. According to Kwinter the most architectural dimension of *Zone* is not the topic of the city and the contribution of architects, but the materiality of the book itself and its graphic design produced by Bruce Mau. The academic publications become a design object. This “increasing aestheticization of the text within the New York publishing scene around Deleuze” is also remarkable in the development of *Semiotext(e)*’s graphic design.¹⁵ To this effect the 15th issue *Semiotext(e): Architecture*, edited in 1992 by architect Hrazten Zeitlian, displays a highly layered, complex and high-contrast photocopy graphic design, about which Lotringer tells in an interview, that “he didn’t like the graphics, which he found to be too polished, ‘too architectural’”¹⁶. *Zone* is for Lotringer the “antithesis of Semiotext(e)”, because “it was rich, beautiful, and full of money”¹⁷. Kwinter explains the increasing reception of Deleuze by the field of architecture combined with an emphasis on the importance of graphic design in the following way: “But 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 [Christian Hubert] that came and asked me the question [about Deleuze and Postmodernism], and it played an amazing role. The American reception was essentially driven by architects”.¹⁸ Surprisingly the issue *Semiotext(e): Architecture* does not get the same attention as the future architectural publications on Deleuze will get – especially the ones produced in the scope of the Anyone Corporation.

Anyone Corporation and ANY

One day, according to Rajchman, the architect Eisenman calls and invites him to the Anyone conference, organised by the Anyone Corporation, which was founded in 1990 by Eisenman, Cynthia Davidson, Arata Iso-

13. Rajchman 2003, 1.

14. Rajchman tells about his contribution to *Zone*: “I was editor of zone for a day, they [Kwinter, Cray and Feher] say, because I went to the initial meeting, but since I’d already done Semiotext(e) I thought it would be more interesting for them to do it rather than me.” Ibid.

15. Brott 2011, 33, Annot. 43.

16. Ibid., 26.

17. Lotringer 2013, 256.

18. Brott 2011, 24-25.

zaki, and Ignasi de Solà-Morales Rubió with the overall aim “to advance the knowledge and understanding of architecture and its relationships to the general culture” at the dawn of the Third Millennium.¹⁹ Rajchman explains his reaction as follows: “So I said it sounded really interesting but I didn’t know much about architecture. He led me to believe that was no problem at all. [...] so since I was working on this Deleuze project and reading this material I said to myself Deleuze could have a really interesting impact in these debates in architecture [...] Eisenman finally had a problem with Derrida, they found in Deleuze something interesting, and this, in my point of view, is how the two things came together”²⁰. As said, Rajchman’s involvement in the actions of the Anyone Corporation seems to start with an invitation and the following thought that introducing Deleuze to the field of architecture could have an interesting impact on architectural debates. In this regard, the paper “On Not Being Any One”, which Rajchman gives in the occasion of the first Any-conference in May 1991, reads as an introduction into Deleuze’s philosophy. He is above all addressing two key texts of Deleuze, which possess a strong connection to questions of space and to spatial figures. On the one hand there is the concept of striated and smooth space in Deleuze and Guattari’s *Mille Plateaux. Capitalisme et schizophrénie 2* from 1980, on the other hand Deleuze’s *Le Pli* on folding and baroque architecture from 1988. At the end of his paper Rajchman alludes to Eisenman’s architecture, admitting that he never saw a building by him, but he perceives in his drawings and writings a process of liberating architecture from the delimiting rational, striated spaces of traditional architectural plan – a process he calls “becoming-Eisenman” as an analogue of Deleuze and Guattari’s becoming-animal/woman/minority etc. But then Rajchman speaks of a “disheartening element” in Eisenman’s writings, when the architect “imagines a great metaphysical agon or struggle between philosophy with a capital P and architecture with a capital A, the one having to resist the incursions or the advances of the other”²¹. Instead, Rajchman claims for an encounter of philosophy and architecture, where they together create a “temporary space in which the question of what is new in architecture and what is new in thought combine or compose with one another in an unexpected configuration or opening that no longer belongs to anyone”²². So his intention is the opening up of both disciplines to work together without fighting for a hierarchical position within this relation.

Rajchman contributes to almost all the other Any-conferences in the

19. Anyone Corporation Web Page.

20. Rajchman 2003, 3.

21. Rajchman 1991a, 110.

22. Ibid., 110.

following years referring mainly to Foucault and Deleuze.²³ Besides the conferences, Rajchman is part of the editorial board of *ANY*, the magazine of the Anyone corporation with Davidson as general editor.²⁴ In 1993 the first issue “Writing in Architecture” appears and one year later Greg Lynn and Rajchman edit together the 5th issue on “Lightness”, in which Rajchman wants “to try out a concept like lightness in architecture”²⁵, a concept which is derived from Deleuze and Guattari and which shall rescue architecture from the traditional burden-support space.²⁶ Lightness points to the imagination of a freer and more experimental sort of space, different from the classical one, which is defined by gravity. With the help of Deleuzian concepts, Rajchman envisions architecture freed from grid frames, structure, typology or any kind of ideology. In the same issue, a translation of the chapter “Mystère D’Ariane selon Nietzsche” from Deleuze’s *Critique et clinique* and an article by Bernard Cache are published. Deleuze refers in *Le Pli* to a manuscript with the title *L’ameublement du territoire*, written by his student Cache but not yet published, and replaces the notion of a static object with Cache’s term ‘objectile’ for a function, which contains virtually an infinite number of objects. Deleuze writes about Cache’s work: “Inspired by geography, architecture, and the decorative arts, in my view this book seems essential for any theory of the fold”²⁷. It is Rajchman, who – reacting to the big interest of Deleuze in the United States – asks Cache for the still unpublished manuscript. Then it gets translated and distributed in 1995 under the title *Earth Moves: The Furnishing of Territories* as the first book of the Writing Architecture series, which the Anyone corporation uses to spread mostly theoretical essays on architecture. Retrospectively Rajchman says, that without him taking care, the manuscript wouldn’t have been published and Cache would have had nothing to do with the connection of Deleuze and US-American architecture.²⁸

Karen Burns writes in regard to the influence of the Anyone Corporation in the “Deleuze-after-Derrida” narrative in architectural history, that the “rise of Deleuze [in architecture] was not a natural phenomenon,

23. See “On Not Being Any One.” *Anyone* (1991). “Anywhere and Nowhere.” *Anywhere* (1992). “Manyways.” *Anyway* (1993). “The Place of Architecture in Philosophy.” *Anyplace* (1994). “Some Senses of ‘Ground’.” *Anybody* (1996). “A New Pragmatism?” *Anyhow* (1997). “Time Out.” *Anytime* (1998). No contributions to *Anywise* (1995), *Anymore* (1999) and *Anything* (2000).

24. Other members of the editorial board are Tadao Ando, Jennifer Bloomer, Brian Boigon, Henry Cobb, Charles Gwathmey, Rem Koolhaas, Sanford Kwinter, Greg Lynn and Mark C. Taylor. Later Silvia Kolbowski, R. E. Somol and Sylvia Lavin join. See imprint of *ANY*.

25. Rajchman 1994, 7.

26. *Ibid.*, 6.

27. Deleuze 1993, 144, Annot. 3.

28. Rajchman 2003, 6.

but an institutionally structured one”.²⁹ The conferences and publications from the Anyone Corporation in the 1990s provided a critical setting for architectural debate around Deleuze, which was in the beginning dominated by the concept of the fold. Rajchman’s contributions to discussions about ‘folding’ in architecture and his relation to Eisenman will now be of interest.

***Unfolding Frankfurt* and “Folding in Architecture”**

Considering Deleuze’s books on art related topics, like *Francis Bacon. Logique de la sensation, L’image-mouvement. Cinéma 1* and *L’image-temps. Cinéma 2*, the book *Le Pli. Leibniz et le baroque* has a special position and not only because there Deleuze says a few things about architecture. According to Rajchman his concept of baroque architecture is “so strange that though it was like that... you could actually try to do things that aren’t already determined by Deleuze himself”³⁰. Apparently this wasn’t the case for Deleuze’s books on painting and cinema: “Initially it wasn’t so much that Deleuze was good at architecture or that there was some connection between the two but that architecture appeared as its own development in which they could absorb Deleuze in their own interesting way whereas the Cinema and Art History worlds couldn’t do that because they were more literary”³¹. So Rajchman perceives the realm of architecture as an occasion, in which one can relate to the philosophical model of Deleuze in an experimental way, something that Deleuze would appreciate. Rajchman tells the story, that when Deleuze publishes *Le Pli* he writes about the new book and sends the review to him. The answer he receives is: “this is very funny, because in reaction to this book there’s two groups that I never expected to respond: surfers and architects”³². In his opinion Deleuze is surprised as well as interested at this phenomenon that is emerging mostly among English speaking people and much less in France itself. And Rajchman is one of these people, who foster the Deleuze architecture connection by speaking in architectural schools and contributing to architectural publications.

In 1991 Eisenman publishes *Unfolding Frankfurt*, a book, in which he presents his master plan for the Rebstockpark in Frankfurt/Germany. At Eisenman’s invitation Rajchman contributes the article “Perplications: On the Space and Time of Rebstockpark”, which he calls “the literature on folding architecture”³³. Here Rajchman defines the relation between *Le*

29. Burns 2013, 28.

30. Rajchman 2003, 3.

31. Ibid., 3.

32. Ibid., 2.

33. Ibid., 4.

Pli and Eisenman's project as a reciprocal "intensive reading", to be understood as an experimental encounter, where unnoticed "complicities" between both are released while both remain divergent and singular.³⁴ So not only Eisenman's architecture is an intensive reading of *Le Pli*, also *Le Pli* is an intensive reading of the Rebstockpark project. Again a hierarchy between both disciplines is rejected. Philosophy and Architecture fold into one another, they encounter, capture and dislocate each other, without one being the original and the other the adaption – that is what Rajchman imagines.³⁵ For him Eisenman uses the fold firstly as "the central formal technique employed in the generation of the design" – seen in the obvious folding process of the site – and secondly as "the central Idea or Question of the project", questioning the overarching totalities of the traditional view on architecture.³⁶ Because the architect uncovers multiplicities, "an imperceptible disparation in what presents itself as a perceptual totality"³⁷. Rajchman introduces Eisenman as a player, who throws questions into the field of architecture, and equalizes him to the "true players", which are Deleuze, Nietzsche, Mallarmé etc. These true players don't play according to pre-existent rules, rather "the [playing] table itself bursts open and becomes part of a larger, more complex game that always includes the possibility of new rules"³⁸.

Rajchman also contributes with the article "Out of the Fold" to the most famous publication on the concept of 'folding' in the architectural discourse, the *Architectural Design* profile "Folding in Architecture" edited by Lynn. After introducing some main concepts of Deleuze, especially the notion of an 'affective' space, he asks: "The modernist 'machines for living' sought to express a clean efficient space for the new mechanical body; but who will invent a way to express the affective space for this other multiplicitous one?"³⁹ Thus Rajchman assigns to architecture the task to create the so-called "affective space", in which the subject cannot understand and interpret a discernible logic but experiences the space through the body. And the architect Eisenman now provides this "architectural expression" – the architectural equivalent to Deleuze's philosophy, that is why Rajchman writes: "As Deleuze invents a new philosophy of the informe, or an informel art of thinking, so Eisenman invents an architecture of the informe, or an informel way of building and designing"⁴⁰. So invited initially by

34. Rajchman 1991c, 22.

35. Ibid., 24.

36. Ibid., 21.

37. Ibid., 36.

38. Ibid., 70.

39. Rajchman 1993, 63.

40. Rajchman 1991c, 22.

Eisenman, quickly Rajchman becomes the most ambitious intercessor of 'folding' in architecture.

Constructions

After having reconstructed Rajchman's several contributions and its role in introducing and spreading Deleuzian concepts among architects, now the question is what is his interest in bringing Deleuze and Architecture together. To answer this, I recommend a close reading of *Constructions*, an assemblage of essays by Rajchman, published in 1998 in the Anyone Corporation's Writing Architecture series, and of *The Deleuze Connection* from 2000. In *Constructions* he starts with asking: "What if the architectonic in Kant were not an overarching system but something that has itself to be constructed anew, in each case, in relation to fresh problems – something looser, more flexible, less complete, more irregular, a free plan in which things hang together without yet being held in place?"⁴¹ Here the task is to overcome the Kantian architectonic, to recognize it only as a temporary construction, from which we have to free ourselves in order to reach "a free plan, in which to move, invent concepts, unfold a drama"⁴². For Rajchman 'to think' is synonymous with 'to construct', so he calls the philosopher a constructor and every work is, in reference to Deleuze, a montage, an 'agencement' (a layout of room), that is why "making a philosophy would become a matter of architecture".⁴³ Philosophy's plan of construction shouldn't be predetermined by given rules, as it is the case with the Kantian architectonic, rather it has to be always built anew. Rajchman thinks, that for once the architectonic of thinking is loosened up, the main philosophical questions – how to construct a work and how to construct a life – will acquire new shapes.⁴⁴ Important here is the notion of the architectonic of thinking and its relation to both architecture and philosophy. In the *Critique of Pure Reason* Kant argues, that philosophy has an inner schema, called architectonic, which is based on the distinction between sensibility and understanding and which is complete and necessary. This architectonic is now regarded to be too rigid and can be compared to the traditional notion of architecture as a grounded and static object, also something that Rajchman wants to overcome. This means, that because the architectonic is shaping philosophical thinking, he believes that exactly this sort of architectonic needs to get changed, so that philosophy can change too. This means further, that because the architectonic is based on

41. Rajchman 1998, 1.

42. Ibid., 2.

43. Ibid., p. 2-3.

44. Ibid., p. 2.

the traditional concept of architecture, this concept needs to get changed as well. And here, I would argue, lies Rajchman's interest in the realm of architecture.

In the much earlier book *Philosophical Events. Essays of the '80s*, where the last chapter is titled "What's New in Architecture?", Rajchman explains the notion of space in the theories of Foucault, Derrida and at the end Deleuze, in order to claim for "an architecture of the event".⁴⁵ Already here he asks, "what an 'invention of the other' possessing the 'singular structure of an event' would mean for architecture, and for the architectural allegory of thought, and therefore of invention in thought"⁴⁶. So again the way of doing architecture is connected to the structure of the thought, conceived by an architectural allegory, and thereby to the possibility to create something unexpected in philosophy. Rajchman continues: "for a long and powerful tradition of thought which we still 'inhabit', to construct a habitation, a way of living, has meant to construct a space in conformity with a plan, an ideal, a model, essence, or nature, that would be independent of it [...] The task of inhabiting the uninhabitable is to conceive of another relation of our being-together in a space and a time than this one"⁴⁷.

So the rigid and predetermining Kantian architectonic needs to get abandoned by rethinking architecture and its notions of ground, gravity and ideal plan. The Cartesian notion of space, a homogenous gridded space, in which everything is ordered within the three dimensional coordinate system, is regarded as not being able to explain social space, which envelops in-between-spaces possessing "distances and proximities of another, nonquantifiable sort"⁴⁸. Here the concept of the fold, introducing a heterogeneous, complex and every changing notion of space, serves as an alternative. It gets connected to the organisation of the city, for instance Rajchman writes that for once the architectonic is loosened up, then philosophy "would become free, impermanent constructions superimposed on one another like strata in a city"⁴⁹. The city is seen as free and vital to the degree that it allows for the movement of free thought.⁵⁰ Deleuze introduces the "brain-city" as one "filled with voids and interstices, always changing

45. Rajchman 1991b, 156. The book cover is interesting because underneath the alignment of the philosophers Deleuze, Derrida, Foucault, Habermas, Lyotard and Rorty an image of an architectural plan is displayed, showing probably housing units in rather organic shapes. Here the connection of philosophy and architecture is materially inscribed in the layout of the book's two-dimensional space.

46. Ibid. References are from Derrida.

47. Ibid., 157-158.

48. Rajchman 2000, 100.

49. Rajchman 1998, 2.

50. Rajchman 2000, 41.

and leaking, defined by tacit or indeterminate rules”⁵¹. Like the city the new kind of philosophical construction should be “a montage of overlapping and necessarily unfinished ‘remarks’ and ‘investigations’”⁵². Consequently architects as well as the philosophers have to work with informal plans and diagrams, so through experimentation, rather than through a plan or program as sort of ideology. The plan of construction must “always be unformed, indeterminate, loose enough that other figurations, other confabulations may yet happen”⁵³.

For Rajchman the problem emerges in the course of realisation, because the question is “how to introduce this anorganized or complex space into building – in other words how to create a free, operative space in construction not preset by any overarching organization or given through combination among existing elements”⁵⁴. Since this is not yet designed, Rajchman commissions seven architects to design a ‘virtual house’ – published in the 20th ANY issue “The virtual House”⁵⁵ – a house, “which, through its plan, space, construction, and intelligence, generates the most new connections, the one so arranged or disposed as to permit the greatest power for unforeseen relations”⁵⁶.

In fact Rajchman imagines that a “freer” architecture would lead to a “freer” architectonic of thinking and thus to a way of doing philosophy, through which unexpected inventions can emerge. In order to see this happen, he as a philosopher commissions architects to design buildings, which, as he supposes, shall be connected to philosophy, more precisely to concepts of Deleuze. So it goes from philosophy to architecture, back to philosophy and so forth? How, then, does Rajchman conceive the relationship between architecture and philosophy?

Working together

At the end of *Constructions* Rajchman asks: “And what if then happened that constructions in architecture and philosophy discovered provisional points of contact and alliance, as though together speaking a new and foreign idiom no longer belonging to the recognized languages of

51. Rajchman 1998, 6.

52. Ibid.

53. Ibid., 7.

54. Ibid., 105.

55. The ANY issue “The Virtual House” from 1997 is based on the commissioning of seven architects to design a virtual house, among them Eisenman, and on the discussion of those houses at a seminar in Berlin.

56. Rajchman 1998, 115.

either?”⁵⁷ He imagines a working together of philosophy and architecture without rivalry or identification, without one dictating the rules and the other applying them. Instead they together create “a zone of new connections”, which lead to “the formulation of new problems, the invention of new concepts”.⁵⁸ Referring to Deleuze and Guattari’s expression, according to which “Philosophy needs a nonphilosophy that comprehends it”⁵⁹, Rajchman explains that philosophy not only presupposes nonphilosophical understanding, but is also addressed to it.⁶⁰ Therefore he is stressing the importance of “translations in arts or sciences”⁶¹ by saying, that “to do philosophy is thus to fabricate concepts in resonance and interference with the arts, past as well as present”⁶². The image of philosophy as a metadiscipline that sets the rules for the others has to be abandoned. In a similar way Deleuze says, that philosophy should be practiced like an ‘art brut’, which has “its own raw material that allows it to enter into more fundamental external relations with these other disciplines”⁶³. In this regard Rajchman states, that “philosophy is impoverished when reduced to being merely about the arts, reflecting on their forms of judgment; for it has a much more vital role to play together with them, linking up with them in odd places, interfering and intersecting, with them through ‘encounters’ prior to settled judgments”⁶⁴. So philosophy should not become a new theory, prior to art and which art is applying then, rather it serves as an ‘interceder’: inciting creation or thinking in other nonphilosophical disciplines, so that together speaking something “new” emerges.⁶⁵

Coming back to the initial quote, architecture seems to serve as the nonphilosophical discipline, which philosophy is presupposing in order to obtain a much more vital role. Rajchman thus believes in an enhancement of philosophy through the realm of architecture, as if by working together architecture overcomes the traditional burden of the Cartesian space and the notion of gravity, then they might change together the architectonic of our thinking and thereby philosophical working and writing. With this in mind, we eventually see that the story of architecture and philosophy connected via sharing the topic of ‘folding’ during the 1990s is not necessarily the one of architects appropriating Deleuze’s philosophy for formal

57. Ibid., 9.

58. Rajchman 2000, 4.

59. Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 218.

60. Rajchman 2000, 114.

61. Rajchman 1998, 100.

62. Rajchman 2000, 115.

63. Deleuze 1995, 89.

64. Rajchman 1998, 56.

65. Rajchman 2000, 118.

or organisational innovation, but also one, which incorporates the actions and intentions of philosophers alike – in this case of Rajchman as one ‘intercesseur’ for a working together of architecture and philosophy.

References

- Anyone Corporation. Web. <http://www.anycorp.com/anycorp/about.html>.
- Artistsspace. Web. <http://artistsspace.org/programs/schizo-culture>.
- Brott, Simone. 2011. *Architecture for a Free Subjectivity: Deleuze and Guattari at the Horizon of the Real*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Pub.
- Burns, Karen. 2013. “Becomings – Architecture, Feminism, Deleuze: Before and After the Fold.” In *Deleuze and Architecture*, ed. Hélène Frichot and Stephan Loo, 15-39. Edinburgh University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1985. Interview by Antoine Dulaure and Claire Parnet. *L'autre journal* 8: 10-22.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1993. *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. 1994. *What is Philosophy?* New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1995. *Negotiations*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Frichot, Hélène and Stephan Loo. 2013. *Deleuze and Architecture*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Lotringer, Sylvère. 2013. Interview by Scapegoat at Los Angeles Art Book Fair. http://www.scapegoatjournal.org/docs/05/SG_Excess_254-265_F_LOTRINGER.pdf.
- Rajchman, John. 1991a. “On Not Being Any One.” In *Anyone*, ed. Cynthia Davidson, 102-111. New York: Rizzoli.
- Rajchman, John. 1991b. *Philosophical events: Essays of the 80s*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rajchman, John. 1991c. “Perplications: On the Space and Time of Rebstockpark.” In *Unfolding Frankfurt*, ed. Peter Eisenman and Judy Geib, 20-77. Berlin: Ernst.
- Rajchman, John. 1993. “Out of the Fold.” In *AD Profile* 102 (Folding in Architecture): 61-63.
- Rajchman, John. 1994. “Lightness: A concept in architecture.” In *ANY* 5 (Lightness): 5-7.
- Rajchman, John. 1998. *Constructions*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Rajchman, John. 2000. *The Deleuze connections*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Rajchman, John. 2003. Interview by Simone Brott. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/67949/2/67949.pdf>.
- Schwarz, Henry and Anne Balsamo. 1996. “Under the Sign of Semiotext(e): The story according Sylvère Lotringer and Chris Kraus.” In *Critique* 3: 205-219.



© Maribel Mendes Sobreira