



Solar Azimuth: 074.93°

# ARCHITECTURE FILMMAKING

.66°

Solar Azimuth: 160.86°



.28°

Solar Azimuth: 290.42°

# IGEA **TROIANI** AND HUGH **CAMPBELL**

.00°

Solar Azimuth: 290.71°



**Un-framing Reality: Sets of Intensities as Smallest Common Denominator in Film and Architecture**

Marc Boumeester

---



The discourse on the relationship between film and architecture has long been dominated by two approaches: the analysis of narrative and the search for a common ground. Both elements have steered this quest into trajectories with a limited reach. A first step in dismantling such thinking is to overcome the fixation on meaning and representational value in the respective media, which involves a critical ‘unlearning’ in order to make progress. An instrument that is helpful in this pedagogy is called the ‘Vital Collapse’, through which existing medium-specific methodology is overloaded with incompatible datasets stemming from the other medium. In this way the fascination for program or narrative is rendered useless in both media, and the core of their strengths is exposed, even to a point where we can identify the ‘desire of the medium’ itself. A second step is even more decisive. Instead of creating sets of densities in film and architecture, we should focus on sets of *intensities*. As by default, *the frame* has been designated as the place for concretization of sets of densities. In both media, *the frame* is the playground for the manifestation of their strengths, and is seen as the (literal) portal for conversions and dialogue between the two media, their smallest common denominator. A crucial flaw in reasoning is the assumption that the only point of entry is the part that is (literally) in the frame, which means that a potentiality has already been actualized in one or the other medium. This is thus, by definition, not the common ground that was searched for. Instead, the attention should go out to what is *not* in the frame, the intensities themselves (virtuality) before actualization. Intensities can be considered as non-actualized reality, which are only rendered visible by making use of the weaknesses (rather than the strengths) of both media. In order to elucidate this theoretical approach, this chapter draws on a series of educational research projects that transformed cinematic research into architectural practice.

### **Hylomorphism Versus Anamorphisms and Catamorphisms: Feeding ‘Wrong Data in Old Thinking’**

Hylomorphism is the notion that in the transformation of matter into form, a type of ‘soul giving’ is involved. This ‘ensoulment’ was regarded to be the prerogative of the human (artist) and stands – in my view – at the basis of a long tradition of representational thinking. Hylomorphism is one of the methodologies that philosopher George Simondon opposes most in his work. He criticizes hylomorphistic thinking for accentuating the presupposed

## ARCHITECTURE FILMMAKING

1 prerequisites of the interaction, in this case form and matter, rather than the requirements  
 2 for this process to occur, such as metastability, information and energy. Philosopher Miguel  
 3 de Beistegui (2004: 303) elaborates:

4  
 5       Contrary to the claims of the Aristotelian, 'hylomorphic' model – a model born of a simple  
 6       reductive interpretation of simple technological operations, such as the molding of  
 7       a brick – the individual is not the result of a molding which, in a single blow as it were,  
 8       provides a homogeneous and formless matter with its determinate form. Rather, it is  
 9       a (temporal process) through which the crystalline form acts like a 'recurrent germ of  
 10       information' in a medium already rife with singularities and energetic differences.

11  
 12 Substantialist metaphysics and hylomorphism both operate with petrified and unchanging  
 13 terms that are postulated as autonomous structures constituting the world. They leave out  
 14 the conditions of energy, assemblage and agency involved in matter actualizing and taking  
 15 form. Simondon sees that the energetic potential residing in matter is unlocked and given  
 16 direction in the formation of an individual. Philosopher David Scott (2014: 5) summarizes  
 17 this concept:

18  
 19       [T]he individual is only one element produced by individuation; the individual is neither  
 20       the sole goal nor motivating impetus for individuation happening. One does not pass  
 21       rapidly through stages of individuation to finally realize in the end the individual, perfect  
 22       and self-contained and exhausting being.

23  
 24 A becoming is an event, not a process. Simondon's belief is that 'a living being exists as only  
 25 always a becoming between individuations, not as a becoming after individuation' (Scott  
 26 2014: 33). The process of individuation is infinite. Philosopher Didier Debaise explains:

27  
 28       As soon as we say that all individuation is singular – an event – the limits, forms and  
 29       consequences of which we cannot *a priori* determine, we raise a question : how to  
 30       describe or refer to a regime of individuation? There is, for Simondon, a limit to intelli-  
 31       gence which approximates Bergson: all exclusively theoretical approaches to regimes  
 32       of individuation, and thus of relation , necessarily transform, by cutting or stabilizing,  
 33       their novelty.

34  
 35  
 36 (2012: 8)

37 Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari offer what they call a 'double articulation'. This means that  
 38 first the 'raw materials' that will become a new entity must actualize (which is called the form  
 39 of content) and secondly they must be consolidated into an entity with properties of its own  
 40 (form of expression). I would like to propose a different scope on the formation of expression,  
 41 which is transversely placed against hylomorphism. The central question to address is: 'what  
 42 is the desire of the medium' which I would like to systematically approach as a recursive  
 43 function consisting of anamorphisms (unfolding outcomes without a concept) and catamor-  
 44 phisms (folding outcomes into a concept). The desire of the medium is best seen through the  
 45 lens of an oscillating reaction in which its systemic and intrinsic needs are negotiating with the  
 46 desires of the artist, and the outcome is a contingent state without a single optimum.

## Vital Collapse

I regard the real to exist out of two components: the actualized and the virtual. The virtual is that part of reality that is not actualized, and can remain so to be very effective, especially in producing effects. Therefore in my view aesthetics deal with reality. Meta-media is a transitional state between the virtual and the actualized; it is the energetics of actualization. The capacity to transit from the virtual to the actual and vice versa is called affordance. Architects (and filmmakers) are trained to work with the strengths of their respective media, in this case it is *the frame* (as both a concrete and a metaphorical concept). The true added value of any collaboration (or collision) between the two disciplines in a pedagogical setting is to provoke students to 'load data' coming from the other discipline into their own existing methodology. This can only go terribly wrong, as both media produce often opposing affects and effects. In this way the pre-bunked notions on design are undermined, and thus make way for a new set of perspectives, for instance feeding cinematic cartography (which has no limits to dimensions or a need for linear time) into architectural design, or feeding architectural cartography (which knows perspective and stasis) into film. In both cases the media are overloaded with information they are not able to process, causing a breakdown of its instruments. This 'Vital Collapse' proves to be as destructive and vitalizing as a forest fire; it is unmoral (nonjudgmental) not amoral.

## Unframing: Drawing on the Weaknesses of the Media Rather than the Strengths

The smallest affective relation between designer and medium is determined by the bandwidth that exists between the strongest and the weakest capacity of a medium to partake in any form of communication. The medium-specific smallest affective relation determines the ability and readiness of the medium to interact with the artist or designer. Paper has a very wide range and film has a much smaller range for engagement in drawing for instance. Yet drawing would be still in the bandwidth of film, as is so vividly demonstrated in the work of the American artist Stan Brakhage for instance. The concept can also be interpreted more metaphorically; sand has a great readiness for drawing, yet it has a very short memory, architecture has a smaller readiness, but a far better memory.

Deleuze (1989: 7) claims that cinema brings us the *movement image*: 'capable of thinking the production of the new'. This entails a shift from regarding cinema as a form of representation to the recognition of cinema as the existence of an independent entity. Not the depiction of reality, not the illusion created in the image, either, but the reality of the 'world in film' itself. This medium offers us many new dimensions for ways to create a world in which non-linearity, spatial freedom, subjective realities and 'limited endlessness' exist in potential. This goes for architecture as well, albeit with a fully different set of restrictions and potentials. By the creation of a frame (both metaphorical and literal) we expose the limitations of the process brought upon by the medium: for every single thing to appear in the frame, there are thousands not appearing. This emphasizes that the enormous array of potential that filmmaking (and architecture) offer comes with the very limited degree of freedom that is allowed to actually make a concrete product. The designer is very limited in what he or she can put in the frame, in order to make a viable actualization in the medium. Therefore, it serves little purpose to compare both media on basis of what they already have produced,

1 as that is already a steep reduction of potential; their strengths produce what we already  
2 know (in the frame), their weaknesses produce the unknown (potential). We need to create  
3 a collision of the two media on the basis of their weaknesses, not their strengths. That what  
4 we already know (what is in the frame) has actualized there as a result of our desire for it  
5 to appear and draws on the strengths of the medium. To reach a next level of understand-  
6 ing, we need to ask ourselves: what does the medium desire? The search for this 'desire of  
7 the medium' is a conceptual outline to open up the discussion on new modes of regarding  
8 human-non-human interactions in design processes, including the design of these very pro-  
9 cesses. Its goal is to encourage the introduction of a different paradigm that could add to  
10 the better understanding of the role of art and design in society. Rather than to replace one  
11 arborescent structure (the framing) with another, it could be wise to approach these matters  
12 from a rhizomatic point of view!

### 14 **Cinematic-Aided Cartography: Anamorphisms and Catamorphisms**

15  
16 When working for professor Arie Graafland at the Delft University of Technology, theory  
17 section at the faculty of Architecture, I was asked to make three short films to accom-  
18 pany his book (Graafland 2000) *The Socius of Architecture*. This publication deals with  
19 analyses of three specific sites (in Tokyo, Amsterdam and New York) through a series of  
20 social-architectural interventions, or intervention proposals to be more accurate, as they  
21 were never realized. The short films were not meant to illustrate the chapters in the book:  
22 that would be superficial and rather useless, as there was not anything concrete to show of  
23 the projects in an actualized state. The films needed to make clear what the book was not  
24 able to do: they needed to show the affordances of the specific sites. At the same time the  
25 book and the film should be doing what the architecture could not do: it had not been built  
26 and could therefore only be present as a virtuality with no actualized functionality, yet filled  
27 with potential. Even the fact that the design had been made could potentially influence the  
28 site already. All three media (architecture, film and book) were addressed on their weaknes-  
29 ses, yet in collaboration they were able to convey the conditions rather well, both in terms  
30 of *problematique* and potential intervention. The film did not show the architecture (the  
31 solution), the book did not show the *problematique* (the site), and the architecture did not  
32 show anything, yet it charged the fields of potentiality and drew all focus to both front and  
33 back of the cases. As these sites were especially chosen for their status in the urban fabric, it  
34 was not easy to convey these capacities through 'traditional' aesthetical means. First, there  
35 was the Tsukiji fish-market in Tokyo, which is the largest trading-place of its kind in the world.  
36 The trading, shipping and processing activities operate 24 hours per day, giving labour to  
37 over sixty-thousand people. The organization of all these activities is not easy to overview:  
38 much of the actual trading and processing is done by small (family) businesses and involves  
39 much manual labour. The impression one gets from this place is rather the opposite of a  
40 highly efficient, sterile and industrial processing plant, yet the effectiveness is certainly com-  
41 parable. The biggest problem of capturing the atmosphere and the enabling order that pro-  
42 pelled the economy in this seemingly chaotic environment was that there was no centralized  
43 mode of thinking. All of its agency is distributed in the assemblage that exists during market  
44 hours. Rather than having one core building that hosts all activities and enables processing  
45 in a serial and linear way, all the activities were accommodated by smaller structures that  
46 took part in providing smaller portions of this chain. The organization is parallel-serial in a

decentralized way. This arborescent type of organization makes it especially hard to demonstrate the enormity of the scale.

The second location was the Meatpacking District in Manhattan, New York. This site is known for its several connotative layers. The railway connection with the hinterland ended on an elevated track straight into the heart of the district, ensuring an almost uninterrupted supply of meat until the end of the 1970s. The area was known for its rough character: it is whispered that a significant reason to remove its role as significant hub in the food-supply chain was driven by the wish to rid it from mafia practices. During the decline of its initial functions, it became the centre of exploring alternative modes of sex that matched the roughness of the environment. Clubs, specializing in sadomasochism and other hard-core, male-gay practices, became the new focal point of the neighbourhood, also attracting a string of illegal and dangerous activities (drugs, prostitution, violence) to the area. Building on this reputation, many fashionable (and fashion-) designers found this place to be the ultimate spot for contrasting their high-end designs, which fuelled the most recent wave of gentrification and led to the establishment of flag-stores of many fashion designers in the district. On its turn this invited another type of nightlife; the hippest bars and clubs are now centred in the Meatpacking District. When the area became known for its role as the backdrop of the *Sex In The City* series and movies, its reputation as 'hippest place of Manhattan' was definitely affirmed. My problem was clear: the Socius-book was written in the time just before the (provisional) final transition and reacted on problems of that era. The design intervention was situated on a part of the remains of the elevated railway-track, which was at that time a token of an era long lost. The design served as a shelter for homeless people who at that time were a major concern to the municipality.

When I was making my film, this had already changed, and in order to catch some of the meat-packing activities, I had to look hard for a place that actually still worked in this industry and had to wait several days until a shipment of meat arrived (the only one in a whole week). In the very early hours of the morning, the area hosted a strange blend of hard-core fetishists and bondage-aficionados, who looked in disdain upon the young hipsters leaving the newer clubs to get into the pimped limousines. The supply trucks for both the meat and fashion industry where queuing up in the adjacent streets, where the cleaning activities serving the 'mise-en-place' of the daytime shopping rolled out in full swing. The question was obvious: what part of this eclectic scenery shows the 'true' Meatpacking District? I will return to that later.

The last of the three sites of my investigation was the *Westerdokseiland*, an area just west of the central station in Amsterdam. This compound was founded in 1832 and served mostly as railway emplacement. Due to its proximity to both the harbour and a part of the historical city, it gradually became a valuable piece of property. As it was long owned by the railway company, it only unlocked its potential for other developments very late in the timeline of gentrification of 'rough' neighbourhoods in Amsterdam. Here I was faced with a different obstacle. The original area on which the interventions in the book had reacted, had already been transformed and was in the finishing stage of completing another plan. It was thus impossible to show both the original and the current condition; obviously, it would not please my client to fill his film with someone else's design. The only elements that I could use were the building activities itself, the layout of the area and the surrounding areas. In order to

## ARCHITECTURE FILMMAKING

1 make a film about this subject, I needed to show anything but the subject, a type of 'depic-  
2 tion by absence' (like using a footprint in sand to show the foot).

3  
4 The construction of the three films later served as a blueprint (or at least a source of inspira-  
5 tion) for students to develop their own take on this type of 'cinematic-aided cartography'. In  
6 order to get to a level of abstraction that could serve as a conceptual outline, I needed to go  
7 through the process myself and invent a new cinematic logic, which pushed the medium itself  
8 outside of its comfort zone. As the Tokyo site was the least familiar to me, and New York and  
9 Amsterdam followed in that order, the learning curve in my explorations descended accord-  
10 ingly. Consequently, in the following examples the Tokyo experience will deliver the most in-  
11 sights (the genesis of the anamorphism), which will be supported by the New York experience  
12 (catamorphism) and sealed with the Amsterdam example (unframing). Given the fact that  
13 this was a commissioned assignment, I also needed to be careful not to neglect the 'narrative'  
14 of the respective sites in the context of the commission. Therefore, I needed to place sufficient  
15 emphasis on the content of the site and not only on the development of my theories.

16  
17 ***Tsukiji***

18  
19 The first film that was completed was that on the Tsukiji fish-market in Tokyo. As mentioned,  
20 the biggest issue was the inability to depict the site's size and process as an effect of its  
21 decentralized labour-, economic- and infrastructural philosophy. At this point it is good to  
22 realize that the marketplace is an exponent of a much larger system of cultural and social  
23 demands and customary vectors. In a nutshell one could claim that the quasi-religious ex-  
24 pressions of respect that typify the Japanese ethos towards food preparation and food con-  
25 sumption demand the existence of this type of supply chain. It is not the availability of daily  
26 fresh fish and seafood that enables the consumption of these foods in a raw or delicately  
27 processed way, but the system of the socio-cultural foundations that demands this type of  
28 organization to exist in order to consume this type of food in the specified way. The architec-  
29 tural intervention here was specifically designed for the group of day labourers, a significant  
30 number of the 60,000 workers that inhabit the place are single, mostly uneducated men, who  
31 need to submit to a system of daily selection in order to secure some income. They need to  
32 congregate at designated places to be handpicked for labour.

33  
34 This system repeats itself every day and most of the workers are migrants, predominantly  
35 from the poorer regions of Japan. The enterprise proves to be very inefficient: much of the  
36 hard-earned wages are spend on food and housing. The net revenues that can be sent home  
37 are extremely small, non-existing or even negative, meaning that debts are being made in  
38 order to stay in the vicinity of the market. The design for the shelter was supposed to pro-  
39 vide the workers with affordable, clean and safe lodgings, and situated right on the edge of  
40 the huge complex, next to a church that is frequented by its target-group. Seen from this  
41 perspective I chose not to focus on the group directly: any depiction of an individual as rep-  
42 resentative would be unfair and prove to be rather difficult to complete. Besides that, it was  
43 not the right way to start this narrative, day-labour was an effect, not a cause.

44  
45 I decided to create an axis that included both scales. On the one hand the size of the system,  
46 with its economic, social, cultural and political value and directives. And on the other hand

the size of the day-labour, with its huge problems on an individual scale. This could be called a nesting of scales. Axis thinking can evoke the creation of two oppositions that do not exist, or two elements that are presented as being unchangeable, demanding the system to logically fill all the blanks in between, although they might not be existent or not be relevant. My take on this axis consisted of the relation between the two scales as the central rod in my investigation. This meant that both ends of the relation were not defined in a concrete or precise way, in the same way one can define an axis in terms of bigger and smaller, higher and lower etcetera. This could be called the 'differential axis'. Subsequently I started collecting all elements that were visually influential and organized them along the axis (this was a mental exercise of course; the actual editing only started when I was back in Europe). Suddenly all elements proved to be relevant: after all there was no definition of the ends of the axes, only about their relation, showing that the system was always presenting 100 per cent of its existence. Nothing exists outside of its expression.

A second type of axis was formed by the system of parallel handling. As indicated, all the processing is done in a semi-modest, parallel manner, which ultimately leads to an overall throughput of 700,000 metric tons of fish and seafood every year. The only way to start building an understanding of that magnitude is to repeat the same type of images to a point that the repetition itself becomes visible. With this I mean disrupting the cinematic process of homogenization and harmonious assembling of a montage, in favour of the creation of a more fundamental insight in the underlying problem of the subject matter. This was a hard procedure, not so much conceptually or technically, but for this I had to undermine my own standards as a filmmaker; I had to intervene in my aesthetic drives and senses. In this way, information works in both directions: it virtualizes and it actualizes. The relation between the actualized and the virtual is non-linear. The virtual is not a pre-existing condition of the actualized. The actualized is not logically necessary arising from the virtual, yet the virtual generates the contingently obligatory hinterland of the actualized. Architectural theorist Sanford Kwinter (2001: 8) illuminates:

Indeed the actual does not resemble the virtual, as something preformed or preexisting itself. The relation of the virtual to the actual is therefore not one of resemblance but rather of difference, innovation, or creation (every complex, or moment-event, is unique and new). Thus the following should be clear: realization (of a possible) and creation (through actualization-differentiation) are two intrinsically distinct and irreducible processes.<sup>2</sup>

The true story that was told took place outside of the frame of the film by definition. Any appearance of an outcome of that story in the frame was contingently obligatory (otherwise it would have appeared) but certainly not necessarily logical (it is a meta-story, one of multiple outcomes). This anamorphism leads to the better understanding of the site through the generation of many outcomes without a preconceived concept, of which only one was actualized 'on film'.

## **New York**

A second insight was derived from the experiences in New York. As mentioned, the difficulty there was the historical layering of the connotative values of the area of the Meatpacking

## ARCHITECTURE FILMMAKING

1 District. Regardless of which layer I would pick, I would always leave some others out. The  
2 intervention was based on a set of premises that partly no longer existed, partly had shifted  
3 and partly would be 'universal' in the sense that homelessness is not an effect that can be  
4 solved by modifying only a set of parameters. The causes and effects are much too complex  
5 to be addressed on a single level. Besides that, none of the layers had actually vanished;  
6 the area was still claimed by meat-packing activities, SM practices, clubbing hipsters, gar-  
7 bage-men, fashionistas, business-people and gazers, all at the same time. Immediately after  
8 my return I made a short edit of some of the meat-packing actions and when showing this  
9 to a visiting professor from Columbia University who lives close to that district, she reacted  
10 immediately: 'That must have been filmed a long time ago', whilst in fact the footage was  
11 not even a week old.

12

13 This is indicative of the constant interchange between denotation and connotation that is  
14 provoked by that area: it is what people think it is. The process of gentrification is seemingly  
15 an unavoidable element in the development of every city, and in that sense this situation  
16 was comparable to that in Amsterdam. Yet as the proposed intervention was also part of  
17 the system of gentrification and pacification, it was most likely that it could serve its original  
18 purpose very well, even when the conditions themselves had changed. This made me decide  
19 to focus on the conditions it had reflected upon in the first place, without any attempt to  
20 'historicize' the events.

21

22 I told one story, without pretending that the others did not exist. Obviously this was also a  
23 meta-story, not a specific and particular story and the choices of what to depict were much  
24 given by the subject matter itself. Apart from the aforementioned waiting for the photogenic  
25 meat-delivery, I did not force anything to be in or out of the frame. Just like in Tsukiji, I spent  
26 several nights and days in the area, first to get familiar and 'known' and later to film. Especial-  
27 ly in Tokyo it was imperative to demonstrate the respect for the system and the flows within.  
28 The seemingly unregulated swarming of labourers followed very exact paths and structures,  
29 standing one meter closer or further away literally made a crucial difference: the moment  
30 I unwillingly blocked an invisible pathway, I immediately got in trouble. The catamorphism of  
31 New York was that any particular story is true, as long as all stories are included.

32

### 33 Amsterdam

34

35 The third and final insight that could be harvested from the making of this trilogy arose from  
36 the experience with the *Westerdokseiland* project. In contrast with the Meatpacking District,  
37 denotative and connotative layers had already been stripped, physically because of the de-  
38 molishing of all existing structures, mentally because the place had never been inhabited  
39 or utilized by civilian and private figures – there was simply no form of public social history  
40 there. The liberating effect could have been to focus on the architecture itself and utilize the  
41 architects' arguments for the intervention as a thread in the film. Unfortunately the plan was  
42 never actualized; therefore, any arguments to do with that specific site had been 'placed  
43 out of reach' and thus excluded from the frame by definition. The only option that remained  
44 was to lift the level of abstraction to a plan of a plan, becoming an axis of any city versus  
45 any plan. The more generic the arguments (generic in the sense of arguments coming from  
46 a plan, not from the site or actual intervention), the more detailed the visualization needed

to be. Luckily that proved to be easy; as the construction was still in progress, the shots on construction-works were effortlessly obtained, and the shots on the environment of the site were equally simple to produce, as the construction-site itself proved to provide an excellent (literal) point of view. It became a film about interventions in general; the narrative was provided by the potential of the design, not by its actualization. These deliberations are part of a policy to become aware (and in charge) of detecting flows (both actualized and virtual) as the most 'real' structure that underlies our world. Despite our natural inclination to reduce reality to that what is actualized, visible, tangible, or in any other way 'in the frame', we need to force ourselves and shift to another realm of sensibility. We can only be aware of the forces that act upon all processes if we try to distinguish strata that supersede and underlie the becoming of actualization. Framing is an actualization; we need to un-frame these events in order to perceive the totality of reality.

## Conclusion

Through the examples and arguments I have presented in this chapter, I hope to have demonstrated that any (inter)action between film and architecture is at very best only partially steered by the human forces. The strengths and weaknesses of the medium indicate the desire of the medium itself. Potential results of any collaboration with matter and information is at best attributed to all bodies involved in that particular flow. In order to tap into that realm, we need to adapt our modes of perception to a different category on the basis of the transition from extensive to intensive thinking. We need to steer away from anthropocentrism altogether in order to investigate how affect and intensity can replace Cartesian and linear thinking. As an alternative, I have offered the recognition of flow, agency and relation (everything outside of the frame) as the starting point of negotiating our relation to the exterior. In actualization, many types of bodies act and operate, yet not a single one can be identified as the decisive one. The only identifiable moments of transitions are caused when reaching certain thresholds, yet these thresholds are not caused by the sum of all elements. This means that there is no linearity in (reaching) the threshold. Once we would accept these premises, it would be impossible to claim that the only force of desire that is expressed in these thresholds is those of the human participant. This casts a certain degree of reasonable doubt on the hegemony of anthropocentric desire, and forces us to ask ourselves: What is the desire of the medium? In order to effectively and meaningfully engage in the discourse on the relation between film and architecture we need to take all these considerations into account.

## References

- Bennett, J. (2010), *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*, Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press.
- Boumeester, M. (2015), "'Camera Eye": Cinematic studio research into architectural practice', *Architecture and Culture*, 3:1.
- Combes, M. (2013), *Gilbert Simondon and the Philosophy of the Transindividual*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Debaise, D. (2012), 'What is relational thinking?' in M. P. Boucher, P. Harrop and T. Rhoades (eds), *Inflexions 5, Simondon: Milieu, Techniques, Aesthetics*, Montreal: Sense Lab, pp. 1-11, [http://www.inflexions.org/n5\\_debaisehtml.html](http://www.inflexions.org/n5_debaisehtml.html). Accessed 31 March 2016.

## ARCHITECTURE FILMMAKING

- 1 De Beistegui, M. (2004), *Truth and Genesis: Philosophy as Differential Ontology*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- 2
- 3 DeLanda, M. (2006), *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity*, London and New York: Continuum.
- 4
- 5 Deleuze, G. (1989), *Cinema 1: The Movement Image*, London: Continuum.
- 6 Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1980), *A Thousand Plateaus Capitalism and Schizophrenia 2*
- 7 (trans. Brian Massumi), Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- 8 Frichot, H. (ed.) (2013), *Deleuze and Architecture*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- 9 Graafland, A. (2000), *The Socius of Architecture*, Rotterdam: O10 Publishers.
- 10 Guattari, F. (2009), 'A liberation of desire', in S. Lotringer (ed.), *Soft Subversions: Texts and*
- 11 *Interviews 1977-1985*, Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), pp.141-57.
- 12 Kwinter, S. (2001), *Architectures of Time: Toward a Theory of the Event in Modernist Culture*,
- 13 Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- 14 Massumi, B. (1992), *A User's Guide to Capitalism and Schizophrenia: Deviations from Deleuze*
- 15 *and Guattari*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- 16 Moussavi, F. and López, D. (2009), *The Function of Form*, Barcelona: Actar.
- 17 Parikka, J. (2014), *The Anthroscence*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- 18 Radman, A. (2012), 'Gibsonism', Ph.D. thesis, Delft: Delft University of Technology.
- 19 Scott, David (2014), *Gilbert Simondon's Psychic and Collective Individuation: A Critical Introduction and Guide*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- 20
- 21 Simondon, G. (1992), 'The genesis of the individual', in J. Crary (ed.), *Incorporations* (trans.
- 22 Mark Cohen and Sanford Kwinter), New York: Zone Books, pp. 296-319.
- 23 Žižek, S. (1997), *The Plague of Fantasies*, London: Verso.

## Notes

- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27 1 Rhizome is a model constructed by Félix Guattari and Gilles Deleuze to describe cultural
- 28 organization that resists the mode of root-tree system thinking, in which chronology
- 29 and causality prevail in the quest for the genesis of 'things'. Rhizomatic thinking
- 30 presents culture and history as a type of cartography with no single origin or evolution,
- 31 a rhizome 'ceaselessly establishes connections between semiotic chains, organizations
- 32 of power, and circumstances relative to the arts, sciences, and social struggles' (Deleuze and Guattari 1980: 8). A rhizome has no end nor beginning, it is always the in
- 33 between-ness that characterizes its existence.
- 34
- 35 2 Kwinter (2001: 10) continues: 'The first programmatically reproduces what was already
- 36 there, formed and given in advance, while the other invents through a continuous, positive,
- 37 and dynamic process of transmission, differentiation, and evolution. The crux lies
- 38 here: Actualization occurs in time and with time, whereas realization, by limiting itself to
- 39 the mere unfolding of what pre-exists, actually destroys novelty and annihilates time. In
- 40 the first instance time is real; in the second it remains artificially derived and abstracts
- 41 in relation to events. In the one case time is a dynamic and perpetually activated flow, in
- 42 the other, the result of an externally built-up succession of static images'.
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46