

Agencies of the Frame

Agencies of the Frame:
Tectonic Strategies in Cinema
and Architecture

By

Michael Tawa

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

Agencies of the Frame: Tectonic Strategies in Cinema and Architecture,
by Michael Tawa

This book first published 2010

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2010 by Michael Tawa
All drawings and photographs © Michael Tawa
Cover Image: Baños Almirante, Valencia. Photograph © Michael Tawa

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-1745-7, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-1745-5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	ix
Pretexton, <i>Jean-Luc Nancy</i>	
Introduction	1
O(u)verture— <i>similarities and differences; transdisciplinarity and deterritorialisation; cinema and reality; unsettling the real.</i>	
<i>Architecture and—disciplinary conjunctions; conjugal and strategic function of the and; difference and deferral.</i>	
<i>Drawing parallels—drawing from and drawing for; precedents; drawing for strategic and tactical benefit; selection of films and built projects; validity of readings; assemblages; intentional and non-intentional features of assemblages; adaptability and sustainability; reading for proliferating sense.</i>	
<i>Framing the look—the image; regimes of visibility; representational and presentational capacities of the image; ethics of looking; towards a non-representational architecture of enablement.</i>	
<i>User’s manual—purpose and uses of the book; thematic synopsis of the five main themes.</i>	
Chapter One.....	42
Place and Setting	
<i>Setting—setting and work; framing and unsettling; symbolic settings; Asplund and Lewerentz’s Woodland Crematorium; Cordoba Mosque.</i>	
<i>Place—space and place; place, memory, identity; place and Simondon’s “individuation”; place as “metastable” setting; ethos and topos; place, placelessness and modernity; displacement and dislocation.</i>	
<i>Taking place—“at home in homelessness,” the taking place of place, Ngannyatjarra country; kinaesthetic spatial practices; framing landscape in Burgess’ Uluru-Kata Tjuta Cultural Centre, Herzog’s Where the Green Ants Dream, Ian Dunlop’s People of the Western Desert, Roeg’s Bad Timing, Kurosawa’s Sunshine Through the Rain and Throne of Blood.</i>	
<i>Framing place—incontinent “Nature”; apparatuses of control; Heidegger’s reading of Aristotle’s phusis (nature); kinematics; potentiality; the right to concealment; Modernity and nature; landscape in Godard and Tarkovsky.</i>	
<i>Displacement—presence, absence and withdrawal; oblivion of the gods; the uncanny; framing landscape in Antonioni’s l’Avventura and Blow Up.</i>	

Chapter Two	91
Spatiality	
Setup— <i>space and place; form and rhythm; rhuthmos; geometric setups and regimes; frames and framing; hors d'œuvre, Derrida's parergon, out-of-frame and out-of-field; limit, leimma and residue; spatial framing and dynamics in Paradjanov's Sayat Nova, Kazan's Baby Doll and Dreyer's Joan of Arc; limit and surface in Miralles and Tagliabue's Torre de Gas Natural, Nouvel's Fondation Cartier and Quai Branly.</i>	
Looking away— <i>frame and look; Steigler's attentiveness; care; gaze of betrayal; close-up in Pasolini's Gospel According to St Matthew; Agamben's "whatever being" and Deleuze's "whatever space"; framing space in Antonioni's The Passenger; makeshift spaces; framing enablement.</i>	
Narrative frames— <i>framing for the Other; spatial narratives in Le Corbusier's Villa Savoye, Kahn's Korman House, Burgess' Hackford House, Zumthor's Sumvigt Chapel and Strasbourg Cathedral.</i>	
Chapter Three	131
Temporality	
Time: <i>time, division and the instant; past, present and future; time and tempo; Bergman's Cries and Whispers; time and space.</i>	
Limit, caesura— <i>time, limit, limbo; time of the look; khronos, kairos and opportunity.</i>	
Other times— <i>duration; tempo and temporality; structures of temporality in Wilder's Double Indemnity, Inarritu's 21 Grams, Roeg's Bad Timing and Antonioni's The Passenger, l'Eclisse and Blow Up; time, image, duration; time pressure and affective time in Tarkovsky's Mirror; infinitely finishing; The Necks' Aether; overlaid times in Arvo Pärt's Festina Lente; time and facticity in Tarkovsky and Herzog.</i>	
Time of the shot— <i>time in Godard's Éloge de l'Amour, Jarmusch's Stranger than Paradise, Paradjanov's Sayat Nova and Lynch's Lost Highway, Mulholland Drive and Inland Empire; time and virtuality in Lynch; gaze and duration in Godard's Éloge de l'Amour and Herzog's Fata Morgana.</i>	
"It is boring for one"— <i>Heidegger's profound boredom; the moment of vision.</i>	
Witholding potential— <i>Agamben's potentiality; Jullien's "blandness"; preservation of potential in space; symbolic and experiential registers of time in architecture; Jai Singh's Jantar Mantar observatory; the musical columns of Vijayanagar; programmatic potential in architecture; designing for the unprogrammable; adaptational potential in architecture; designing for enablement; transmuting context; light and time at Chartres Cathedral and the Baños Almirante of Valencia; architectural registers of time, place and memory.</i>	

Chapter Four.....	200
Materiality	
Light, sound, architecture— <i>regimes of visibility; light and space; light and dark; knot, joint and connection; sound and space; symbolism of sound and light; Plato’s Myth of Er.</i>	
Light and sound in cinema— <i>grains of image and textures of sound; Jarmusch’s Year of the Horse and Dead Man; Bergman’s Cries and Whispers, Persona and Winter Light; materiality of the image in Tarkovsky; the desert in Antonioni; light in Lynch and Godard.</i>	
Materialised sense— <i>vision and hearing; vibration and resonance; listening and attentiveness; conjugation and augmentation; mantra (sound) and yantra (space); the sound of the earth in Mahler and Godard; sound of alterity in Taverner’s The Protecting Veil; sound and assemblage; soundtracks in Pasolini, Lynch, Roeg, Tarkovsky and Antonioni.</i>	
Monstrous images— <i>image and monstration; resonant presence; violence of the image; evidence and appearance; architectural violations.</i>	
Grounds of artifice— <i>ground, grounding, grounds; Heidegger’s “The essence of Ground.”</i>	
Surfeit— <i>surface and excess; materiality of the image in Paradjanov’s Sayat Nova; substance and materiality of space in Siza and Lewerentz.</i>	
Chapter Five	258
Agency, Crisis, Disestablishment	
Assemblage— <i>assemblage and agency; mobilising potential; Deleuze’s “Plane of Immanence”; Simondon’s “metastable field” and “transduction”; buildings, ensembles and systems.</i>	
Agencies of the frame— <i>plane and plan(e) of consistency; Deleuze’s agencement; frame as an apparatus for mobilising potential; spatial framing in Hitchcock’s Rear Window; spatial dynamics in Antonioni’s l’Avventura; technology and “enframing” in Heidegger; prosthetic apparatuses and technical catastrophe; Martin Arnold’s Cinemnesis; time and space in Galeta.</i>	
Crisis— <i>multiplicity, virtuality and actuality; memory and recollection in Tarkovsky’s Mirror; geometric potentiality; virtuality in geometry, space and architecture; Simondon’s “supersaturation” and the crisis of sense.</i>	
Disestablishment— <i>montage, stability and instability; rhythm and destabilisation; disturbance, and crisis; subversive tactics in Antonioni, Godard and Haneke’s Caché; framing and incommunicability; subversive montage in the Palace Museum Beijing, Markli’s La Conjiunta, Scarpa’s Brionvega and Lewerentz’ St Peter</i>	
Notes.....	310
Bibliography	338
Index	349

PRETECTON

Architecte: *tektôn* en chef ou en premier, c'est-à-dire charpentier principal, couvreur principal, constructeur initial.

Peut-être même: bâtisseur du principe—et du commandement, et du commencement. L'*archi-* intégral, radical, authentique, c'est-à-dire l'*archi-* tout court, et très simplement, se précède lui-même.

Il s'encadre avant de s'être posé, placé, situé de quelque façon que ce soit. L'*archi-*, de manière très générale, est le cadre des cadres et donc le cadre d'avant les cadres, les places, les délimitations, les distributions, les rapports de forces, de volumes, de tensions.

L'architecte donc devrait se précéder lui-même. Appelons "tectonique" la qualité de la structure, de la tenue principielle, de la mise en place par conséquent de l'Idée sans laquelle nul agencement, nulle disposition ne saurait s'engager. Le tectonique, donc, est antérieur à toute position, proposition, exposition de quelque montage, construction, instruction que ce soit.

Archi et tectonique dans cette mesure se recouvrent. Tout *archi-* est tectonique et réciproquement: le premier mot indique dans la direction du principe ce que le second indique dans la direction du bâtiment. Commencer et bâtir se recouvrent là où on commence à bâtir en même temps qu'on bâtit un commencement (qui est toujours aussi commandement).

Tout commencement commence une espèce ou une autre de bâti—cadre, dispositif, structure, constantes et variables, jeu des résistances, convergences et divergences, attractions et répulsions. Inversement tout bâtir fait commencer quelque chose, un volume, un lieu, un espace, une bâtisse ou un bâtiment—qu'il soit temple, usine ou cabane.

Même la grotte, même la caverne—l'invention de la grotte ou de la caverne, le geste troglodyte—est architectonique. La caverne existe, mais il faut en saisir la forme, l'ampleur, il faut s'y disposer en tous les sens de l'expression: se disposer à y pénétrer, à en ouvrir le lieu, et se disposer en elle, s'y assied, s'y coucher, y faire le feu. Bientôt on y décore les parois. Elles deviennent des murs.

Le geste architectonique encadre mais il fait plus qu'encadrer: il ouvre la possibilité du cadre et pour cela avant de plier et fermer un triangle, un carré ou un rectangle, un volume quelconque, tube ou boîte, il entame l'espace. Il entaille. Il découpe, il taille des épaisseurs, des profondeurs, des avancées, des soutiens, des assises. Il taille dans l'espace brut qui est un bloc d'étendue indifférenciée. Le *tektôn* est charpentier ou bien sculpteur, dit-on. En réalité c'est un seul métier: c'est la taille qui extirpe le bloc, la poutre, l'étauçon ou la dalle.

La taille n'est pas seulement de blocs. Les formes ne sont pas seulement des tracés. Ce peuvent être des mouvements, des élans, des motions. C'est aussi un chemin vers une porte. C'est aussi un escalier ou une échelle. C'est comment on regarde au dehors ou au-dedans. C'est le corps en marche, allongé, accroupi. C'est la veille et le sommeil, la vigilance et l'oubli.

L'entaille ouvre la possibilité du cadre, de la découpe, dans un regard qui est une pensée qui est un mouvement, une tension: comment j'espace l'espace lorsque j'y prends place. Le philosophe appelle cela *Dasein*: être un *là*. Comment je suis non pas "ici" mais moi-même cet *ici*. Je ne m'y trouve que parce que je l'ouvre.

Chaque corps ouvre l'espace et l'entaille, se met à le tailler en morceaux, en pièces, en masses, en nappes, rubans, pans, panneaux et voiles. Chaque corps est une caméra qui cadre et qui monte ses cadres selon ses mouvements, avances, reculs, glissades, montées, descentes: rien d'autre qu'un corps ouvert et mobile dont la kinésie découpe les champs, les plans, les portées successives de la perception. Mais que veut dire "perception"? C'est entrée d'un corps dans le monde et poussée du monde en lui. Procession ou promenade, dérapage ou étirement, prises, déprises, saisies, dessaisissements. Toutes les espèces, les sortes, les allures d'entaille que peut faire un corps, une pensée, un tact, une approche.

Michael Tawa est une caméra, un corps à son travail d'entaille dans la masse épaisse qui se trouve à la fois dans le monde et posée sur lui: la masse signifiante des discours, théories, propositions, analyses, rhétoriques et poétiques où se jouent d'autres façons d'entaille, d'entame et de cadre. Car on veut aussi dire ce que fait le corps cadreur qui, lui, ne parle pas. On veut le cadrer à son tour dans des mots, des propositions, des énoncés, ce qu'on dit faire du sens mais qui surtout met à vif la richesse, la profusion des tectoniques indéfiniment renouvelées et qui pour finir échappent quand même aux prises du discours. Il parle de "sacré" par exemple, ou de "durée," ou de "présence," il parle de "violence" ou de "rencontre," de "territoire" ou de "flux": autant d'entailles, parfois profondes, parfois légères, brèves, de simples encoches et parfois des

rayures, des stries: de l'une ou de l'autre manière ce sont des échappées vers des espaces qu'aucun mot ne contient, des espacements, des extensions, des appuis et des tremplins parmi lesquels il nous fait avancer, sentir la tectonique toujours à l'œuvre non pas devant mais derrière nous: l'architectonique qui le commande lui-même comme un pilote qui serait très loin derrière lui, très loin en lui, la première entaille qu'est son corps même d'architecte.

—Jean-Luc Nancy

PRETECTON

Architect: chief or first *tektôn*, that is to say principal carpenter, principal roofer, initial constructor.

Maybe even: builder of the principle—and of the commandment, and of the commencement. The integral, radical, authentic *archi-*, that is to say, in one word and very simply, the *archi-* precedes itself.

He frames himself before having been posed, placed, situated in one manner or another. The *archi-*, in a very general way, is the frame of frames and thus the frame from before frames, places, delimitations, distributions, relationships of force, of volumes, of tensions.

The architect should therefore go before himself. Let us call “tectonic” the quality of the structure, of the principal disposition, of the consequent putting into place of the Idea without which no setup, no disposition could be engaged. The tectonic, then, is anterior to any position whatsoever—to any proposition, exposition of montage, construction or instruction.

In that sense, *archi* and tectonic overlap each other. Every *archi-* is tectonic and reciprocally: the first word indicates in the direction of the principle what the second indicates in the direction of the building. Commencement and building overlap each other right there where we commence to build at the same time as we build a commencement (which is also always commandment).

Every commencement commences one or another species of framework—cadre, apparatus, structure, constant and variable, play of resistances, convergences and divergences, attractions and repulsions. Inversely all building makes something begin, a volume, a place, a space, a construction or a building—be it a temple, factory or cabin.

Even the grotto, even the cavern—the invention of the grotto or the cavern, the troglodytic gesture—is architectonic. The cavern exists, but one must grasp its form, its amplitude, one must be disposed to it in every sense of the term: disposed to enter it, to open it as a place, and to dispose oneself within it, to sit there, to lie down, to make a fire. Soon we decorate its sides. They become walls.

The architectonic gesture frames but it does more than frame: it opens the possibility of the frame and therefore, before folding and closing a triangle, a square or a rectangle, any volume whatsoever, tube or box, it initiates space. It gashes. It cuts up, it carves thicknesses, depths, projections, supports, seatings. It carves into brute space which is a block of undifferentiated extension. The *tektôn* is a carpenter, or else a sculptor as we say. In reality it is a single trade: carving is what extirpates the block, the beam, the prop or the pavement.

Carving is not only of blocks. Forms are not only tracings. They could be movements, élan, motions. It is also a path towards a door. It is also a stairway or a ladder. It is how we look to the outside or to the inside. It is the body walking, lengthened, crouched. It is waking and sleep, vigilance and oblivion.

The prop opens the possibility of the frame, of the cutting out, in a look that is thinking in motion, a tension: how I space out space when I take place there. The philosopher names this *Dasein*: being a *there*. How it is that I am not “here” but am myself this *here*. I only find myself there having founded it.

Every body opens space and carves it, sets about cutting it up in portions, in pieces, in sheets, ribbons, flaps, panels and veils. Every body is a camera which frames according to its movements, advances, retreats, slidings, ascents, descents: nothing other than an open and mobile body whose kinetics carves up fields, shots, the successive reaches of perception. But what does “perception” mean? It is entry of a body into the world and thrust of the world within it. Procession or promenade, skid or stretch, takes, releases, seizures, relinquishments. Every species, sort and aspect of carving that can make a body, a thought, a tact, an approach.

Michael Tawa is a camera, a body at work carving into the thick mass that finds itself in the world and placed upon it: the signifying mass of discourses, theories, propositions, analyses, rhetorics and poetics in which are played out other means of carving, slicing and framing. Because one also wants to say what a framing body does, which itself does not speak. One wants in turn to frame it in words, propositions and enunciations which we hold to make sense, but which above all animate the richness, the profusion of indefinitely renewed tectonics, and which when all is said and done nevertheless evade the framings of discourse. He speaks of “sacred” for example, or of “duration,” or of “presence,” he speaks of “violence” or of “encounter,” of “territory” or of “flux”: so many carvings, sometimes deep, sometimes light, brief, simple notches and sometimes stripes, streaks: in one or another way they are escapements towards spaces that no word can contain, spacings, extensions, supports and

springboards with which he enables us to advance, to sense the tectonic always at work not before but behind us: the architectonic that commands him like a pilot, that would be very far behind and deep within him, and whose first carving would be his own architectural body.

—Jean-Luc Nancy

INTRODUCTION

O(u)verture

The main purpose of this book is to help inform and enrich the spatial and tectonic dimensions of architectural design. The intent is to discern within cinema those qualities, conditions and techniques that might be useful for design strategies, tactics and practices. Although the main focus is on drawing implications from cinema for architectural design, the same might be possible in reverse, as well as across into other disciplines. There are evident parallels between cinematic ways of constructing film and architectural ways of constructing space. The major emphasis is on drawing parallels rather than implying identity between the two art forms. They are substantially, even radically different in purpose, scope and practice. Nevertheless, there are significant overlaps and resonances that are worth mapping out and investigating for common ground.

A parallel relationship maintains difference and distance between two entities. It does not allow direct transfer across the divide that separates them. This means that something irreconcilable must be preserved between them, something that is not accidental or contingent but constitutive and revealing. What separates identities also defines them individually and conjointly in fundamental ways. For example, time is a major constitutive condition of cinema. It cannot-not be broached and worked conceptually and technically. This applies even if time is not the central thematic concern of a film. In architecture time generally does not represent a critical condition. It forms part of the general environment in which architecture is situated, but may not be explicitly conceived of, theorised or worked by architects. It is nevertheless an inescapable component of existential space whether or not it is brought into consideration, and it will condition the quality and experience of built environments.

In the past, time constituted a fundamental register for architecture, particularly in sacred buildings. Many landscapes, buildings and structures explicitly embody the numbers, ratios, proportions, cycles and rhythms of time into their physical fabric.¹ But architects, unlike cinematographers, cannot literally manipulate chronological time, slowing or speeding up its duration by design. What they can do however, like cinematographers, is modify existential time or the sense of time that is felt in the experience of

space. It is possible to convey particular temporalities—for example by certain alignments between built form, light, and environmental conditions. There are therefore parallels between cinema and architecture in terms of the manipulation of existential temporality. Such parallels do not represent equivalences between the two, since the worlds that they each operate within are fundamentally unlike. There are nevertheless resonances, and it is the potential of such resonances that this study looks to investigate.

Architecture is unlike cinema in fundamental ways. Cinema is essentially time-based, even though it clearly would not exist and could not be experienced without space—without the key spatial condition of the interval which makes *here* different from *there*. It deals with moving two dimensional images projected for an audience whose spatial position is fixed and whose engagement is largely limited to vision and sound. The particular framing and sequence of viewing are predetermined, uncontested and irreversible. Visual regimes and points of view established by the camera and the manner, geometry and dynamics of the camera's motion fundamentally affect the nature and reception of films. This takes place according to their disposition towards the world and to worlds that they create, as well as to the relationships between characters, narratives, spaces and times that they valorise. For its part, architecture is fundamentally space-based even though it clearly couldn't be designed, produced or experienced without time. It deals with the installation of stable forms in space, experienced by individuals and collectives whose engagement is largely kinaesthetic and multi-sensory. The sequencing of experience in architecture, or the spatial sequences and narratives it makes available—although evidently limited in many ways—are open to multiple possibilities of trajectory, rhythm and infiltration. Architectural experience will generally be of a self-consistent subject whose ultimately unknowable subjectivity conditions the visual regime they deploy, the equally unknowable and unpredictable points of view they take up, the circuits they trace and the tempo of their movement. They will be engaged to a greater or lesser extent in the milieu they are moving through, and they will make particular demands on that milieu depending on their functional, recreational, commercial or other disposition towards it.

Such limits form part of what defines architecture and cinema, but they also represent opportunities for transformation through practices of place making and cinematography. It is a question of how assumptions and limits can be put to the test in order to eclipse disciplinary, material and technical constraints. It is when cinema can say something about the timeless presence that arrests its passage, and when architecture can say something about the transient moment which unsettles its permanence, that

the extraordinary and the uncanny are enabled to take place and come to pass.

The construction of place remains fundamental to architecture, irrespective of the disciplinary transformations that take place from time to time by design, necessity or crisis. Architects must deploy skills of spatial organisation and manipulation, calibrated and geared to articulating enduring places for human inhabitation. Among the many dimensions that architects must engage with and manipulate to achieve these ends—space, time, materiality, structure, construction, environment—those of space, time and materials will predominate in this study. The fundamental gesture of architecture is the performance of spatial moves and the enactment of spatial and material strategies that determine enclosure, dispose and compose patterns of form, mobilise and make possible sequences and rhythms of motion and rest. Experienced architects draw on multiple typologies and vocabularies of such formal and kinaesthetic gestures, bringing to bear a vast legacy of architectural reflection to the processes of design and production of buildings and places. The richer the vocabularies, the more flexible, adaptable and effective the process becomes.

Architecture has its own formal and gestural histories; its own typologies, vocabularies, tropes and syntaxes. At the same time, architecture has always deferred to other disciplines in order to clarify and elaborate its own procedures and its own problems. In a surprising sense architecture is a discipline with intrinsic rules—geometric, spatial, configurational, and technical—but without the means to implement them other than by consorting with others. It inhabits the intersections between so many disciplines across the arts, humanities and sciences that it can only be adequately known in terms of a foundational otherness, rather than in terms of anything intrinsic to itself. In that sense, architecture is radically improper and delinquent. It might claim authority over space, but so do sculpture and dance; over place, but so do landscape architecture, cartography and geography; over time, but so do music and cinema; over materials, technology and environment, but so does engineering; over procurement but so do law, building and project management; over well-being but so do medicine and psychology. It might defer to philosophy for its ideas; to history for its types; to astronomy, music and arithmetic for its canons of measure; to astrophysics or cybernetics for its metaphors; to aeronautics, biomimetics and parametrics for its forms and materials; to industrial manufacturing for its assemblage, and so forth. The question *What is proper to architecture? What is architecture per se?* is an uncomfortable one. What is it that

remains for a discipline so greatly dependent on others to outline its identity, define its scope and articulate its practices?

In his *Abécédaire*, Gilles Deleuze elaborates the interiority and exteriority of disciplines through the motif of *desire*:

“For me, as soon as we do something, it is a question of getting out, it is a question of remaining and getting out at the same time. So, remaining within philosophy is also a question of how to get out of it. But getting out of philosophy doesn’t mean doing something else. That’s why one has to get out while remaining inside... I want to get out of philosophy by way of philosophy.”²

He then recounts correspondence received after publication of his book *The Fold*—numerous letters from surprising sources, among them the French Movement of Paper Folders, and ocean surfers who saw themselves inhabiting and riding “the mobile folds of nature.” Deleuze’s evident point is that, through philosophy, philosophy gets out of itself, deterritorialises itself by way of drawing latent implications across into other domains. For him these instances represent the true sense of encounter—which is not to meet other people, but to encounter other ideas and other practices. “We encounter things before we encounter people... we encounter the charm of people, the work of people, not people.” What we encounter is desire, and desire is not desire for the singular but for multiplicities and ensembles of elements associated within assemblage that have agency—that is, that have the capacity to produce:

“You never desire someone or something. You always desire an ensemble... what is the nature of the relationships between elements so that there can be desire, so that they can become desirable?... I do not desire a woman, I also desire a landscape that is enveloped in that woman... I never desire something on its own... I don’t desire an ensemble either... I desire within an ensemble... there is no desire that doesn’t flow... that doesn’t flow in an assemblage. So much so that desire for me has always been... constructivism. To desire is to construct an assemblage, to construct an ensemble... to construct a region... that is truly to assemble. For an event to take place there has to be a difference of potential. For there to be difference in potential there has to be two levels. At that moment something takes place, lightning passes or a small stream... Desire... constructs an assemblage, it establishes itself in an assemblage, it always puts into play several factors... In an assemblage there is always a collectivity: collective, constructivism... Never interpret. Experiment with assemblages. Look for assemblages that suit you. There are four constituents of assemblages: an assemblage comprises states of things and enunciations, styles of enunciation. Every assemblage applies a style of enunciation. Then it applies territories, every one to their

territory... Even when we are in a room, we chose our territory. I enter an unfamiliar room. I look for the territory—that is, the place in that room where I will feel most comfortable. Then there are processes that we have to call deterritorialisations. That is to say the manner in which we leave the territory. I would say that an assemblage includes these four dimensions: states of things, enunciations, territories and movements of deterritorialisation. In such ways, desire flows.”³

It is in this sense that architecture and cinema operate as sites of deterritorialisation for each other. They are an outside in which the other’s desire for encounter plays itself out and begins to produce. Cases can be made for multiple disciplinary associations for architecture—for example with music, theatre, philosophy, gastronomy, viticulture and so forth. But with cinema it can avail itself of distinctive and instructive alignments of concern with place, space, time and materiality. Cinema frames places, landscapes and environments. It organises the screen spatially in particular ways. It modulates duration and montage to construct specific temporalities. It manipulates light, sound and the technologies of film production to convey particular ambiances and atmospheres. What cinema does *not* do is remain open ended as to the sequencing of its reception. The viewer is obliged to experience a film according to an order that is both predetermined and inescapable. In fact this is one of the key conditions that cinema has sought to eclipse through various techniques of montage by unsettling chronological sequence and spatial hierarchy, so as to suggest folds and returns in the fabric of space and time. Nevertheless, the cinematic sequence must be set in order to be projected and it must be experienced as set in order to be received.

A common proposition is that architectural experience has no such imposed constraints. People can infiltrate spaces from several directions, cross and crisscross them at will, revisit some and avoid others, remain in one place for a long time and bypass another in no time at all, chose to move in a line or in returning circuits. Hence the claim as to the freedom available in architecture compared to the constraining regime of reception in cinema. But things are not that simple. Firstly, a significant proportion of the space of the world is out of bounds or otherwise inaccessible—by law, by design or by the nature of things. Dwellings, civic and commercial buildings, industrial estates, government and military installations, gated communities, the service zones of buildings such as lift shafts, machine rooms, security facilities and so on—all of these are spaces of exception. This means that spatial infiltration is always already limited by at least pragmatic and technical conditions. There are political conditions which establish power relations determining accessibility and inaccessibility; preventing access by certain people to certain spaces, but also allowing

pervasive surveillance and therefore access to all spaces by others. There are then the designed conditions conceived by architects and others who install particular spatial practices by determining specific geometric forms and typologies, spatial organisations and layouts, circulation patterns, solids and voids, structures and services, and the facilities (or lack of facilities), furnishings, materials, signage and surveillance that support these practices. Part of these designed conditions flow from implicit philosophical, religious, socio-cultural, political and aesthetic registers that often remain undeclared, but which affect the reception of architecture, the spatial disposition and kinaesthetic comportment of those who inhabit and use it. This deterministic capacity of architecture further masks the apparent freedom to come and go where and as one pleases. The greatest works are always those that test the disciplinary limits and constraints supposed to condition their conception, production, reception and consumption. They do not eliminate these limits but maintain them—working with them liminally and subjecting them to significant stress so they dilate and become open to other possibilities. Consider for example the question of how multiple temporalities (past, future and present, slow and fast time) could be conveyed in cinema within a framework that must remain strictly chronological, sequential and linear, and in architecture within a framework that must remain strictly orthogonal, immobile and centred.

Following his assertion that the proper concern of cinema is not to “realistically” convey the factuality of events but to capture their reality, Andrey Tarkovsky makes a telling observation about the way imagination, dreams and recollections can be conveyed in cinema:

“How is it possible to reproduce what a person sees within himself, all his dreams, both sleeping and waking? ... It is possible, provided that dreams on the screen are made up of exactly these same observed, natural forms of life. Sometimes directors shoot at high speed, or through a misty veil... But that mysterious blurring is not the way to achieve a true filmic impression of dreams or memories. The cinema is not, and must not be, concerned with borrowing effects from the theatre. What then is needed? First of all we need to know what sort of dream our hero had. We need to know the actual material facts of the dream; to see all the elements of reality which were refracted in that layer of the consciousness which kept vigil thorough the night... And we need to convey all of that on screen precisely, not misting it over and not using elaborate devices. Again, if I were asked, what about the vagueness, the opacity, the improbability of a dream?—I would say that in cinema ‘opacity’ and ‘ineffability’ do not mean an indistinct picture, but the particular impression created by the logic of the dream: unusual and unexpected combinations, and conflicts

between, entirely real elements. These must be shown with the utmost precision. By its very nature, cinema must expose reality, not cloud it.”⁴

The implication is that in order to convey the real character of a situation, event, object, person, place or world—that is, its *this-ness*, *quidditas* or *haecceity*—there must be a significant element of unreality and artificiality, of playing with and distorting the “realistic” in such a way as to amplify its “real” content. For Tarkovsky this is not to be sought in special effects or literal translation, but in the focussed and intensified working of the materials and technologies of film itself, paying close attention to the inherent logic of the moment being conveyed and being willing to suspend disbelief in order to perfect that conveyance. Tarkovsky’s conceptual and tectonic modes of working have significant implications for architecture.

Much current architectural theory and practice declares an urgency for engaging with contemporary realities in which certainty and stasis no longer hold, where universals have no purchase, where fluctuation and interminable variation condition experience and where the disconnected and fragmented are commonplace. In response, architects look to formal systems and modes of working which privilege the dynamic and the ambiguous. Attracted to so-called non-Euclidean geometries and rhizomatic networks, embedding design in the diagramming of fluctuations in global markets, political deterritorialisations or other kinds of statistical analyses and parametric modelling, architects look for relevance in the conditions, needs and demands of a contemporary world in a state of crisis. As a result architecture becomes a mimetic and formal representation of the dynamic, fluctuating, unsettled, unpredictable and catastrophic lineaments of that crisis. But doing so it merely trades one form of *mimesis*—the imitation of transcendent permanent realities—for another: the imitation of immanent impermanent fluxion. It continues to adhere precisely to the literalness that Tarkovsky warned against. It is not a question of finding “elaborate devices” to represent certain conditions or to displace certain accepted modes of working. Rather, it is a question of remaining and working with the foundational and familiar existential characteristics, elements and processes of reality in order to convey its unsettling and uncanny dimensions. The implication for architecture is that the most unsettling, the most unfamiliar and extraordinary experiences happen to take place precisely in the midst of the most ordinary and mundane of circumstances.

Architecture *and*...

Architecture *and* cinema. Why this particular conjunction? Architecture *and*: music, gastronomy, viticulture, philosophy, religion, geography, politics. Always architecture *and* something else—as if architecture had no intrinsic being and could exist only in relation to something else, to something outside of its bounds. It may be that architecture's primitive role has always been the implementation of commissions and directives from outside its own domain through the application of organisational and technical know-how, skills and resources to realise them. Architecture originates in the field, in the workshop and with the guilds. It comes very late into the ambit of art, the humanities and the university. Before then such alliances were without value or function. Architecture proceeded by the application of commonly accepted practices and techniques in geometry and construction. These constituted the "content" of architecture—what was proper to it, what determined its identity as an applied practice. The complexity and sophistication of this applied content and tecnic can be gauged in traditional buildings across different cultures, constructed when architecture as a discipline and profession existed only in a latent state: Medieval cathedrals and Hindu temples, Roman and Arab baths, Mesoamerican cities and so forth. The appearance of "Architecture" as a distinct discipline and profession also meant the appearance of distinct "content" that could be abstracted from its traditional practices. The complex conceptual and ritual framework of Masonry is a case in point. Once introduced into the academy and displaced from the field and the workshop, architecture needed to define its disciplinary boundaries and justify its contents. The more it did this, the more it distanced itself from its primitive conditions. This distantiation has a limit. The intensification of architecture's dalliance with theory appears to have reached a state of excess and overburdening of this limit. The corollary of excess is an impoverishment of the kind of primitive know-how that characterised architecture before "Architecture." This is evidenced as much in the quality of built architecture as it is in the nature of architectural education, curricula and practices.

Regaining what is proper to architecture does not imply returning to past circumstances, nor does it imply a-conceptual un-theoretical perspectives on practice and education. The point I would make here is that much of the theory adopted into architecture—whether it be Pythagorean cosmology in Vitruvius or Derrida's trace in Eisenman—is improper to the extent that it does not engage what is at the same time proper and radical to architecture. Traditional architectural know-how and techniques for articulating and constructing buildings, irrespective of how

pragmatic or unconsciously held they happen to be, are, like every idea held and every gesture enacted, susceptible of being theorised. Processes of organising space through geometric patterning and repartition can be diagrammed, codified, classified and converted to repeatable patterns that require no theoretical or conceptual undertaking in their application to particular projects. However these geometries and patterns do have ideational dimensions which connect them into complex webs of symbolic registers for example. Likewise all technical figures in construction, no matter how mundane, connect to registers beyond the pragmatic in similar ways. Consider for example the terms *door furniture* and *housing* in carpentry. With the first, the notion and reality that a door is inoperative without being furnished with hinges, a latch, handle, lock and so forth, is self evident practically. Theoretically however this term gives leave to think the concept of furniture as what is necessary to operability—whether it be a door, a room, a street or a public square. Door furniture, room furniture, street furniture—these might all be designed on purely aesthetic grounds, or they might reference Derrida's trace and Eisenman's overmapped geometries. But they can also engage with a different kind of theory which derives from their pivotal necessity for the operability of the equipment and spaces that they furnish and furnish-with.⁵ As for *housing*, the term refers to the creation of a joint in carpentry, where one member of the connection allows a place for the other by modifying itself. Normally this is done by having some material removed which the other member can then occupy. Japanese timber joinery has made of this possibility an extraordinarily sophisticated art. Connections vary in complexity from simple housings to very complex joints in which two or more members each give something away to receive the others. The most remarkable examples in Japanese carpentry are those which require no third element—such as glue, dowels, nails or bolts—to fasten the housing assembly. Here, it is the precise mutual compliance of each component with each other component that creates a locked joint with practical, structural and aesthetic value. This architectural moment—something proper to construction in other words—implies and entails its own theorisation. No other discipline can approach the concept of housing in the same way, and only this approach can yield distinctive insights and directions for theoretical investigation. Such technical instances of housings have something foundational and radical to say about the theme—for example, that housing is about reception, receptivity, hospitality, hosting, allowance, making room for, affordance, sacrifice, compliance, deferral, complementarity, interlocking, strength, inseparability, demountability, adaption, reuse and so forth. The particular constellations of words, ideas and themes opened up by architectural notions like housing and furniture

are not possible in any other discipline. These constellations are fields which enable the production of sense—of *architectural* and *architectonic* sense that can be elaborated into frameworks and assemblages with substantial implications for design.⁶

The *and* in *architecture and cinema* would then be a gesture of reappropriating sense, of recovering assemblages whose components have become dispersed in music, philosophy, poetry, religion; or else appropriated by other conditions and disciplines, by cinema for example. In such cases the conjunction *and* takes on a formative or semantic role. Philosophy, music, or whatever else, supply meanings and concepts that architecture might convey or communicate, but which it does not in itself have the capacity to produce. The danger is a setting up of architecture as primarily concerned with signification, with an instrumental function of communicating or expressing ideas. It then operates as an empty container—informed, animated, ordered and organised by meanings drawn from outside to shape and articulate it. It depicts and represents those ideas, becoming *metaphorical* or *symbolic* in the process. The clearer the representation, the more efficacious the depiction, the better the communication and the more successful the architecture. This trope is Platonic and follows the motifs of *mimesis* (imitation of the archetype or *eidōs*) and *methexis* (participation in the *eidōs*), developed notably in the Republic, and of the *khōra*, developed in the Timaeus. There, space (*khōra*) is the “nurse of becoming”—formless potentiality or pure inarticulate capacity in need of an idea or archetypal pattern to shape, organise and give it purpose. In phrases like “architecture and cinema,” the *and* will commonly establish a relationship of hierarchical dependence implying that the first needs the second in order to be meaningful.

Another sense of the *and* is the implication of an intrinsic, secret alliance. If we take “architecture and music” as an example, the *and* would imply that the two art forms and practices are affiliated according to some essential commonalities—such as number and geometry, proportion and rhythm, tonality and atmosphere, timbre and materiality. These identities refer both arts and practices to a more essential state of being. The *and* provides a circuit of continuity between them, across which their affiliation can be played out. Again the trope is Platonic and its lineage Pythagorean. In the Republic, Plato lists four key stages on the way to truth. Each is associated with a science. They are arithmetic (static one-dimensional number), geometry (static number in two and three dimensions), music (number in motion) and astronomy (three dimensional number in motion). These four became the *Quadrivium* of Medieval pedagogy. The four sciences are completed by the “capstone” of Dialectics, towards which all learning must be directed. Number and the

logic of its operations regulate all things, from quantitative calculation to the qualitative dimensions of discernment, wisdom and truth—all things in proper order and proportion. This allows Plato to venture a quantification of ontological relationship by defining the various states of being in the form of a proportion: “as being is to becoming, so is pure intellect to opinion, and as intellect is to opinion so is science to belief and understanding to the perception of shadows.”⁷ In such a register, architecture *and* music would imply that there is some intrinsic kinship between the two, that they are analogues, alternate expressions or modulations of a single condition, or that there is a foundational measure of identity between them. This alliance would allow both art forms and practices to share common content and to reflect each other. The study of architecture and music would then concern itself with demonstrating essential correlations, with the subtext being that *and* means *equal to*: architecture = music.

The sources and persistence of this ideology and its mobilisation for architectural practice are well documented. It rests on a harmonic conception of existence and a hermeneutic framework for creative practice. It can only be sustained where the ambition is to correlate human production, through *mimesis*, with a cosmic production that has sacred status worthy of imitation. In this framework, the *and* represents a relationship of logocentric and hierarchical dependence implying a dual rhythm of deduction/induction. The alliance is reinforced by etymology since name (*logos*) and number are cognates and convey two states of the same entity. Every existent has a name and every name a corresponding number, so that the name (*NAM) is the being *in principle*, while the number (*BR) is the being *in vibration*—that is, in rhythmic operation. The world is constituted of such vibratory states and harmonic configurations which are available to human endeavour as a means of according human and cosmic conditions. The harmonies embedded in human works are thereby deduced from and induce cosmic harmonies embedded in the world, themselves deduced from and inducing the first harmonic utterance: the *logos*, word or verb.

With Roland Barthes, the *and* takes on a radically different function. Instead of drawing together two entities to form a unity it operates to concatenate without fusion, but also to ramify. It works in a conjugational and not merely additive or integrative manner. The conjunction is not summative but excessive. In Barthes’ terminology, the resulting concatenated system produced tends to overcoding. It develops to a liminal state of crisis which is both catastrophic and transformative. The entities thus gathered remain distinct while the collectivity is marked by an increase and intensification. By virtue of the excess produced, the entities

begin to resonate and imply others which are not concrete but immanent and virtual within the collectivity, and whose potential is actualised by the resonances. A personal experience from music might illustrate this. I recall a performance by the musician Keith Jarrett at the Sydney Opera House. Jarrett's overture consisted in playing a series of chords, repeated in a sustained cycle of iterations. The chord sounds produced remained clearly distinct and the pattern of repetition scrupulously maintained. At a certain moment during the sequence, an additional melodic line could be faintly heard above the repeating chords. But Jarrett was not playing a melody. This additional layer was being produced entirely through the resonances activated by the separate chords, themselves comprising distinct, though related tones. The melodic line was smooth and continuous across the chords and, as it were, *floated* some way above them. This was not a solitary experience. Several in the audience who realised what was developing were sufficiently taken aback to look for confirmation from others. Jarrett had managed to mobilise the potential of these chords, to actualise without explicit articulation their propensity to unfold entire scales or modes, and to foreground their latent melodies. In this example, the *and* which linked the chords kept them singular but also produced, because of the acoustic prolongation, overlap and resonance of sound either side of each chord, something supplementary, emergent, unexpected and surprising.

This is equally the Deleuzian function of the *and*. A concatenation of singularities which produces something new, unplanned, possibly unplannable and unprogrammable.⁸ For Deleuze, the *and* belongs to the motif of the *milieu*—the midst and middle. It constructs a site in which the focus shifts away from the terms of a relation towards the mediating relation itself. That is, away from the stable *being* (*être, est*) of the terms to the *and* (*et*) which mobilises a deployment of “conjunctions, disjunctions, alternations and interlacements, of additions the total of which is never achieved, of subtractions the remainder of which is never fixed.”⁹ This priority of being and privileging of essence is foundational in language and philosophy:

“All of grammar, all of syllogism, is a means of maintaining the subordination of conjunctions to the verb to be, and to make them gravitate around the verb to be. We have to go further: make it so that the encounter with relations penetrates and corrupts everything, mines being, makes it tumble. Substitute and (*et*) for being (*est*). A and B. The AND is not even a particular relation or conjunction, it is what subtends all relations, the route of all relations which makes all relations flee outside their term, outside the ensemble of the terms, and outside everything that could be determined as Being, One or All. The AND as extra-being, inter-

being. Relations could establish themselves between their terms, or between two ensembles, from one to the other, but the AND gives another direction to relations and forces terms and ensembles to flee, one and the other, on the line of flight that it actively creates. To think *with* AND, instead of thinking BEING, to think *for* BEING: empiricism has never had any other secret... The multiple is no longer an adjective subordinated to a One which divides itself, nor to the Being which encompasses it. It has become substantive, a multiplicity which never ceases to inhabit every thing. A multiplicity is never in the terms, no matter how numerous, nor in their ensemble or totality. A multiplicity is only in the AND, which does not have the same nature as the elements, the ensembles and even their relations.”¹⁰

The *and* therefore has a creative and productive function. Its use shifts, unclenches, accelerates and mobilises language, bringing it to a state of stammering or stuttering (*begaiement*), carrying it to an encounter with the strange, unfamiliar and uncanny within itself.¹¹ Philosophy then becomes a practice of putting into work, of functioning, of agency, of preparing or making room for what arrives and eventuates. The components of philosophy, of thought, of community are not distinct, stable entities or eternal ideas. When people enter a room, he writes, “they are not persons, characters or subjects, but an atmospheric variation, a change of hue, an imperceptible molecule, a discrete population, a fog or a dripping storm cloud... Real entities are events, not concepts.”¹² By implication, spaces are not defined formal configurations that have a separable existence. Rather, they are settings, milieux and ambiances subject to interminable modification, changes of state, reorientations, densifications and rarefactions caused by whatever assemblages happen to take place within them and affect them fundamentally.

The efficacy of the *and* is to unclench assemblages and agencies whose interminable deterritorialisations provoke a surfeit and fulguration of production. It operates as the pivot of assemblage, the trope which affords a development of agency and desire. In Barthes’ terms, the *and* triggers a state of *jouissance*, accompanying the experience of overcoding to excess of signification. It is a mark of radical difference and interminable deterritorialisation between elements which the *and* simultaneously separates and concatenates, divides and conjugates. It makes possible the difference of potential necessary for there to be communication, negotiation and commutation between the elements—for it to be possible for something to spark, flow or resonate between them. In that sense, the *and* initiates an open system of dynamic interaction, of constantly unfolding conditions which, while not bringing terms into cohesion nevertheless triggers or brings them into production. Bringing elements

and conditions into neighbourhood through the *and*, through juxtaposition, collage, montage and other assembly and editing strategies, is not a process destined to specific outcomes. It is not the means to an end. The process may well deliver outcomes, but the outcomes are not the point. The process and what it produces are equally not convergent or predetermined but *emergent*. The focus of this process is on creating conditions and circumstances of preparedness and readiness—limit conditions of crisis and emergency within a system that is attentive to the advent of whatever comes, of whatever presents itself in the midst.

Architecture *and* cinema means that we are faced with two fundamentally unlike and irreconcilable entities. Two singularities that do not refer to a transcendent commonality or unity, but which nevertheless produce between them an enabling site of assemblage and agency. The relationship is neither closed nor symmetrical but parallel. This means that the two do not touch and do not meet, that the discrepancy between them is sustained. The gap between them is a field of potential difference and therefore of potential resonance and vibration. They are parallel in the sense of interminably shuttling between and deferring to each other, and beyond each other to yet others through a disconnected connectivity which is vitally productive. This parallelism becomes a mechanism for reading, producing, mapping and implementing new configurations of thought, figures of speech, states of being, gestures, trajectories, geometries, strategies, tactics, techniques and technologies. At least that is the sense intended for architecture *and* cinema in this book. The framework approaches Deleuze's contention of philosophical practice as a kind of multilingualism—in the sense that architecture and music are two systems that are brought into strategic relationship through the analyses and parallels proposed:

“We have to be bilingual even in a single language, we have to have a minor language in the interior of our language, we have to make of our proper language a minority usage. Multilingualism is not only the possession of several systems each of which would be homogenous in itself; it is first a line of flight or of variation which affects each system by preventing it from being homogenous. Not to speak like an Irish person or a Romanian in a language other than one's own, but on the contrary to speak in one's own language as a stranger. Proust says: ‘Great books are written in a sort of foreign tongue’ ... That is the definition of style.”¹³

This might mean that its dalliance with cinema enables architecture to become estranged, to create a foreign condition for itself within itself, to find trajectories which deterritorialise it from within. It would not do this by acting “cinematically” or working outside its confines, but precisely by